THE ROLE OF ORAL LANGUAGE INTERACTIONS IN ENGLISH LITERACY LEARNING:
A CASE STUDY OF A FIRST GRADE KOREAN CHILD

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN EDUCATION

BY
KWANGOK KIM
DISSERTATION ADVISOR: DR. LINDA MARTIN

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
MUNCIE, INDIANA
MARCH 2011
ABSTRACT

This paper is a qualitative case study of a Korean first grade child. The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of a first grade Korean child’s oral language interactions with teachers, parents, peers, and community members and to examine how a child’s oral language impacts his literacy learning in English. The data were collected over five months from three different settings: the school, the Korean Language School, and the home. Data methods were interviews, observations, field notes, surveys, audio and video recordings, documents, and informal assessments in Korean and English. Data analysis was based on the analytical categorization and the constant comparison analysis.

The results of this study revealed that opportunities to engage in social interactions between a child and his teachers, parents, and peers through oral conversation contributed to the language and literacy learning of the child observed. The analysis of the data showed that literacy development in English was influenced by three factors: individual factors, home and school environmental factors, and community and cultural environmental factors. Individual factors were personal motivation, the first language effect, and background knowledge. Home and school environmental factors included parents’ support, peer group activity, and teacher’s role. Finally, community and cultural environmental factors were mass media and Korean culture and identity. The results of the study supported Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory and Bronfenbrenner’s ecology system theory that learning occurs through social interactions in cooperated groups and their environments.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Context

With the development of communication technology, social and cultural boundaries are changing rapidly, and the world is becoming a diverse society. The educational system in the United States is also undergoing significant change with the growing population from diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), approximately one third of the growth in the United States population is due to immigration. More than 37% of the U.S. population will be Latina/o, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American by the year 2020.

English Language Learners (ELLs) from diverse backgrounds encounter difficulties and troubles adjusting themselves within new and different educational, social, cultural, and linguistic environments. There are several reasons contributing to the difficulties and problems. First, immigrant families are not familiar with the demands of American schooling. Thus, parents of ELLs are failing to provide adequate and necessary support for their children’s academic success (Valdes, 1998). Second, policy makers have become impatient with the failure of schools and adopted proficiency examinations including tests of English language and literacy. These policies put ELLs under pressure
and ELLs are struggling to become fluent language users and achieve the high level of language and literacy competence (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000). Third, ELLs face conflict and confusion between the different cultures and the languages of their home and school. For example, Au and Mason (1981) find that Hawaiian children are used to engaging in free-flowing interactions at home. As a result, Hawaiian children participate positively in the class activities when they are engaged in small-group discussions which are similar to interactions children are used to at home. Finally, once the children begin to learn English at school in an English-only environment, they rapidly lose the language spoken at home (Wong Fillmore, 1991). The loss of the first language results in the loss of identity and self-confidence as well as producing a negative view of one’s own cultural heritage. The loss of self-esteem leads to a low educational achievement (Kouritzin, 1999).

Students, through diversity, bring to school unique experiences and cultural background knowledge from their own nations. Hiebert (1991) points out that the diversity present in many American classrooms can be seen as a means for acquiring literacy and as an important contribution to the process of literacy acquisition in the diverse society of the 21st century. From this perspective, the various contexts (social, cultural, and linguistic) ELLs bring to their classroom should be considered as important facts in order to develop their language and literacy skills. The cultural and social settings through which children acquire and develop their literacy affect their literacy understandings, practices, and attitudes (Smith, 2004).

Learning is a social activity (Vygotsky, 1978). Children initially develop their understanding of literacy by observing others and participating within social and cultural
settings. Social interaction is regarded as an essential instrument whereby information is structured. Learning is facilitated through the assistance of others who are more knowledgeable, such as teachers, peers, and parents. Children learn reading, writing, and academic discourse through the interactions of the group in the sociocultural environment (Goatley, Brock, & Raphael, 1995).

**Statement of the Problem**

Multicultural classrooms are common in the United States as the number of children from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds is increasing. The enrollment of ELLs in public schools will be as high as 35 to 50% by the year 2025 (National Assessment of Educational progress, 2005). However, the considerable gap between literacy achievement of ELLs and mainstream students has been a concern for many years. Significant numbers of ELLs typically score far below that of native English speakers in academic achievement, and the gap is widening (National Assessment of Educational progress).

Expectations of teachers may directly influence the learning performance of ELLs (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). Gomez (1996) states that “the beginning perspectives of students toward diverse children, particularly those of color and those from low-income families can be characterized as limiting these children’s opportunities to learn and achieve in school” (p. 120). Au (2000) also argues that students of diverse backgrounds are categorized as poor readers at school because of their limited English skills, and teachers give the instruction of lower level skills in isolation without meaningful connection to the context. They spend more time at school on lower-level skills such as spelling, phonics, and word identification, rather than on comprehension, higher order
thinking, and evaluative thinking. As a result, ELLs have fewer opportunities to develop the full process of reading, writing, and higher-level thinking skills.

Teachers play a critical role for the ELLs in supporting language and literacy development. Forty percent of preservice teachers surveyed at a Midwestern university showed “a lack of empathy with minority problems in regard to institutional racism and expressed a lack of confidence in education” (Moultry, 1988, p.11). In addition, only 6% of regular classroom teachers have had any formal coursework addressing ELL issues (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1997). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, only 13% of the teachers in the United States are of diverse ethnic backgrounds. This means most teachers are generally from mainstream backgrounds, and they have little knowledge and information about their students’ diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The lack of teachers’ understanding and concern for diverse children and insufficient professional training make teachers unprepared for the literacy learning of ELLs.

The result of 33 teachers’ surveys in Layzer’s (2000) study shows that ELLs are shy, timid, not talkative, and tentative in interacting. These characterizations of ELLs reveal that teachers easily attribute ELLs’ tentativeness to personal character. As a result, ELLs lack opportunities to engage in activities such as the varieties of paired work, small group work, and opportunities to share work in their own words. ELLs need to not only engage in reasonable discussion but also associate with the academic discourse of the various school subjects related to their own cultural and social backgrounds. Au (1998) addresses the importance of culturally responsive instruction indicating that, “students’ opportunities to learn to read improve when teachers conduct lessons in a culturally
responsive manner, consistent with community values and norms for interaction” (p. 312).

Recent research reveals the great benefit of maintenance of the first language for minority students and the importance of the development and preservation of the first language (Kouritzin, 1999). When young minority children enter the school, the loss of their first language begins quickly. They discover the value of English at school and start to shift from their first language to the second language (English), which is the only way they make friends and gain access to the social world. However, parents have little awareness of the importance of their children’s first language maintenance. Teachers and parents also may have little information on how to help their children to maintain their first language although they know the important role of first language. If family and community do not provide a sense of belonging to their own ethnic identity and culture and support children’s first language maintenance, the relationship between children and parents will be filled with conflict (Park & Sarkar, 2007).

There is a lack of adequate research conducted in language and literacy acquisition considering the implications of the social and cultural interactions of students from diverse backgrounds. Additional research regarding the content, which is related to ELLs’ cultural backgrounds, prior knowledge, and first language maintenance, will promote ELLs to maintain their identity and self-esteem and finally develop their higher literacy acquisition and academic performance.

**Purpose of the Study**

Based on Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory (1978), language and literacy learning occurs from social interaction with more knowledgeable members including the teacher,
other adults, and peers. In this view, language and literacy learning is much more than a matter of letters, sounds, and words. It implies meaningful connection to the context, a higher order of comprehension, and critical thinking between the members of society. ELLs can develop their first and second language through having friends and other members of the community with whom they can communicate. Therefore, home, school, and community should be considered places where ELLs can enhance their language and literacy development.

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the nature of a first grade Korean child’s oral language interactions with teachers, parents, peers, and community members and to examine how a child’s oral language impacts his literacy learning in English. The aims of this study come from several specific questions: How will three different contexts (school, home, Korean community) which have different cultural values and beliefs influence the child’s language and literacy development?; what are the characteristics of oral interactions in each context?; and how will oral interactions in each context impact the child’s language and literacy learning? The main research question is the following:

**Research Question**

How do oral language interactions at school, home, and in the community impact a first grade Korean child’s literacy learning in English?
Definition of Terms

*Culture*: Culture is a system of values, beliefs, and standards which guides people’s thoughts, feelings, and behavior. Culture “involves a dynamic process which people use to make sense of their lives and the behavior of other people” (Au, 1993, p. 4).

*Oral language*: Oral language includes both receptive and expressive skills, and encompasses specific aspects such as phonology, vocabulary, morphology, grammar, and pragmatic skills (August & Shanahan, 2006, p.29).

*Literacy*: literacy refers the quality of being one who can read and write. Reading is a language process in which an individual constructs meaning through a transaction with written text that has been created by symbols that represent language (Hudelson, 1994, p.130).

*Multicultural education*: Multicultural education is a process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students. It challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among other) that students, their communities, and teachers represent (Nieto, 1992).

*ELLs*: ELLs stands for English Language Learners. It refers to student participants who are learning English as a second language (Prater, 2009, p.608).

*Sociocultural theory*: It delineates learning as a process of transforming participation in communal practices with the assistance of the more knowledgeable members of the community with the learner’s zone of proximal development (Kong & Fitch, 2003, p.355).
**Language loss:** Language loss is when a minority group member cannot do the things with the minority language that s/he used to be able to do. Some of the proficiency s/he used to have is no longer accessible (Fase, Jaspaer, & Kroon, 1992, p.8).

**Second Language (L2):** L2 can refer to any language learned after learning the first language (L1), regardless of whether it is the second, third, fourth, or fifth language (Gass & Selinker, 2008, p.7).

**Second Language Acquisition (SLA):** SLA refers to the process of learning another language after the native language has been learned, generally a nonnative language in the environment in which that language is spoken (Gass & Selinker, 2008, p.7).

**Code switching:** Code switching refers to the use of more than one language in the course of a conversation (Gass & Selinker, 2008).

**Significance of the Study**

In the modern world, 3,000 or more languages are spoken (Byon, 2008). According to the statistics of the U.S. Department of Education (2006), Korean is ranked fifth among the most common Limited English Proficient students’ (LEP) native languages, followed by Spanish, Russian, Hmong, and Arabic. However, until quite recently, Korean has not been as well known and popular as East Asian languages such as Chinese and Japanese (Byon, 2008).

As the number of Korean immigrants increases, the process of language loss among young children also grows over two generations, between the second and the third generations. According to Wong Fillmore (2000), language loss is the result of both internal and external forces operating on children: “The internal factors have to do with
the desire for social inclusion, conformity, and the need to communicate with others and the external forces are the sociopolitical ones operating in the society against outsiders, against differences, against diversity” (p.208).

The first generation of Korean immigrants has a strong belief that it is important to preserve strong ties with their old country and first language (Hinton, 1999). Korean parents want their children to assimilate to the mainstream and acquire native-like English skills to be successful in this society, but they desire their children to not lose their first language and maintain the value of their own culture and identity. However, under the current socio-political conditions, children have few choices to attend schools which offer opportunities to develop both languages fully. Hinton (1999) argues that when schools do not support the maintenance and development of the first language, the responsibility is up to the family, but the success of first language maintenance is rare.

This study has significance in investigating the language and literacy learning of minority children, particularly related to the language maintenance and loss of a Korean-American student. Only a few studies of literacy in bilingual communities have been undertaken, and research of the literacy practices of Korean Americans is uncommon.

**Assumptions of the Study**

1. The child, the teacher, and parents respond to the oral and written questions in a truthful manner.

2. The significance of the student’s behavior could be determined through observation, interviews, and collection of artifacts.
Limitations of the Study

This research is a single participant case study. Merriam (1998) states that “case studies include as many variables as possible and portray their interaction, often over a period of time; case studies can thus be longitudinal” (p. 30). The observation of language shift from home to school as well as the transcription of the interview and observation data, which was accompanied by extensive detail on the social, personal, and physical settings, needs more time than five months, the length of this study, to obtain an in-depth description of the process of language and literacy learning. The number of subjects investigated was limited; it was difficult to generalize the results. In addition, in gathering information, there was no way of probing his knowledge and conversation any further than what he had produced.

Summary

The number of students from diverse backgrounds increases and most of them not only suffer from a mismatch between their home culture and school culture, but also struggle with academic achievement and English proficiency. Schools and educators encounter unprecedented challenges regarding how to help ELLs achieve high levels of literacy in a classroom. Learning is a social and cultural interaction, and children learn from teachers and peers at school, parents at home, and others in the community. It is not excessive to emphasize the role of teachers and parents in developing language and literacy that is taught to minority students. This study investigates how a first grade Korean child develops his language and literacy based on the social and cultural interaction at school, home, and in the community.
CHAPTER II: REVIEWS OF LITERATURE

Historical Background

Language and literacy learning is a complex process and it involves a multiplicity of perspectives relating to linguistics, psychology, and sociology. The linguistics focuses on the description of the linguistic systems of second language learners, psychology focuses on the process of the learner system which learners create, and sociolinguistics focuses on social factors which affect the use of the system (Gass & Selinker, 2008). These different perspectives interact together and not only provide affluent information and resources but also reveal important information about how the language and literacy learning takes place.

During the 1950s, behaviorism or the Skinnerian prospective was prevailing. Within the framework of the Behaviorist theory, language and language learning came from automatic habits through mimicking and analyzing the behaviors of others. In other words, learning was acquired as a result of certain environmental contingencies, not from growth or development (Skinner, 1974). One of the main concepts in behaviorist theory is the notion of transfer, which means: the learning of task A will affect the subsequent learning of task B with regard to behaviorist theorists. They considered language as speech rather than writing. By the mid-1960s, the movement turned attention back to the mental structures and processes of the human mind and away from the environment. Two
communities of theorists, linguists and psycholinguists, especially were prominent in this period. One of the most influential linguists to language learning, Noam Chomsky (1975), assumed learning as a natural process, which was developed through meaningful use, not practiced with mindless reaction, as behaviorists proposed. Chomsky argued that human beings are biologically programmed to acquire language under favorable conditions. Chomsky established Universal Grammar (UG), which focused on the assumed innate mental structures that allowed for language use. He addressed it as: “The theory of a particular language is its grammar. The theory of language and the expressions they generate is Universal Grammar” (p.167). The theory underlying UG assumed that language consisted of a set of abstract principles that characterized core grammars of all natural languages (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Another community which shifted language acquisition from the view of conditioned behavior to a natural process and inherent ability was psycholinguists such as Kenneth Goodman and Frank Smith. Psycholinguists’ focus is on semantics and how meaning is acquired, represented, and used during the process of reading. They suggested that children learned written language through exposure in a meaningful situation (Goodman & Goodman, 1980) rather than through the acquisition of a set of skills.

By the mid-1970s, researchers were interested in cognitive psychology, specifically information-processing theory (Pearson & Stephens 1994). This perspective held little regard for the innateness or naturalness of reading; instead it searched for general processes that consider language as an interaction between symbol systems and the mind. The characteristics of this period were a model of sociocultural or contextual influences on the processing of linguistic information, individualistic interpretations of
written text, and the modifiability of individuals’ knowledge bases (Alexander & Fox, 2004).

Moving into the mid-1980s, the information-processing approach was replaced by constructivist theory. Researchers such as Vygotsky (1978), Lave (1988), and Heath (1983) provided a new viewpoint based on social and cultural anthropology and further developed the methodology of literacy research which contained holistic and aesthetic thought. Within this perspective, learning was viewed as a sociocultural and collaborative experience and the learner was thought of as a member of a learning community (Brown & Campione, 1990). Alexander and Fox (2004) stated that learning could not be separated from the situation in which it occurred, so that knowledge came to reside in the context itself, rather than in the individual learners. Thus, knowledge came in when the students socially participated in discussion or collaborative-learning activities. In the 1990s, information-processing and sociocultural perspectives were reconciled and attention turned back to the individual learner within the educational environment, while the learner still resided within a sociocultural context.

The social aspects of learning are relevant in schools, homes, and communities where interaction between adults, peers, and children have a strong influence on what and how children learn. This study focuses on the nature of social interaction in language and literacy learning of one first grade Korean student. With regard to the research question, related literature reviews include second language acquisition (SLA), language and literacy learning, the relationship between the first language and the second language, and social interaction in language and literacy learning.
Theory Relevant to Research Question

This investigation is based on sociocultural theory by Vygotsky (1978). The central belief of sociocultural theory (e.g., Au, 1993; Au & Carroll, 1997; Au & Raphael, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978) is that the human mind is constituted through language-based social interactions with others. Vygotsky (1978) argued that children’s cultural development and learning took place twice; first, through dialogue in social interchange with others (interpsychology) and the other, inside the children’s mind (intrapsychology). From the perspective of Vygotsky, school learning takes place in the context of social relationships such as teachers-students, parents-children, or peers’ interactions. An ethnographic study by Alan Davis (1996) showed the example of teacher-student interactions. He described successful classrooms where low-income learners and minorities attended. The researcher found no particular teaching methods in the classrooms, but he found each classroom to have a highly coherent and inclusive social system. Davis (1996) stated that “‘culturally compatible’ is not their underlying values or the nature of activities in which students engage, but rather the development of the relationship in which each person is valued and able to participate successfully” (P.26).

Vygotsky’s theoretical framework is also relevant to modern multicultural education. Half a century ago, Vygotsky started his experience working with children in different social and ethnic groups in Russia. The educational issues, literacy as well as ethnic and cultural diversity, Vygotsky and his colleagues explored became the main point in many classrooms in the United States. The popularity of Vygotsky’s theory is the fact that he already offered the answers to the questions that were not asked earlier in Western countries. Vygotsky’s interpretation of signs and symbols as mediators in the
development of cognitive processes through social interaction has great latent benefit for teaching culturally diverse learners. The belief of sociocultural theory furthermore has insightful implications for facilitating students’ literacy learning in multicultural and multilingual classroom settings (Ageyev, 2003).

In a sociocultural theory, learning takes place within cultural contexts (Wertsch, 1985; Purcello-Gates, 1995). Purcello-Gates focused on the importance of comprehending the cultural contexts which the learners had developed to understand who they were related to and how to process, interpret, or decode their world. The goal of learning is the creation of a mutual understanding in the social interaction of particular individuals in a particular context. It addressed the importance of considering the literacy practices beyond the classroom to understand the whole process of literacy acquisition and development (Heath, 1983). In an ethnographic study conducted in two speech communities, Heath found that there was variation in the language socialization patterns and the language usage between different socioeconomic groups. She argued that language learning was cultural learning based on the fact that oral and written language used in the home and the communities affected successful learning in school.

Another major concept of sociocultural theory contributing to the theory of learning and instruction is mediation (Kozulin, 2003). Mediation has two kinds of agents, human mediator and the other, symbolic tools mediators. Kozulin (2003) described the importance of the relationships between the human and symbolic aspect of mediation. The role of the human mediator is in the form of the actual interaction between people. Symbolic tools means letters, codes, and mathematical signs. Although symbolic tools have a rich educational potential, symbolic tools alone without the human mediator is
meaningless. In other words, if a foreign language is taught as a coding system that simply maps the correspondence between foreign words and native language words, the learner becomes severely handicapped in both comprehension and expression in the foreign language.

Sociocultural theory asserts that children learn and develop their understanding of literacy through their observation and participation with other children in cultural and social settings. In Vygotsky’s view, peer interaction, scaffolding, and modeling are important ways to facilitate individual cognitive growth and knowledge acquisition. The view of language learning through social interaction between children, peers, and adults is associated with Vygotsky’s concept of the *zone of proximal development* and Bruner’s concepts of *scaffolding*. Vygotsky (1978) defined the zone of proximal development as a region of activities that individuals can navigate with the help of more capable peers and adults. In other words, the zone of proximal development is the interpersonal space where new understandings can occur and knowledge is generated through collaborative interaction and critical inquiry. Scaffolding (Bruner, 1983) refers to the gradual withdrawal of adult support as children master a task. Interactional support such as dialogue between a teacher and a child helps to maximize the growth of the child’s intrapsychological functioning and it produces the responses of language learning (Clay & Cazden, 1990). The teacher’s role as the one who scaffolds new information is helping children to solve the problem independent from adult’s support and control.
Current Literature Relevant to the Research Questions

Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

One of the well-known models in the area of second language learning is Krashen’s (1982) *Monitor model*. From the psycholinguistic processing model, Krashen described the Monitor model in the 1970s, which has had a long term effect on the field. The first hypothesis from the Monitor model is the *Acquisition –Learning hypothesis*. Krashen (1982) assumed that second language learners have two independent systems of developing knowledge of a second language. One is through what he called *acquisition*, and the other through *learning*. Language acquisition is similar to how children acquire their first language. Through a subconscious process, children acquire a second language without awareness of grammatical rules. It requires meaningful interaction in the target language, in which speakers are concentrated in the natural communicative act, not in the knowledge of grammar rules. Language learning comes from direct instruction about the grammatical rules and comprises a conscious process. Students have to memorize the rules and need conscious knowledge of the grammatical rules of the new language. In this study, the terms of learning and acquisition are not differentiated, but used in combination.

The second hypothesis is *Comprehensible Input*. Krashen claimed that humans acquired language in only one way: by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981). When English Language Learners (ELLs) enter the new classroom, they receive comprehensible input from the new environment and understand the communication from outside the learner. Consequently, ELLs acquire language by hearing and understanding messages from their teachers and classmates
(Krashen, 1982). Based on the Comprehensive input theory, Haynes (2007) suggested that a small-group setting rather than a teacher-only lecture style setting allowed ELLs to increase comprehensible input. Small-group activity will provide more opportunity for ELLs to practice oral language and repetition of information, and adapt the message according to the ELLs’ needs. If the language skills, which are slightly above the ELLs’ actual ability, are provided to ELLs, ELLs will increase their language comprehension efficiently by scaffolding new information.

Haynes (2007) and Cummins (1994) described the importance of *comprehensible output* as well as comprehensible input in ELLs English learning. The process of developing ELLs’ English skills with their English-speaking peers is called comprehensible output. Although the comprehensible input (e.g., understanding of messages and receiving information) is a main aspect of second language acquisition, comprehensible output (e.g., the active use of the second language) should be encouraged as well (Haynes, 2007). Therefore, communicative interaction, both input and output, is considered as a useful variable to emphasize the second language acquisition process rather than comprehensible input alone. Communicative interaction is more companionable with the zone of proximal development as the learners construct an interpersonal environment through interaction. Au (2006) suggested that cooperative learning groups were one way for new ELLs to receive ample input and output. They would develop their communication skills by joining the cooperative learning groups and increasing the balance of input and output.

The next hypothesis is *Affective Filter*. Krashen (1981) claimed that a number of “affective variables” played a facilitative role in second language acquisition. These
variables include the learner’s emotional state, motivation, self-confidence and anxiety. In other words, ELLs’ embarrassment, anxiety, and low motivation combine to raise the affective filter and form a ‘mental block’ which prevents comprehensible input from the learner’s ability to process new information (Krashen, 1981; Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Haynes (2007) indicated that classroom teachers could create a more effective learning environment for ELLs by supplying comprehensible input and output in a low anxiety environment. When students were encouraged to participate in activities such as sports, art, and music programs according to ELLs interests, the affective filter did not impede their language acquisition.

**Second language developmental stages.**

Tabors and Snow (1994) described the language development stages of preschool aged children from homes where English is not their first language. According to Tabors (2008), by the time children reach preschool age, they have developed a broad vocabulary and basic knowledge of grammatical structures in the first language and understand the purpose of language. Tabors and Snow categorize young children’s second language acquisition into two types: *simultaneous* and *sequential acquisition* (p.11). When children are exposed to two languages from birth and mainly acquire words from both languages, it is called simultaneous acquisition. If children build their first language primarily at home and second language learning occurs later, it is called sequential acquisition. The latter type of second language acquisition will be considered in this research.

Tabors and Snow (1994) classified language development into four steps: home language use, the nonverbal period, telegraphic and formulaic speech, and productive
language use. When ELLs are in the new language context, they encounter both social and cognitive challenges. During the first step, ELLs usually use the home language for a while or stay silent. If their effort to use their home language would not be accepted, they enter a silent period and do not talk. Older children quickly realize that their communication in a first language will not work in the classroom, in contrast to younger children (Saville-Troike, 1984). This is followed by a nonverbal period, commonly seen during the first few months. In this phase, students are cognitively engaged in cracking the code: observing others, rehearsing, and repeating what they hear. ELLs need the help of the adults in the classroom. During this stage, they should not be ignored by their peers on account of their poor, basic English skills. Following this period, children use telegraphic and formulaic speech. They can use a few content words, develop a vocabulary of object names, name the ABCs, and identify colors. Finally, they reach productive use of the second language.

Haynes’ (2007) stage of second-language acquisition classified five steps: Preproduction, early production, speech emergence, intermediate fluency, and advance fluency. The preproduction is a silent period which may last for a few days to more than a year, depending on a variety of factors. ELLs should not be forced to speak before they are ready during this period. If they are encouraged to participate in small group interaction, they will be more confident in speaking with their peers. Early production is the period when students can speak one or two words phrases and use short language chunks. This stage may last up to six months. At the speech emergence stage, students can communicate with simple phrases and short sentences. They are able to understand easy stories and do some content work with help. During the next stage, intermediate
fluency, students use complex sentences and try to express, share, and write their opinions and thoughts. Students use learning strategies and study skills, and their comprehension in a content area is increasing. At the last stage, advanced fluency, students use complex vocabulary and sentence structure like native speakers do. They continually develop new vocabulary, build up learning strategies, and increase their writing skills.

Factors that affect second language acquisition.

Age differences in learning second language.

The age differences when learning a second language have been one of the controversial and complex issues among scholars and researchers. It is commonly known that young children have the least trouble in learning their first languages. Singleton (2005) suggested that young learners acquired language quickly and easily based on the critical period hypothesis. According to Lenneberg (1967), children’s brains were more flexible than those of older learners, and they were superior to adults in learning a second language. The young learners also could learn languages easily because their cortex was more plastic than that of older learners (Barry, 1992).

However, Dicker (2003) argued that it also demanded time and effort for young children of normal abilities and in normal circumstances to learn second languages. Dicker maintained that the reason behind young children’s quick and easy acquisition of a second language came from the expectation of language proficiency by age. This means less language proficiency is asked from young children, while older learners face the demands of more complex language proficiency. Older learners have a more difficult task in front of them than young learners do.
Therefore, learning a second language requires a great deal of effort and time for young children, just as children spend comparable time and effort on learning their first language. McLaughlin (1978) concluded that the process of learning a second language was neither quick nor effortless, and it was not true that younger was better.

Although more recent empirical work has shown the complexity of young children’s language acquisition, in general, children have better phonology, but older learners achieve better second language syntax (Long, 1990; McDonald, 2006). Pronunciation is one aspect of language learning in which the younger-is-better hypothesis may have validity (McDonald, 2006). Oyama (1976) found that as the younger learners began to learn a second language, the more native-like the accent they would develop for the language. However, experimental researchers (Rocca, 2007; Long, 1990) supported that older students and adults performed better than younger children under controlled conditions, except in the area of pronunciation.

Genesee (1981) examined the formal second-language learning of children of different ages and found that second language learners at an early age did not prove to be advantageous; the older students learned faster and eventually caught up with the younger ones. Politzer and Weiss (1969) also suggested that the older learners achieved higher scores and had better readiness for learning the language than the young learners. Snow and Hoefhagel-hohle (1978) sustained that older learners were more skilled in dealing with the instructional approach; on the other hand, the younger learners were at a disadvantage in learning a second language because of their cognitive and experiential limitations compared to the older students.
Individual differences.

Individual differences were considered as one of the main variables in language acquisition (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978). Saville-Troike’s (1984) study revealed the extent of individual differences in the student’s language learning, use, and interaction. Diaz-Rico and Weed (1995) illustrated that individual factors such as affective and cognitive factors affect the learning of a second language. Affective factors include self-esteem, motivation, anxiety, and attitudes of the learner; on the other hand, cognitive factors relate to information processing issues and the ways of acquiring or learning the second language.

Jun-Aust (1985) also examined the factors that affected individual differences in second language learning. She investigated integrative motivations, parental attitude, ELLs’ choices of peer pairing, and intelligence on second language proficiency. She used natural observation and experimental techniques (formal language proficiency test) to investigate how peer pairing influences communicative language proficiency and formal language proficiency. The results showed that peer pairing was an important factor which affects communication language proficiency and listening proficiency.

Wong Fillmore (1979) signified how learner’s individual differences influenced the second language acquisition. She examined five subjects, who were all newly arrived from Mexico and not exposed to English previously, to discover what social processes each child was involved in. The subjects were paired with five English-speaking friends for observations. The result showed that the individual differences among the five children had to do with the interaction of the cognitive and the social factors of language acquisition; the nature of the task of learning a new language, the strategies that needed to
be applied to the task, and the personal characteristics of the individuals involved. Hence, the study showed that individual differences of acquiring a second language had to do with the child’s social preference or social confidence rather than the child’s intellectual or cognitive capacity.

Jun-Aust (1985) argued that Wong Fillmore (1979) did not clearly describe the distinction of formal language proficiency and interpersonal communicative proficiency. Consequently, Jun-Aust suggested that Wong Fillmore’s study lacked the information about the factors, formal language proficiency and communicative language proficiency, which influenced individual variations in learning language. It could be that both formal language acquisition and communicative language acquisition integrate together and occur when children are exposed to: community, school, and home. It is hard to distinguish these two types of language acquisition separately, especially when children start to learn a second language. In this research, both formal and communicative language learning will be identified as second-language learning.

**Time exposure & other factors.**

Many educators think one of the best ways for children from minority backgrounds to learn English is to offer them a constantly exposed English environment (Long, 1990). Often, teachers and parents encourage children to speak and read only English at home. On the surface, one might expect that the more English children hear and use, the quicker their English language skills develop. However, children in bilingual classes, where there is exposure to the home language and to English, have been found to acquire English language skills equivalent to those who are in English-only programs (Long, 1990). Furthermore, merely more exposure to English does not result in better
performance; rather, students who have had the most exposure to their first language have the best performance in English (Dicker, 2003).

Language develops when children are exposed to many opportunities to express themselves. If children are forced to speak only English at home, they will be deprived of learning to communicate effectively in either language. Students should be encouraged to read and speak in their native language outside of school. Children who participate in diverse verbal interactions at home in their native language show higher language development before schooling (Simich-Dudgeon, 1989).

The student’s age and level of native language fluency may be indicators of new language acquisition. Older students, over age eleven, are able to transfer their native language reading skills to the second language. They have already learned to think logically and abstractly in their first language. Hence, a child who arrives in an English-speaking school at age twelve acquires more English-speaking academic skills in one year than an eight-year-old sibling (CIERA, 2000). In addition, there are various factors which influence the student’s L2 learning, such as age of arrival and starting age of L2, cognitive abilities, motivation, attitude, and parental support (McLaughlin, 1978).

**Language and Literacy Learning**

**Language proficiency.**

Cummins (1984) suggested there are two types of language proficiency: one type was Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and the other was Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS is also called social language which relates to communication skills used in informal situations such as cafeteria, school buses,
hallways, and playgrounds. CALP refers to decontextualized language for acquiring new information and knowledge in class.

Cummins’ research shows that ELLs usually acquire BICS within six months to two years of entering school. CALP takes five to seven years to reach a similar level to a native English speaker on academic works. This means that even though ELLs show fluency-level superficially in BICS, their language skills are still less mature. Some ELLs experience a sudden drop in reading achievement when they go to a higher grade, though they have been making good progress in earlier grades.

The studies of Cummins (1991) and Hakuta, Butler, and Witt (2000) explored how long it would take to acquire academic L2 proficiency for ELLs. According to their findings, attainment of age appropriate levels of performance in L2, including literacy, can take four to seven years. It will take seven to ten years if L2 learners are not educated in their L1; however, it will take five to seven years if they are educated two to three years at school, regardless of background variables (as cited in Camlibel, 2005, p.19). Thus, L1 proficiency is a powerful predictor of L2 development rate, and leads to better L2 learning (Cummins, 1984; Hakuta, 1987; Snow, 1987).

Thomas and Collier (2002) also found that the most powerful predictor of academic success in L2 was formal schooling in L1. ELL groups who attend the program with balanced L1 and L2 instructional support achieve academically higher in L2 than groups being schooled monolingually in L2. Their study provides evidence that the student’s cognitive and academic development in L1, as well as proficiency development support successful progress in L2. They suggest, however, it will take four to ten years for ELLs to catch up to the academic level of native-English speakers. One of the reasons
it takes so long is native-English speakers are continually developing their cognitive and academic skills in a learning environment like ELLs do.

**Oral language and literacy.**

Oral language has long been understood to play a central role in reading and writing; nevertheless, the developmental links between oral language skills and reading have generally been ignored in the literature. The role of oral language in literacy especially for second-language learners has been overlooked and uncovered (Neuman & Dickinson, 2002). Now researchers are exploring these links more fully to understand the relationships between various aspects of language and literacy. Thus, the National Research Council concluded that the majority of reading problems could be prevented by oral language skills (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). A number of studies have also concluded that there is a positive correlation between individual differences in oral language skills and later differences in reading (Share, Jorm, Maclean, & Matthews, 1984). Children who have larger vocabularies and a greater understanding of spoken language have higher reading scores (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 2002).

The researchers argued that oral language developed in literate cultural traditions was passed on to children in daily interaction (Heath, 1983; Wells, 1981). Parental support, such as shared reading with a child, will provide the child with cultural transmission (Ninio & Bruner, 1978; Snow, 1983). Tabors (2008) suggested that the process of first language acquisition occurred in the context of social interaction within the child’s family structure through five aspects of the language system (phonology, vocabulary, grammar, discourse, and pragmatics). During the early childhood years, children engage in discussion that extends their understanding of the sounds, and the
skills in oral language have been closely linked to literacy development (Snow et al., 1998). Continuous forms of discourse in the home will help children to make the transition to school with ease and acquire cognitive and literacy skills (Watson, 2002).

Literacy itself takes many definitions. Pellegrini (2002) suggests that literacy is something that must be taught either implicitly or explicitly. It is not “acquired” in the same sense that oral language is acquired (p. 55). Literacy is more than being able to read and write. It is beyond acquiring a set of basic skills for decoding and producing written symbols (Watson, 2002). Literacy can be seen as a set of complex multidimensional skills that improve over the life of an individual, from childhood to adulthood (Wasik, 2006).

During the past decade, literacy has become recognized as a more complex process than previously believed (Tabors & Snow, 1994). Most recently, as scholars have moved away from the notion that literacy competency develops solely from within the child, the term “emergent literacy” has been replaced by “early literacy.” From this perspective, literacy begins at birth and is influenced and interpreted by surrounding sociocultural context (New, 2002, p. 249). These new understandings of early literacy are consistent with the grounds of sociocultural and constructivist theories, such that children are guided to participate in practices that vary according to cultural values and developmental aims, “situated in broader social contexts and social relations” (as cited in New, 2002, p. 250). The links between children’s experiences and literacy development reflect the importance of the role of the social context, and help narrow down the serious achievement gap between children from different social, racial, and linguistic backgrounds (Neuman & Dickinson, 2002).
**Relationships between L1 and L2.**

There is considerable debate that ELLs should be taught to read first in their first language to be successful in second language learning (August & Hakuta, 1997). Thomas and Collier (2002) argue that as students learn literacy and academic skills in their first language more intensively and effectively, their academic attainment in English will be better. In other words, once basic concepts and skills are learned in the ELLs’ first language, they transfer readily to a second language. For example, the researchers (Lindsey, Manis, & Bailey, 2003) found that first and second-grade students who received academic instruction in Spanish had higher achievement in beginning reading in English than comparable students who received academic instruction in English. August and Hakuta concluded that first language instruction led to first language maintenance without blocking second language acquisition.

Collier and Thomas (1998) found that minority students who came to the United States at the ages of eight and nine with first-language literacy skills performed better than younger students, ages five and six, who had no first language literacy skills. Snow et al. (1998) established a relationship between language skills and literacy accomplishments. Tabors and Snow (1994) also reported that second language learning would be greatly facilitated once the ELL had a strong first language foundation. Tabors and Snow suggested that if children build a strong foundation in their first language and develop skills through home activities like book reading, then their linguistic capacity will transfer to English later.

According to Krashen (1981), early stages of reading in the primary language affect the development of second language literacy. Recent findings show that first-
language reading acquisition has contributed much to the area of second-language reading learning (Fitzgerald, 1995). In particular, free reading in the first and second language is strongly related to the promotion of advanced second-language development of a whole grade of students (Krashen).

Cummins (1991) proposed the linguistic interdependence hypothesis. This suggested a reciprocal relationship between L1 development and L2 development; that once the child develops reading skills in L1, he or she is able to transfer those skills to L2. This is what Cummins (1979) terms as Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP): “In essence, in the act of learning concepts and skills, people form a schema that is independent of the specific language of presentation, even though the act of learning can involve active recruitment of the language to regulate thinking” (Hakuta, 1990, p. 7). However, Cummins’ hypothesis has been criticized because it mainly emphasizes linguistic and cognitive factors rather than social and contextual factors and is defined too broadly and vaguely (Genesee, 1984).

Saville-Troike (1984) found most of the children who achieved best in content areas, as measured by tests in English, were those who had the opportunity to discuss the concepts they were learning in their native language with other children or adults. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) stated that a silent period was a necessary phase of second language learning to build up some competence through listening, and he concluded that “communication situations in which students are permitted to remain silent, or respond in their first language, may be the most effective approach for the early phases of language instruction” (as cited in Dicker, 2003, p.103). From this view, L1 is a bridge between the
home and the school for children. The use of a first language encourages second language
learners to participate in school activities more positively.

*Language maintenance and language loss.*

Many investigators assure that it is important to encourage parents to maintain
their first language at home, use it for literacy activities, and make conversation
throughout the early childhood period (Nord, Lennon, Liu, & Chandler, 1999). Snow
(1990) suggested that the most effective way to build students’ English literacy is to
begin by teaching them to read and write in their home language. Researchers pointed out
that parents’ supportive interactions with their children at home in the first language were
the most crucial factor in maintaining the first language from generation to generation
(Lao, 2004; Li, 1999; Park & Sarkar, 2007). Tannenbaum and Howie (2002) maintained
that the first language was not a barrier to acquiring the new language when the
relationships between the children and the parents were secure (Park & Sarkar, 2007).

The family plays an important role in minority children’s first language
maintenance. Guardado’s (2002) study revealed that the parents in “language
maintenance families” used more positive and effective methods in order to encourage
their children to use the first language than parents in “language loss families.” From a
survey of 86 parents in the United States, Lao (2004) found that the majority of parents
strongly supported their children’s development of bilingualism. Parents think their
children can have practical advantages by maintaining two languages, such as better
employment opportunities, positive self-identity, and efficient communication within
their own ethnic community (Park & Sarkar, 2007).
Pak (2003) described the Korean church as one of the important communities in which Korean-American students could learn their culture and heritage language. Korean parents believe that Korean language maintenance is closely connected with Korean identity maintenance (Park & Sarkar, 2007). Cho (2000) investigated the role of the first language in the Korean community, and the results revealed that developing first language ability could positively affect social interactions and relationships within the Korean community.

**Code switching.**

It is considered natural for ELLs to mix or switch two languages when they are learning a second language (L2). There are minor distinctions between code-mixing and code-switching, depending on the researchers’ opinions, but the terms code-switching will be used in this study. Code switching refers to the use of more than one language in the course of a conversation (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan (2000) described the characteristics of code switching consistent with the stages of second language learning. In the beginning stages, the first language may be fluent and creep into the second language without any control. At the next stages, the student will mix the two languages and borrow a word or phrase from one language when he/she cannot retrieve from the other language. At the later stage, when the student is proficient in both languages, he/she may mix the two languages intentionally for social reasons.

One of the popular assumptions of using code switching is that a lack of concept development in one language brings a haphazard blend of two languages. However, several studies (Zentella, 1988; Shin, 2005) showed contrary results of code switching. Zentella demonstrated that the most fluent bilinguals were the most fluent code-switchers.
Shin also discussed code switching as a valuable communicative strategy available to proficient bilingual speakers. She studied 15 Korean children’s conversation in New York City and found that the children used code switching purposefully to convey their meanings precisely. Shin stated that code switching was an important element in speaking two languages and was not a result of the children’s inability in keeping the two languages apart.

Auer (1995) categorized code switching in two ways: participant-related code switching and discourse-related code switching. Participant-related code switching is used to negotiate the proper language for the socially appropriated interactions. Auer reported that the students accommodate their bilingual abilities to the ability of other participants in the conversation. Shin (2005) also found that students consider and accommodate other participants’ language competences and preferences during conversations. For example, a student who was speaking Korean tended to switch to English in the conversation, when he/she noticed the partner’s preference was English. Also, the student adapted to the proficiency of other participants. If the peers around the student had a low proficiency in English, the student who was proficient in both languages accommodated his/her language ability by switching to Korean.

Discourse-related code switching is used to organize and structure the ongoing conversation, especially to emphasize the repeated utterance in a different language. For example, while preferred answers are accompanied by the same language, disagreed answers are accompanied by different language by code switching. The results of Shin’s study showed that students who were fluent in L1 and L2 appeared to use low rates of code switching; however, interestingly; less competent students in English also created
low amounts of code switching. This provided the evidence that individual difference of English preference was related to the use of code switching.

Social Interaction in Language and Literacy Learning

More recently, researchers interested in Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory have investigated how various contexts help to shape the reader’s responses. Children initially develop their understanding of literacy through observations and participation with others in various settings (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985), and even small differences in contexts can affect language development. The diverse cultural and social settings through which children acquire and develop their literacy affect their literacy understandings, practices, and attitudes (John-Steiner, Panofsky, & Smith, 1994).

Bronfenbrenner (1979) proposed that social systems are nested inside one another and integrated. In such a view, individual characteristics are nested in the home and the classroom environment, which is nested in and influenced by the wider settings, such as the local community and the national system of education. Individual characteristics imply attitudes, motivation, personality, learning style, native language proficiency, and verbal intelligence. The characteristics of the home include access to the target language and parental attitudes and support. These individual and environmental factors are interrelated and embedded within one another.

Literacy and language studies typically focus on children’s acquisition and development of skills within one isolated context (e.g., home or school). However, Weigel, Martin, & Bennett (2005) argued that more studies should focus on combined literacy environments or aspects of home and school literacy, to support children’s skill development. From an ecological perspective, the Weigel et al.’s study (2005) affirmed
that children acquire literacy and language skills from multiple contexts (e.g., home, school, and community). Such work will strengthen cross-contextual aspects and the interdependence between the environments.

**Impact of culture.**

The issues of culture in learning have been inseparable for centuries because one of the main goals of learning is the transmission of culture from generation to generation. (Kozulin, 2003). However, most school curriculums have been formed for middle-class and native English speakers. Children who fall outside this group may feel alienated when they cannot find any images of their own culture, lives, and experiences in the curriculums. Certain types of cultural accommodations improve students’ academic engagement and participation. For example, Au and Mason (1981) found that children are more engaged and participated with a higher cognitive level when they were involved in free-flowing interaction at home.

Culture may affect the characteristics of peer interaction and social engagement. Cultural differences are related to the child’s environment, cultural beliefs, and social competence which influence children’s social interactions (Howes, 2009). Farver, Kim, and Lee (1995) examined how the cultural differences influenced children’s early development, particularly cultural differences between Korean- and Anglo- American preschoolers’ social interaction and play behaviors. The result revealed that Korean American preschool children were less social and present less pretend play than Anglo-American children.

Korean parents consider play as a way of amusement to escape from boredom or hard studying. On the other hand, American children’s parents consider play important
for children to learn. They believe that a young child’s cognitive growth and social development are increased by engaging in pretend play. Korean parents’ educational expectations for children are high. They prefer academically oriented, curriculum centered environments and want classrooms with academic related activities rather than social interaction related activities, whereas Anglo-American parents consider the school environment providing more opportunities to interact socially with peers and a variety of play materials. The result of the low frequency of pretend play of Korean-American children may be related to the characteristic of Korean culture. In Korean culture, the students are frequently taught to listen to their teachers’ instruction without any question (Kim, 1980), because it is considered a virtue to hide one’s feelings instead of displaying them outwardly (Kim, 1980; Chu, 1978).

This shows that children’s play and social interactions reflect their parents’ cultural values and beliefs. Leseman, Rollenberg, and Gebhardt (2000) stated that “Children’s cognitive potential is not an individual property, but a property of the social interactions of the individual with other individuals within ‘incorporating cultural systems’ guided by ‘cultural rules’ such as the playgroup in kindergarten” (p.127).

**Collectivism vs. individualism.**

Hofstede (2007) classified cultures as collectivist and individualist along with the interpersonal relationships. Collectivist culture focuses on cohesive groups, especially intimate family bonds between cousins and other relatives. Parents from collectivist culture backgrounds expect their children to develop stable friendships with others and good relationships between other family members. Individualistic cultures place value on individualistic different activities and practices. Parents from individualistic cultures
expect more invested goals such as school readiness, and are less likely to value opportunities for young children to have sustained contact with peers. (Hofstede 2007; Hofstede & McCrae, 2004).

Ageyev (2003) argued that core values of American culture contradicted Vygotskian theory. That is to say, sociocultural concepts are created from an ideology of collectivism, while American culture is from individualism and independence. Ageyev (2003) noted, “the very idea that the human mind is so deeply shaped and formed by social interaction seems directly to contradict many prominent American values and ideals, such as individualism, independence, and self-reliance” (p. 435). Under American values and ideals, Gavelek and Bresnahan (2009) pointed out that American education was based in
A) a belief that the same instructional environment for children of different cultural backgrounds ensures equal opportunities to learn; B) an attitude that children should have to adapt to the educational system rather than vice versa; or C) the belief that learning two or more languages is a problem rather than something to be fostered (p.167).

Farver, Kim, and Lee (1995) purported that Korean culture emphasized the collectivist rather than the individualist and stated that the reason was “Korean values which deemphasize individuality and self expression may have influenced children’s expression of pretend in social play” (p.1097). With the influence of cultural beliefs, Korean-American children showed low frequency of attending pretend play; however, Korean-American children were more helpful and cooperative with peers than Anglo-
American children and offered objects to initiate play. This reflected how the collectivism of the Korean culture affected group cooperation, teamwork, and harmony.

**Play and peer relationship.**

Children learn effective problem solving, thought organization, and language through play (Cook, 2000). According to Vygotsky (1978), play creates a zone of proximal development in children. The zone of proximal development is the distance between one’s actual developmental level and one’s potential developmental level when a child is interacting with someone in the social environment. Children try to jump ahead of themselves and are likely to act above their developmental level and above their average age and behavior when they are playing in order to explore their learning potential.

Play is a crucial element to develop ELLs’ oral language skills through meaningful interaction with peers and adults (Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan, 2000). If students are engaged in meaningful interaction with peers who speak the target language, more opportunities are given to ELLs to develop their oral language skills and communicative proficiency in that language. Wong Fillmore (1985a) suggested that three types of interactive processes occurred in language learning, and each of them connected closely: social process, linguistic process, and cognitive process. Throughout the social interactive process, students are exposed to appropriate models by interacting with peers who are fluent in the target language. Students learn the systems that characterize the social rules through everyday language use. Through the linguistic interactive process, learners adapt what they already know about language and try to make sense out of the linguistic input they receive. They monitor what they learn by seeking feedback directly
or indirectly and explicitly or implicitly. The cognitive interactive process is a step of analytical procedure. Learning arises when student’s motivation is enough to get meaning from the interaction.

Also, there are significant relations between the peer relationships at school and academic achievement (Wentzel, 2009). Students who believe that their peers accept and care about them have positive aspects in their classroom life, whereas students who are rejected by their peers feel lonely, emotionally depressed, and tend to lack academic motivation and achievement (Goodenow, 1993). Positive behavior in helping, cooperating, and sharing shows the significant relations between peer acceptance and academic outcomes in early childhood and early adolescence. (Wentzel & Caldwell, 1997)

There is substantial evidence to indicate that children who have communal friends have higher self-esteem, and are more socially competent than children without friends (Newcomb & Bagwell, 1955; Ollendick et al., 1992). A child’s social adjustment is determined critically by having friends or not, and it proves how friendships contribute to the development of social competence. Friendships throughout childhood predict later social competence during adolescence, and even into adulthood (Bagwell, Newcomb, & Bukowski, 1998).

**The role of teachers, parents, and peers.**

Individual characteristics and environmental factors can influence second language learning (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). Individual factors are attitudes, motivation, personality, learning style, first language proficiency, and verbal intelligence. Environmental factors include small settings, such as home and classroom environment, and large settings, such as neighborhood, community, and national society. Individual
factors are nested in the environmental factors, and these factors are incorporated.
Therefore, individual characteristics, parental support at home, and the teachers’ attitudes
at school are factors which all play an important role in facilitating second language
proficiency.

Teachers’ roles are critically important for students from diverse backgrounds.
Teacher’s behaviors and their ways of speaking are crucial to constituting a learning
environment (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Teachers foster their students’ abilities to make
sense of text worlds and lived worlds by encouraging them to make connections between
their own experiences and cultures and those of characters in the books they read.
Teachers need to have a deep understanding of the particular learning-teaching
environments in which they are working in order to exploit the opportunities offered by
teacher-fronted, individual, and group learning settings. Interactions between a teacher
and a pupil take place in a classroom environment, which is most conducive to second
language learning. The strategies teachers use to teach the second language and the
classroom environment influence how easily students attain proficiency in that language.

There is evidence that parent-child reading plays an important role in children’s
eventual school success through many subsequent investigations (Clark, 1976). Based on
a review of existing intervention programs, Bronfenbrenner (1976) also suggested, “the
family seems to be the most effective and economic system for fostering and sustaining
the child’s development in literacy” (Wasik at al., 2006, p.448). Nevertheless, 83 percent
of teachers state in the survey data that parents are failing to provide adequate and
necessary support for their children’s academic success. According to the data, the most
common obstacle to children’s success in school is parents’ lack of time for their children,
lack of interest in their children’s education, or lack of knowledge about how to support their children. Young children’s knowledge and skills are connected to family socialization patterns (Leseman, Rollenberg, & Gebhardt, 2000). A child’s oral language and literacy use is strongly related to parents’ educational level and cultural environment.

**Summary**

With the growing number of children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, concerns about the area of multicultural education and second language learning are increasing in the United States’ schools. The issue of second language learning is controversial, and several factors, such as individual differences, time exposure, and the student’s first language level, are considered to affect second language learning. The researchers examining the relationship between the first language and the second language had found that there was a positive correlation between them. Children who had a strong foundation in their first language showed successful progress in their second language.

The theoretical framework of this study is based on Vygosky’s sociocultural theory (1978). Social interactions with others are important for language development, because language learning occurs effectively when students engage in actual conversations with others who speak their second language fluently. Children learn to read through social interaction with those around them, which allows them to construct their own understandings of what reading is and how it works. The successful students have strong culture and identity by maintaining their own first language. They use strategies of social interaction and cognitive strategies to learn English. The role of
teacher and parent is important in supporting ELLs’ language development. In addition, ELL’s meaningful interaction with peers may provide them more opportunities to develop their communicative proficiency in the second language.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate how oral language and literacy learning in Korean affect a first grade Korean child’s language and literacy learning in English and also how his oral language interactions in English influence literacy learning in English. This study was a single subject case study within the qualitative research approach. Data methods included interviews, observations, field notes, documents, and assessments in Korean and English. Regarding the research question, this chapter presented a summary of the participant, research design, description of research procedures, and data analysis.

Description of the Participant

Subject

The participant of this study was a single subject, a first grade Korean child named Jinsu (the name used is a pseudonym). He was born in America and had learning experiences in the child care center, Head Start (one type of preschool), Kindergarten, and a local elementary school, Springhill Elementary School (the name used is a pseudonym). Jinsu went to Korean Language School at the church every Friday afternoon to learn Korean. He was exposed to the Korean environment before he went to
because his parents speak Korean at home, and he had started to learn English in preschool and kindergarten.

A sample selection of this study is based on a purposive sampling (Patton, 1990). According to Merriam (1998), a sample selection in qualitative research is usually small in size, nonrandom, and purposeful. Merriam (1998) states that “purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (p.60). Patton (1990) also argues that “the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth” (p.169). First of all, in beginning purposive sampling, it was necessary to select criteria that would reveal the purpose of the study and identify information-rich cases.

Several criteria were considered for the subject. One of the criteria I considered first was a Korean child from a Korean family who was exposed to Korean at home and in the community. Second, a child from preschool to first grade was considered as a suitable subject because second language acquisition begins when a child enters a school. Third, the child’s school was to be from the normal public school environment. With the limited number of Korean children in the area, a first grade Korean child at Springhill Elementary School was selected as the subject of this study. Three different contexts were considered for the observation of the subject: school environment, family environment, and community environment.

**School Environment**

The Springhill Elementary School was a kindergarten-to-fifth grade charter school located in a small city in the Midwest area of the United States. The total
enrollment of the school during 2009 to 2010 was 285 students. The population of students was 60% Caucasian (171), 25% African-American (70), 11% multiracial (31), 3% Asian or Pacific Islander (8), 1% American Indian (4), and one Hispanic student. Fifty-six percent of the students were receiving free meals, 10% of the students were receiving reduced meals, and 34% of students had paid meals. The number of English language learners was three among the students.

The building had originally been a public school, but was closed for one year. When Springhill Elementary School reopened, 40% of the total students were original students who came back from the former school, and 20% were students who transferred from other schools and cities. Forty percent of the students were from the Expanded Learning Program (ELP).

ELP is an extensive Gifted and Talented program for the elementary level. This program involved students who were high ability learners in classes where curriculum was designed to meet their academic needs. The children who wished to join the Expanded Learning Program were required to take a test and had their writing portfolio considered. Jinsu was in the Expanded Learning Program.

**Korean Community**

The Korean community was organized through the Korean Church in the city. The Korean community members gathered at the church for the Sunday worship service every Sunday. After the service, the members studied the Bible, had lunch, shared information, and built their social relationships. The Korean Language School (KLS) was one of the Korean church programs. The classes were divided by students’ grades and Korean language levels. The beginners’ level was for kindergarten to second grade.
students, the intermediate level was for third to fifth graders, and the advanced level was for middle school students and high school students. The KLS class was held every Friday afternoon from four to six o’clock. Jinsu had studied in the beginners’ class for two years.

**Home Environment**

Jinsu’s parents came to the United States in 2001. They were both doctoral students at a university in the city when this study began. They had lived in the city more than nine years and participated in the Korean culture-related events at the university. They were also members of the Korean church and attended the worship regularly once a week. Jinsu was their only son and their desire and expectation for his education was high.

**Research Design**

This study is a case study based on the qualitative research approach. Qualitative research is different from quantitative research in that quantitative researchers emphasize statistical measurements and analyses of causal relationships between variables (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998), and they seek experimental methods, predictions, and generalization of findings (Hoepfl, 1997). On the other hand, qualitative researchers seek understanding and illumination from the real world where the “phenomenon of interest unfold naturally” (Patton, 2002, p.39).

The term ‘case study’ is used in many different ways to mean many different things. Merriam (1998) states “A qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, an institution, a person, a process, or a social unit” (p. xiii). Yin’s (1994) definition of case study is “an
empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p.13). Stake (1995) clarifies that, “the case could be a child. It could be a classroom of children or a particular mobilization of professionals to study a childhood condition...the case is a specific, a complex, functioning thing...the case is an integrated system” (p.2). Camlibel (2005) states that “experimental studies that are designed to assess children’s language acquisition do not provide contexts that are realistic enough, or may be far from children’s daily-life experiences” (p. 5). Therefore, the field studies based on the case study may be proper for the understanding of humans by engaging in action and interaction within the contexts of situations and settings (Merriam, 1998).

Based on the definitions of Merriam, Yin, and State, the rationale of this single subject case study is to present an in-depth understanding of a Korean child’s language and literacy learning and to provide a rich description of the phenomenon from the child’s real-life environments. In addition, not only will naturalistic data of an educational case study offer important insights of first and second language learning, but also the results of the data will influence educators, policy makers, and the persons who are involved in the area of educational practice and research.

Validity and Reliability

Internal validity, according to Merriam (1998), “deals with the question of how research findings match reality. Internal validity in all research hinges on the meaning of reality” (p. 201). In qualitative research, the main instrument of data collection and analysis is accomplished directly by human beings without any collection instrument.
Hence, interpretations of reality are accessed directly through their observations and interviews. Merriam (1998) suggested six strategies to develop internal validity.

One of them is the use of triangulation, which is “using multiple investigators, multiple sources of data or multiple methods to confirm the merging findings” (p. 203). Multiple sources lead to a better understanding of the phenomenon and data than a single source in a study (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Thus, multiple sources of data for triangulation were used for the study. Multiple sources included translation of interviews, translation of the audio and video-recordings, observations, field notes, and the results of assessments.

The second strategy I considered was member checks, which helped to enhance internal validity by “taking data and tentative interpretations back to the people from whom they were derived and asking them if the results are plausible” (Merriam, 1998, p.203). Jinsu’s classroom teacher, Korean Language school teacher, and his parents were involved in this study. I continuously shared their opinions about the data from Jinsu’s language and literacy learning in Korean and English at school and home throughout the whole study.

The third strategy was peer examination. I asked colleagues to comment and make suggestions about the findings and weaknesses of the study. When the transcription was completed, I asked one of my colleagues, a graduate assistant, to check the inaudible part to clarify the transcription and share her opinions about Jinsu’s oral language behaviors. I had regular meetings with the faculty members and had a conversation regarding the research design, the process of collecting data, the method of data analyses,
and the interpretation. Internal validity was strengthened and clarified through these strategies.

External validity is about how the results of a research study can be related to generalization (Merriam, 1998). There are many arguments about the possibility of generalization in a qualitative research, especially from a small, nonrandom sample. One of the concerns about case studies is the lack of scientific generalization. Yin (1994), however, suggests the answer for this concern is that “case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations...the case study does not represent a ‘sample,’ and the investigator’s goal is to expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization)” (p.10). To generalize a qualitative study, Merriam (1998) also suggests using rich and thick description of a research situation, describing a program, event, or individuals, and using multisite designs to maximize diversity in the phenomenon of interest.

Based on Yin (1994) and Merriam’s (1998) views on generalization in qualitative research, I first made an effort to develop the theoretical framework. As Yin (1994) stated before, case studies rely on analytical generalization and the role of theory has been characterized as analytic generalization. Thus, it is important to develop broader theory for generalizing the results of this case study. Next, I adopted rich and thick description and multisite designs for the strength of external validity. The rich and thick description will allow readers to determine how closely their situations match the research situation. The use of several observation sites (school, home, and community) and the multisite designs maximized diversity in the phenomenon of interest.
Reliability is concerned with the replication of the research findings. Merriam (1998) suggested that repeated study would support the same results. Triangulation supported reliability as well as internal validity, by using multiple methods of data collection and analysis. Dey (1993) explained that, “If we cannot expect others to replicate our account, the best we can do is explain how we arrived at our results” (p.251). Merriam (1998) suggested that researchers have to describe details for the reliability of the study; how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the examination. Many different sources of data collection of evidence may be one of the ways to reinforce reliability of a case study.

**Description of Procedures**

**Data Methods**

The period of this study was five months from January 2010 to May 2010. According to Merriam (1998), case studies do not claim any particular methods for data collection or data analysis. Any methods of gathering data can be used in a case study. The data methods were interviews, observations, audio and video recordings, field notes, surveys, child’s writing samples, and assessments in Korean and English. Data were collected from three different contexts: Jinsu’s school, the Korean Language School, and his home. Jinsu’s parents, school teacher, and KLS teacher signed the consent forms to participate in the study (Appendices A, B, & C). The school and the KLS settings were visited personally and audio or video recording were conducted by me, and the home setting was recorded by Jinsu’s father. Data from interviews and audio and video recordings were transcribed and translated using a word processor. Triangulation was
aimed by using multiple data sources and methods for the reliability of the study. Rich and thick description was also adopted for the generalization and validity.

**Observation & field notes.**

Observation was conducted from three different places: the school environment, the community environment, and the family environment. The school environment included the first grade classroom, playground, cafeteria, and an art classroom at Springhill Elementary School. The Korean Language School was chosen for the community environment. The family environment contained activities and conversations between family members at home. Jinsu’s school and the KLS were visited fifteen times and thirteen times respectively. His behaviors and oral language interactions in each setting were observed and audio or video-recorded once a week. Field notes were used to document half of the observations. Field notes included a physical description of the schools and teachers, a perspective on what the teachers were doing and teaching, Jinsu’s learning strategies, and how he interacted with his teachers, peers, and parents at school and home. The data from the observations and field notes revealed Jinsu’s activities and interactions with others between peers and adults in language and literacy learning at school, home, and the KLS. The field notes from the classroom observation and recordings were transcribed using a word processor.

**Interviews.**

Patton (1990) described that we could not observe someone else’s mind, feelings, thoughts, and intentions. Interview data provided information that I could not find directly from observation. The interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions and in depth questions. They were conducted with Jinsu, his classroom teacher,
the Korean Language School teacher, and his parents. The interviews with teachers and parents consisted of questions related to their perceptions of Jin’s language and literacy activities and his social interactions at school and home (Appendices E, F, & G). The interview with Jinsu included his feelings and views of Korean and English learning as well as his literacy abilities in both languages (Appendix D). The interviews were audio-recorded under the participant’s agreement. Each interview lasted for thirty to 45 minutes. The recorded interviews were transcribed and retyped in a word processor. The interviews with the KLS teacher and Jinsu’s parents were conducted in Korean. They were transcribed first, then translated into English, and also typed on a word processor. Pseudonyms were used in reporting the data.

**Other documents.**

Data were collected by surveys from Jinsu’s parents and the KLS teacher. Surveys included Jinsu’s parents’ self-graded English ability in speaking, listening, writing, and reading. Jinsu’s Korean ability was evaluated by his parents and the KLS teacher. Jinsu’s writing samples and other documents such as the school report and the standard test result from school were also collected.

A variety of informal assessments were conducted to measure Jinsu’s language and literacy ability in English and Korean. They included an informal reading inventory (Stieglitz, 2004), conversations, comprehension assessments collected from retellings, answering questions, vocabulary discussions, and writing samples in Korean and English.
Data Analysis

The framework of analysis procedures will be conducted by the model of qualitative data analysis suggested by Marshall and Rossman (2006). Data were organized by dates, transcribed, and shared with the participant to be sure that the meaning of a specific part of an interview was accurately rendered. Then data from audio and video transcripts and written observation field notes were read repeatedly. The coding was conducted focusing on Jinsu’s oral interactions and related behaviors. The related codes were grouped into categories.

The data analysis method of this study was based on the analytical categorization developed by Kumpulainen and Mutanen (2000) and the constant comparison analysis by Glaser and Strauss (1967). All data were read thoroughly and coding was categorized as two dimensions, language function and social processing according to the analytical categorization of Kumpulainen and Mutanen. Language functions were interrogative, responsive, informative, reasoning, evaluative, judgmental, argumentational, repetition, experiential, affectional, and reading aloud. Additional language functions were found in the KLS and home settings. They were incomplete sentences, wrong sentences, simple responses, language habits, hesitation, code switching, honorific words, confirmation, and dialect. Social processing were collaborative, tutoring, argumentative, and sharing (Appendix H).

Activities in each setting were categorized according to the types of studying and conversation partners. The school setting included eight activities: writing, Daily Language Art Review/ Daily Math Practice, group reading, draw box (pair playing), watching video, reading aloud, art, and playground activities. The KLS setting consisted
of eight activities: conversation with the KLS group, conversation with a classmate, conversation with a teacher, reading, comprehension checking, vocabulary checking, writing, and dictation. The home setting had four activities: studying Korean with parents, studying Korean with father, studying English with father, and English dictation with father. Each activity was analyzed according to the language functions and social processing.

The constant comparative method of analysis was a process of taking information from data collection and comparing it to emerging categories (Dye, Scatz, Rosenberg, & Coleman, 2000). Lincoln and Guba stated that the process of constant comparisons “stimulates thought that leads to both descriptive and explanatory categories” (as cited in Dye et al., 2000, p.3). I found tentative links and relationships by comparing three data sets from three different settings; Data were organized by grouping, particular categories were adopted, related data were identified for the purposes of comparison, and findings emerged as a result of analysis.

Summary

This study presented a qualitative case study of a Korean first grade child. The period of data collection was five months from January 2010 to May 2010. Data were collected from three different contexts: the school setting, the Korean Language School setting, and the home setting. Rich and thick description was adopted for the generalization of the study. Also multiple sources and methods were used for triangulation and data generation. Data methods were interviews, observations, field notes, surveys, documents, and informal assessments in Korean and English.
Data analysis was based on the analytical categorization developed by Kumpulainen and Mutanen (2000) and the constant comparison analysis by Glaser and Strauss (1967).
The child’s language skill is affected by personal factors and environmental factors. Personal factors are intelligence, level of first language, and motivation. Environmental factors are interrelated with one another and imply multiple contexts. Data were collected from three different settings—school, community, and home—to investigate the role of oral interaction with others in the literacy development of the first grade Korean child. This chapter includes a description of each setting, the teachers, parents, and the activities. In addition, background of the Korean language and culture was described to better understand the Korean community.

The School Setting

School Background

Springhill Elementary School was located in the downtown area of the city. The one-story building was decorated with red triangles and looked cozy and calm. The first door was open, but the second one was the locked security door. After pushing the buzzer, the door was opened revealing a spacious hall. On the right side of the hall, there was a counter and two receptionists who greeted guests. There was no main office like other schools, but the hall directly led to the classrooms. The left side of the hall led to the music and art rooms, cafeteria, and gym. The right side led to the classrooms. I signed up on the guestbook and followed the right side of the hall. Each wall was decorated with
students’ artwork and writing. Soon, a narrow hall appeared again on the left side, and the first room was the Jinsu’s classroom.

Mrs. April and Her Classroom

Mrs. April, Jinsu’s school teacher, had worked as an elementary school teacher for 28 years and started to work at Springhill Elementary School in 2010. For most of her teaching years, she had taught third and fourth grade, and had not taught kindergarten and first grade since college. Her voice was soft and friendly, and she was kind to every child.

She had been to Korea for a year and knew well about Korean people and cities. She showed her picture taken in Korea and told me she had had a great experience teaching English to Korean students, as well as meeting new friends in Korea. Her experience of living in a foreign country, especially in Korea, might help her to understand students who have different culture, custom, and language. She thought it was important for Jinsu to keep both languages to understand the Korean culture and background.

When I visited Mrs. April’s classroom at 9:30 a.m. on the first day, it was a Language Art class. She was teaching phonemic awareness and chunking such as O_E, OAT, and OA. Her class had 13 students: ten boys and three girls. Two of them were Asian, Jinsu and one girl, and the other students were Caucasian. Mrs. April’s class was a multi-age classroom (kindergarten and first grade). Six of the students were first graders, and seven were Kindergarteners. The desks were set in a square arrangement with a space in the middle. Four students were sitting on the left side, four were on the right side, three were at the back, and two were in the front. Students on the left, right, and back sides
were facing together. Students’ desks have two open dividers on their left or right side that can hold many books and stationery. Their organization looked convenient.

On the left side of the classroom, there were three large bookshelves, a portable cart with two shelves for video equipment, the teacher’s desk, and a sink. The bookshelves were full of children’s books and teacher’s manuals. On a small part of the shelf beside the portable cart, several Dr. Seuss’ books were displayed. Numbers were attached on the top of the left side of the wall, and there was a white board, a mirror, and a cabinet on the back side. Several boxes with different games were stacked on the top of the cabinet. Two soft, ball-shaped cushions were near the cabinet. Three computers were on the right side: one was on the front and two were at the back near the entrance.

A first grade classroom was next to Mrs. April’s classroom, and two classrooms were blocked by a folding screen. The screen was not closed tightly, and I could hear the first grade teacher and students’ voices through the open space. Mrs. April’s voice was soft, in contrast to the first grade teacher’s loud and high voice. It was difficult for me to concentrate while listening to Mrs. April at times. During writing class, the kindergarten students go over to the other kindergarten class for instruction.

**Daily schedule of Jinsu’s classroom.**

The class begins at 8:30 a.m. Language Art class and math class, including Daily Language Arts Review/ Daily Math Practice (DLR/DMP) that were scheduled in the morning. Lunch time was from 10:45 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. and recess was from 11:20 a.m. to 11:45 a.m. Writing class, draw box (pair group playing), music, art, and physical education classes were scheduled in the afternoon. From 1:05 p.m. to 1:45 p.m., music, art, and physical education classes rotated every day. The class dismissed at 2:20 p.m.
I visited the school a total of 15 times from February to May. Flexible visiting times and days were planned ahead from Monday to Friday. One of the purposes of the research was to observe a variety of oral interactions through diverse activities. Thus, visiting the school was not set on a particular time and day. Mrs. April continually communicated with me through e-mail, and the visit was rescheduled according to the classroom events and programs (e.g., Standardized test day and talent show day). During the first two visits, I observed the environment of the physical education classroom, the teacher, and the behaviors of Jinsu and the other students. After the third visit, audio and video recordings started once permission was received from the parents. Audio-taping was conducted once and video-taping was conducted ten times.

Description of Activities at the School

Jinsu’s activities in class varied depending on the visiting time, and were classified such as: writing, group reading, Daily Language Arts Review/ Daily Math Practice (DLR/DMP), draw box (pair playing), teacher’s reading aloud, watching video, art class, and playing outside activities.

Writing activity.

Writing class was observed once from 1:45 p.m. to 2:10 p.m. on March 8, 2010. Nobody was in the classroom when I arrived at 1:30 p.m. While I was setting up the video camera and writing a field note at 1:45 p.m., children entered the classroom. Jinsu saw me writing, and he asked in Korean, using honorific words, “뭐 쓰고 있어요?” This means “What are you writing about?” After the eight kindergarten students moved to the kindergarten classroom, the five first graders, three boys and two girls, gathered in the middle of the classroom with Mrs. April.
She said the first graders would write a story, illustrate it, and submit it to participate in the writing contest. She introduced three books, *Stephanie, It’s Not Easy Being a Bunny*, and *Because a Little Bug Went Ka-Choo*. She explained how to write a story and make a book. First, she read each book aloud to the students and asked questions during the reading: what the problems of the story were, how the problem solved at the end, and what the structure of the story was. Jinsu listened carefully, raised his hand and answered often. He looked like he was excited, laughing and giggling frequently, and sharing his writing ideas eagerly with other peers.

**DLR & DMP activity.**

The DLR/DMP class was observed three times: 10:10 a.m. to 10:40 a.m. on March 2, 12:00 p.m. to 12:15 p.m. on April 6, and 12:45 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. on April 27. On the first observation day, Mrs. April distributed worksheets which were finished by the students the day before. Jinsu received his paper, checked it, and raised his hands triumphantly. He looked at me with a big smile.

Mrs. April talked about how to correct the mistakes the students had made. When she asked the students what letters came at the end of the word, Jinsu raised his hand and answered correctly, but he yawned. He did not pay attention much when Mrs. April was talking about spelling. He rubbed his eyes, made a funny face with his lips, and hummed occasionally. He also played with a silly band all through the class and whispered to Susan to see her dinosaur bracelet. Later, Mrs. April came to Jinsu and Susan and warned Susan to put her bracelet back inside her backpack.

After Mrs. April checked the spelling and mistakes, she conducted sentence dictation. Jinsu concentrated on his writing, but did not pay attention to Mrs. April’s
additional explanations. However, during the dictation, Jinsu looked serious. When Mrs. April passed by, he laid out his paper and repeated his sentence to check if his dictation, which he already wrote, was correct.

On the second observation day, Mrs. April started the DLR worksheet with a problem choosing a different rhyming word. She asked Jinsu to answer the first one and he answered it correctly. During the DMP time, Mrs. April connected a math problem to the story of *Little House on the Prairie*, which they had read previously. Jinsu raised his hand twice and wanted to share his own experience about planting seeds. He was excited when he was sharing his experience.

On the third day, the students were learning measurement. Jinsu raised his hand and waved it back and forth even though Mrs. April was not ready to call on anyone. He was eager to let the teacher know about John’s, one of his neighbors, measurement. However, Mrs. April refused his answer because she wanted John to share his measurement himself. Mrs. April distributed the worksheet to the students. Jinsu and Tommy sat next to each other and they cooperated to estimate and measure the things on the worksheet. Jinsu asked Tommy for help measuring and he shared his ruler with Tommy.

**Group reading activity.**

The reading groups were divided into three levels,—1.3, 1.8, and 2.2— following the students’ reading ability. Jinsu belonged to the middle level group, which consisted of one girl and four boys. Group reading activity was observed three times, and each session lasted six to eight minutes: 10:13 p.m. to 10:19 p.m. on February 23 with *A Flying Book,*
9:20 p.m. to 9:28 p.m. on March 31 with Joy and Kangaroo, and 10:22 p.m. to 10:28 p.m. on April 23 with Nicky Takes a Walk.

During the reading group time, each reading group was gathered with Mrs. April behind the classroom. The other students stayed in their seats reading a book or finishing their worksheets. Mrs. April distributed a different worksheet for each reading group. A short story was introduced on one side of the worksheet, and questions to solve on the other side. Before reading, Mrs. April helped the students to predict the story, and checked the content while the story was being read. She asked each student to take turns reading a paragraph and share their opinions for the questions. Jinsu joined the group reading activity eagerly and asked more questions and made more answers than in any other activities.

**Draw box activity.**

The draw box activity was a pair group or small group activity. The students made a team and chose one playing box that they wanted to play with from the cabinet at the back of the classroom. The draw box activity was observed twice from 12:20 p.m. to 12:42 p.m. on April 6 and from 1:50 p.m. to 2:10 p.m. April 27. Each lasted for approximately 20 minutes. After the DLR and DMP worksheet was finished, Mrs. April announced that they would do draw box next, and the students were excited and cheering. Before moving to draw box time, she made sure the students handed in all their work. Next, she drew sticks from a cup to choose draw boxes. Jinsu was excited and asked me what “draw box” was in Korean.

Mrs. April allowed two people to work together, and Jinsu and Mark made a team. They went to the cabinet and chose a pirates Lego box. The cabinet was full of
boxes of games: Spin Rhyme, Sentence Building Kit, Lake Horse Magic Board, wooden blocks, and several sets of Legos. Jinsu made a cannon and knights using Legos. He continually imitated the explosion of a cannon and talked about a variety of topics such as a TV program (iCarly), an adventure movie (Indiana Jones), a TV commercial on PBS Kids, and a book he read. He seemed to be interested in typical “boy’s stuff” such as guns, cannons, soldiers, and knights. He shared the items from the box with Mark, not insisting that they were his own.

Kevin was Jinsu’s partner at the second draw box time. They chose mosaic pieces, a variety of shaped and colored plastic. They built a pyramid, a castle, and made many different kinds of things. Jinsu enjoyed talking continually with his partner during the draw box. Later, Mrs. April brought them a mirror and explained the concept of “symmetry” using the mirror.

**Watching video activity.**

This activity was observed once for 20 minutes from 12:30 p.m. to 12:50 p.m. on May 6. Mrs. April began to talk about the Hansel and Gretel story. She mentioned that they had already watched Clown Bed, a European version of Hansel and Gretel. The video they would watch that day was two different versions of the story. Before the students watched the new versions of the story, Mrs. April asked them to compare the original story to the European version that they already had watched. She also asked the children to predict what would happen in the new story, and the opinions that students shared were listed on the blackboard. After sharing their predictions, the students watched two different versions, one from Syria and one from the Philippines. Jinsu seemed to enjoy watching the video, but did not participate in the discussion openly.
Reading aloud activity.

Reading aloud time was observed four times. Mrs. April read a book aloud to the students and then one student was designated to come forward with his/her favorite things. The child introduced and shared them with the other students. On the first observation day, Mrs. April read aloud from Dr. Seuss’s *One Fish, Two Fish, Red Fish, Blue Fish*. She asked the students to help her with the rhyming words. Students shouted the rhyming words at the end of the sentences together. Jinsu seemed to listen to Mrs. April, but he was continually playing with a rubber band or a toy airplane, joining the rhyming words only occasionally.

On the second observation day, the children’s desk arrangement was changed to that of a normal classroom. Mrs. April was sitting on a chair in front of a small book shelf where several books were displayed, and the students were sitting on the floor in front of her. Mrs. April read aloud Dr. Seuss’s *Too Many Daves* and had sharing time without any further questions after reading.

Mrs. April could barely speak because of a serious allergy on the third observation day. Instead of reading aloud, the students listened to Bill Peet’s *The Whingdingdilly* from a tape recorder. Before listening to the story, Mrs. April showed the cover of the book and asked the students to make a prediction through the picture walk. Jinsu stood up and pretended to play a guitar eagerly whenever the music was being played on the tape recorder. On the fourth observation day, Mrs. April read aloud *Pirates Past Noon* by Mary Pope Osbone. She read the book with emotion and pretended to be a real character in the story. Before and during the reading, she asked the students to make
predictions and checked the meaning of the tricky words. Jinsu listened to the story carefully and answered the questions excitedly.

**Art class activity.**

Art, music, and physical education classes were rotated from Monday to Friday. The art teacher, Mrs. Brown, allowed me to observe her class. The students moved to her art classroom at 1:00 p.m. The classroom was large, and each wall was decorated with artifacts from students and famous artists, as well as posters with information on color and art. The desks were arranged in a rectangular shape with one side open. The students were being loud, and Jinsu was also busy chatting with John and Ian who were sitting on either side of him.

Mrs. Brown explained to the students what they had to do that day and distributed paper and glue. The students were working on one of Picasso’s pieces of work. They already completed a part of the face and body, and they were creating two hands holding a music score and musical notes during the class. She continually communicated with the students and answered the students’ questions. Jinsu was working on his art with strong concentration.

**Playing outside activity.**

Mrs. Stein’s music class was from 1:05 p.m. to 1:45 p.m., however, before 10 minutes had passed during the class, there was a fire alarm, and a voice came over the intercom system telling everyone in the building to exit outside. Jinsu looked excited to be outside. He searched for the bugs on the playground and showed them to me. Later, Mrs. Stein taught the students how to play the “Gingerella” game, and they gathered together in a circle and played the game. Jinsu seemed to understand the rule of the game
quickly, and he was among the final three who survived. He was excited and went back to the classroom when the drill was over.

The Community Setting

The Understanding of Korean Culture

The Korean language, Han-gul.

Korean is classified as a member of the Altaic language family, which includes the Turkic, Mongolic, Tungolic, and Japonic languages. The Altaic languages have the common features that they have no grammatical category of gender, articles, inflections, or relative pronouns. In the fifteenth century, King Sejong invented Hangul (the Korean alphabet). Hangul consists of 19 consonants, 10 simple vowels, and 11 compound vowels. The Korean alphabet is different from the English alphabet in that the English alphabet is combined into words, but the Korean letters construct syllables. A Korean syllable consists of an initial consonant, a middle vowel, and a closing consonant. The sound of some consonants change depending on whether they appear at the beginning or at the end of a syllable. Words are made up of one or more syllables, and spaces are placed between words. Korean syllables can normally be written in horizontal lines running from left to right. Although it is not common, vertical columns running from top to bottom and right to left are found in the old books.

Understanding the linguistic features of the Korean language and major differences between Korean and English grammar will provide important clues about the effect of the first language on the learning of the latter for the Korean ELL. There are a number of differences between Korean and English grammar including word order, subject-verb agreement, gender agreement, article use, and noun omission. One of the
main differences in grammar is subject and verb order. Korean word order is subject-object-verb (e.g., I school to go), but English word order is subject-verb-object (e.g., I go to school). In Korean, no gender agreement is necessary in pronouns, so it causes some difficulties choosing between “he” and “she.” There is also no grammatical agreement between a third person singular subject and its verb in the present tense, and frequent mistakes making a sentence such as “she/he go to school.” Korean has no equivalent to the articles *a* and *the* in English; therefore the usage of English articles is very difficult for the Korean ELL.

The use of honorifics is one of the specific features in Korean. Influenced by Confucianism from China, Korean society consists of hierarchical and honorific structure and this structure is built into the Korean language. The social relationship of traditional Korean culture is reflected in honorifics between the speaker and the listener. Korean verbs have different honorific forms, and different words are used to denote the level of respect between the speaker and the addressee. For example, *mukda* (eat) can be changed to *chasusida* or *dusida*, depending on whom the speaker is talking to: elderly people, younger people, or close friends. All verbs can be converted into an honorific form by adding the infix-*si*, and a few verbs have special honorific equivalents. One way of using honorifics is to use the special honorific suffix-*nim*, which is affixed to kinship terms or respectable class nouns (e.g., king, teacher, professor, pastor, and owner) to make them respectable.

**Dialects of Korean.**

The regions and the dialects of Korean have a very close connection, because the boundaries of both are determined by the mountains in Korea. Korean has several
regional dialects. The standard language of South Korea is the dialect of the region around Seoul. One of the most remarkable differences between dialects is the use of intonation. The standard Korean has a very flat intonation; on the other hand, the Gyengsang dialect has a strong stress and very pronounced intonation. Although a number of regional dialects are used in South Korea, all dialects are largely mutually intelligible. The use of standard Korean is increasing by the influence of mass media and the development of the transportation system.

Jinsu’s parents are from Daegu, Gyeongsand do, the south-eastern part of South Korea. They use the regional dialect when they speak to each other. Even though they try to use standard Korean while they speak to other Koreans, they still have a unique phonological intonation. Jinsu also speaks with an intonation, although not as much, when he speaks and reads. He shows the unique accent when he reads a book.

The Role of the Korean Church

Korean Americans normally have a close relationship with relatives, friends, colleagues, and church members to maintain informal social relationships with other Korean Americans. They want to build communal bonds (close personal ties) and associational bonds (a collective belonging, identity, and loyalty) in the new country (Hurh, 1998, p.101). Ethnic Korean churches in America, thus, play an important role in the lives of Korean Americans. Among the majority of Korean Americans, Hurh stated, “the religious need (meaning), the social need (belong), and the psychological need (comfort) to attend the Korean church are inseparable from each other: they are functionally interwinded under the complex conditions” (p.112). The Korean church not only provides the spiritual needs of the members through worship and fellowship but also
offers peace of mind and relief from the stress and anxiety caused by language and
cultural differences (Shin, 2005). In addition, the Korean church, for Korean immigrants,
is a place providing useful information about housing, school, and job opportunities, and
building social relations with others.

The First Presbyterian church is one of the oldest Presbyterian churches in the
city. Korean Presbyterian, which is associated to the First Presbyterian church, commonly
supports the Korean students that attend a university in the Midwest. The Korean
Presbyterian church was renamed the International Presbyterian church in 2009.
Attendants of the Korean church are approximately forty to seventy people, but fluctuate
depending on the university semester. More than half of the church attendees are related
to schools: exchange students, visiting professors, undergraduate and graduate students,
and their families. The students’ nations are diverse, including China, Japan, Hong Kong,
Singapore, and Peru.

One fifth of the church members are immigrants who have lived in or near the
city for more than 30 years. The majority of them are women in their 50 to 60’s. There
are no Korean churches near their houses; therefore, they attend the Korean church in the
city on Sundays together. They drive together one car, chatting in Korean all the way,
even though they live in separate cities. One of the women in her 60’s told me she was so
happy to speak in Korean on Sunday, because she had no opportunity to speak Korean at
home at all. She was still missing the Korean language, people, and food, even though
she had lived in America more than 30 years. One of the main purposes of visiting church
for her was joining the social activity, rather than serving the religious ceremony; she
wanted to meet Korean people and speak in Korean, and share Korean food. Thus, the
Korean church, for the Korean immigrants, is a place to build social relations and to provide useful information to share with other Koreans, as well as to serve the Sunday worship for the growth of their faith.

The service of the Korean church is provided once on Sunday mornings in the Korean church chapel. During the sermon, one-channel radios for translation are provided to help those whose language is not Korean to understand the sermon. Extra activities such as Chinese and Spanish classes, Bible study for college students, and the Korean Language School program are provided every Friday and Sunday. The Korean pastor is one of the associate pastors belonging to the First Presbyterian Church. He has worked as the minster for the Korean Congregation at the First Presbyterian Church since 2000. The duty of the Korean pastor is to take charge of the Korean congregation. He plays an important role in establishing communal and associational bonds in the Korean community by providing services for the newly arrived Korean students (e.g., finding a new house or car, providing transportation from the airport, and sharing important information about school).

The Korean Language School

The Korean Language School is one of the Korean church programs. The purpose of the Korean Language School is to help young Korean children, second generations of immigrants and university students’ children, to learn their mother tongue and keep their Korean culture and identity. The classes were divided into three levels by the student’s grades and Korean language levels: beginner level, intermediate level, and advanced level. The total number of students was seven during spring session in 2010. Two students were in the beginner level: one first grade boy and one third grade girl. Three
boys were in the intermediate level, two of them 8th graders and one was a fourth grader who had stayed temporarily in the city for two months and left later. One 11th and one 12th grade girl were in the advanced level. They were learning the Korean alphabet and reading and writing skills in Korean as well as Korean history and culture. Unlike a school setting, the time schedule of KLS was always the same.

There were three teachers at the Korean Language School and the Korean church pastor was the principal. Two of the teachers were graduate students studying at the university and the other one was the wife of a university student. There were no specific requirements for being a Korean Language School teacher. All of them were members of the Korean church who volunteered to teach at the Korean Language School. The class began at four o’clock and finished at six every Friday and lasted for the fall and spring semesters.

**First day of visiting the Korean Language School.**

I had permission from the principal of the Korean Language School before I started to collect data at the school. The administrator had known me well, because I was a member of the church, and he was willing to allow me to observe the Korean language classes. I also had worked as a Korean Language school teacher for a year two years ago and taught intermediate level students.

The church was located near the University campus and the building was in harmony with nature: well-designed garden, green trees and flowers, and a big parking area. The inside of the church was impressive with a gorgeous chandelier on the high ceiling, elaborately decorated white columns around the corner, long shuttered white windows, and red carpet. Two rows of long pews were lined up and the Bibles and hymn
books in English were placed on the back side of the pews. Korean Bibles and hymn
books were separately displayed on the portable shelves near the entrance.

It was the first day of the spring semester of the Korean Language School after
one month’s winter vacation. When I entered the church at 3:55 p.m., the Korean
Language School students, three boys and one girl, were sitting on the pew and chatting
together. The principal and three teachers were with them, but I could not find Jinsu, my
participant, anywhere. Large Korean and American flags were hanging on the candle
stands in front of the altar. Soon the children began to sing Korean songs titled “Foot
Steps” and “Snow Flakes” accompanied by the piano. Both songs were related to the
winter season and familiar to me. After singing together for twenty five minutes, all the
students stood up and recited the Pledge of Allegiance and sang the Korean and the
American anthems. Then, the principal gave a lecture to the students. He introduced one
of the great Korean heroes, Ik-Hyon Choi, who spent his whole life dedicated to the
independence of Korea from Japan.

After the principal’s lecture, the students and teachers went back to their
classroom. The beginner students remained in the chapel, the intermediate students went
to the conference room, and advanced students went to the church library. Jinsu showed
up at the end of the principal’s lecture, after I made a phone call to his mother. She
replied that she did not know the Korean Language School had started and she would ask
her husband to take Jinsu to the church as soon as possible. Jinsu’s parents were very
devoted to his education and they would bring him to the Korean Language School for
every session unless there was a special reason.
Soon Jinsu came to the chapel and sat on his teacher’s left side with his classmate at a large folding table placed behind the last row of pews. Although Yong, his classmate, was at the beginner’s class, her reading and writing skills were far higher than Jinsu’s. Yong’s Korean skills seemed to be between the beginner and intermediate level. She was promoted to the intermediate class after the 2010 spring semester.

**Jinsu’s language transition.**

Jinsu attended the KLS class when he started going to preschool, thus it was his third year with Mrs. Lee at the KLS. Mrs. Lee said that Jinsu was very inactive and shy when he first came to the KLS, but he kept changing as time went by. He is not shy anymore and became able to express himself fully. She stated, however, that Jinsu’s Korean oral language ability had negatively changed for two years. This interview was conducted in Korean. It was transcribed and translated to English:

When Jinsu came to the KLS for the first time, he was fluent in Korean and spoke every word in Korean, very little in English. He has changed, however, since he went to the Steven Elementary School (pseudonym). He began to mix English words in a Korean sentence; for example, “이게 무슨 color 야?” [What color is it?]. Then he used more English words in a Korean sentence. Finally, he was speaking whole sentences in English since he began to go to the new school, the Springhill Elementary School. His speaking ability in English improved rapidly since last August 2009; however, his speaking skills in Korean were getting less proficient.
Description of Activities at the KLS

The Korean Language School teacher and her class.

The Korean Language school teacher, Mrs. Lee, has taught at the KLS for four years since she has lived in the city. Her husband came to the city to study and her two daughters were in the advanced class. She had no teaching experience at the elementary school before. The KLS students gathered at the chapel and had time with the pastor from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., singing Korean songs, pledging to each national flag, singing national anthems, and listening to the pastor’s lecture. After having time with the pastor, the students had a break for ten minutes, time for eating snacks and chatting with one another, and then moved to their own study rooms. Jinsu’s class had two students, he and Yong. Jinsu had been in Mrs. Lee’s class for two years and Yong, a third grader, for four years.

Mrs. Lee taught Jinsu and Yong individually, because their Korean levels were different. She began to teach Jinsu first and then studied with Yong. When it was time to teach Yong, she asked Jinsu to read silently or copy alone what he learned, and often asked me to help him read aloud or to test his dictation. Data from the session I was fully involved in were eliminated from the data analysis of the study.

Mrs. Lee’s instruction was based on the teacher-centered methods and relied on one textbook published in Korea, the Korean National Book for the first graders. She chose one chapter from it and asked Jinsu to read the sentences and checked his comprehension, vocabulary, and dictation. In addition, she would ask him to copy what he learned in the textbook. No pair group or small group activity was found. The class lasted usually 40 to 50 minutes.
The activities at the KLS setting were not varied as much as compared to the school setting. The KLS activity was classified into eight sections according to Jinsu’s type of conversation and studying elements: Conversation with group (COG), Conversation with Yong (COY), conversation with a teacher (COT), reading activity (R), comprehension checking (CC), vocabulary checking (VC), writing activity (W), and dictation activity (D).

The conversation with other group at the KLS (COG) occurred during a break after the pastor’s lecturing. All seven KLS students, the three KLS teachers, and the pastor were involved in conversation while they were gathering and eating snacks before moving to each classroom. Yong was Jinsu’s classmate, and conversation with Yong (COY) was observed frequently before and after class. Jinsu’s conversation with Mrs. Lee during class was classified as Conversation with a teacher (COT), which was mainly daily conversation, not related to studying, between Mrs. Lee and Jinsu (e.g., asking Jinsu to eat food out of the chapel, to bring his backpack, and inquire after his parents etc.). Based on Mrs. Lee’s instruction, five more activities were added: Jinsu’s reading aloud activity (R), Mrs. Lee’ comprehension checking (CC) and vocabulary checking (VC), and Jinsu’s writing (W) and dictation activity (D) during class.

The Home Setting

Jinsu’s Parents

Jinsu’s parents were both doctoral students at a university in the city. His father’s major was adult and community education and his mother’s was special education. Jinsu was their only son, and they lived in a two bedroom private apartment. Jinsu’s family participated in Korean community activities with eagerness and attended church once a
Jinsu’s parents were married in May in 2001 and came to the United States in August of the same year for his father’s education. Jinsu was born in 2003 and his mother had started to study later at the same university.

According to the Bureau of Public Affairs (1986), the literacy rate of South Korean students is 90% because of Korean’s high desire for education. Jinsu’s parents showed high support and desire for his education. Jinsu’s mother brought 90 Korean books, including informational books and national history books with cartoons, when she returned from visiting Korea during summer vacation. It was Jinsu’s father who helped him with his homework and taught him math and Korean at home. Jinsu’s father went to the library regularly with him during the summer vacation. They usually checked out ten to 20 books. He also read Korean or English books aloud to Jinsu at bed time. In the case of English books, Jinsu’ father just read one page and then Jinsu finished the rest, because he liked to read to himself silently, instead of being read to aloud. For Korean books, Jinsu read only main titles, and his father read aloud the rest. The ratio of English to Korean books was 10:1.

Jinsu’s parents spoke in Korean at home. In order to measure his parents’ English skills, I asked his parents to complete a self-evaluation of English skills, one to six scales (from very poor to very good). His father’s self-evaluation showed that writing (fluency, organization, grammar, and vocabulary) and speaking (fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar) areas had the lowest points, each of them have scored three. The highest rate was reading comprehension, which was scored five. On the other hand, Jinsu’s mother’s lowest rate was writing organization with a score of three and the highest rate was reading (comprehension and vocabulary) with a score of five. The results
reflected the English education in Korea focused on reading with grammar, instead of speaking and listening.

Although there is a strong desire among Korean-Americans to achieve high English proficiency, this does not easily translate into actual achievement (Hurh, 1998). This is because of the different language structures of English and Korean, as well as the limited opportunities of use and practice of English in Korea. Different language structures (non-alphabet system and a different grammar) lead to English learning difficulty. English education in Korea, their home country, has been limited to book learning in high school and college. Their limitation of English might encourage them to have a desire that their son should be bilingual.

Jinsu’s parents usually participated in the activities of their own ethnic community. They think their own ethnic community provides a social belonging and recognition of their ethnicity. They said that they wanted to help Jinsu to find his identity and culture from the Korean community. That might be one of the reasons why they joined the Korean community and sent Jinsu to the Korean Language School.

**Description of Activities at Home**

After I received permission from Jinsu’s parents, I asked to record Jinsu’s oral language activity at home and offered them my tape recorder and a video camera. Junsu’s mother was busy with her studying and his father conducted one audio-recording and three video-recording. The recordings were conducted only during the studying time at home and they lack the conversation from his daily life at home.

The audio-recording was Jinsu studying Korean with his father and mother. The three video-recordings included Jinsu studying with his father, reading English books,
conducting English dictation, working on Korean worksheets, and practicing basic vocabulary words in Korean such as seasons, numbers, and days. The home setting was classified with four sections according to with whom and what Jinsu studied: studying Korean with parents (KP), studying Korean with father (KF), studying English with father (EDF), and English dictation with father (EF).

Summary

The data collection of this study considered three different settings, Springhill Elementary School, the Korean Language School, and home, for the in-depth sources of data. This chapter introduced each context: the description of each setting, the teachers, parents and the activities. The Korean language school was a part of the programming of the Korean church, and Jinsu used two languages, Korean and English. Thus, the role of the Korean church and the Korean language were also introduced to better understand the findings of this study.
CHAPTER V: RESULTS

Introduction

The educational system in the United States is undergoing significant change with the growing population of children from diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. Children initially develop their understanding of language by participating within social and cultural settings and by observing others. Social interaction is regarded as an essential instrument whereby information is structured. However, there is a lack of adequate research conducted in language and literacy acquisition considering the implications of the social and cultural interactions of students from diverse backgrounds.

This study presented a single case study using a qualitative research approach. The subject was a first grade Korean American boy. Data were collected through interviews, writing samples, informal assessments, and observations from three different settings: school, community, and home. The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of a first grade Korean child’s oral language interactions with teachers, parents, peers, and community members, as well as to examine how a child’s oral language impacts his literacy learning in English.

Restatement of the Research Questions

In order to investigate the role of oral language interactions of the first grade Korean child, the following question was provided:
How do oral language interactions at school, home, and in the community impact a first grade Korean child’s literacy learning in English?

**Description of Subject**

**Jinsu**

The subject of this study was a 6.5-year-old male Korean American named Jinsu (all names of persons and schools have been changed for anonymity). He was a first grade student at Springhill Elementary School when the study began. He was born in the United States and has lived in the same city from his birth. His parents are both busy graduate students. Jinsu’s parents sent him to a child care center two or three times a week since he was 3.5 years old, whenever they had classes at the same hour. He went to Head Start (one type of preschool) from 2008 to 2009, Kindergarten at the Carmel Elementary School during the 2009 to 2010 school year, and transferred to the K and 1st grade combined class at Springhill Elementary School in the fall of 2010.

Jinsu liked every kind of sports: soccer, tennis, racket ball, basketball, dodge ball, running, climbing, and golf. It seemed that Jinsu’s father influenced his love of sports. Jinsu’s father was interested in sports, majored in physical education in his undergraduate study, and frequently went out to play with Jinsu. When I conducted an interview with Jinsu’s father, he illustrated part of Jinsu’s daily schedule:

We had dinner and went to the university gym for the rock climbing. After rock climbing we wanted to go swimming, but we did not bring swimming suits so we played table tennis instead, and then we came home.
Jinsu was a friendly and outgoing child and showed a positive attitude when he was making friends. For instance, I took Jinsu to my house to administer the post-test in English in June of 2010. It was the first time for him to visit my apartment, and he was curious about everything around the house. Next door to my house there lived a family with a four year-old girl and a seven year-old girl. When he saw them through the sliding door, he knocked on the door without any hesitation and asked their mother if he could come in and play with them. He played with them for an hour and then all of them moved to my house and enjoyed watching TV.

From the interview with Mrs. April, Jinsu’s classroom teacher, in March she described Jinsu’s friend relationships as “social.” He liked to talk to everybody and seemed to play with different children. When asked who Jinsu’s best friend was at school, Mrs. April answered that it was hard for her to pick one as his favorite friend because she observed him playing with different friends, not always choosing the same one.

**Jinsu’s Early Language Transition**

Tabors (2008) classified young children’s second language acquisition into two types: *simultaneous* and *sequential acquisition* (p.11). When children are exposed to two languages from birth and mainly acquiring words from both languages, it is called simultaneous acquisition. When children build their first language primarily at home and second language learning occurs later, it is called sequential acquisition. Jinsu’s case demonstrated the latter type of language acquisition.

Jinsu acquired English as a second language after his first language, Korean, had been established at home. Korean was both his mother’s and father’s native language.
Jinsu’s mother usually stayed at home with him, and Jinsu spoke only Korean until he was three years old, with a limited opportunity to be exposed to English. However, Jinsu’s mother began to study at a college when he was three years old, and he acquired English quickly since he went to the child care center two or three times a week. Jinsu’s mother stated that she believes that there was a reason that Jinsu acquired English quickly:

Within a few days of his attending to the child care center, one boy poured sand on his head with a shovel and he came back home angry. He seemed to notice that he was mistreated because of his English. He wanted to say something to the boy but he could not say a word, because he could not speak English at that time. Another reason for his quick acquisition of English, he was an outgoing boy and liked to make friends and play with them. He noticed, in order to play with his friends, he had to speak English, not Korean, at the child center.

Even though Jinsu was only 3.5 years old at the time, he seemed to notice the different situation when and where to use Korean or English. He also might perceive that if he could speak English fluently, he would be treated fairly by others and could make friends to play with. Through this experience and a strong desire to make friends at the child center, he seemed to be motivated to acquire English quickly.

After Jinsu went to the child care center, according to Jinsu’s mother, he continually talked about what he did with his friends at the center. He was curious about the English names and tried to pronounce their names. At the beginning of acquiring English, he started to insert one or two English words, such as his friend’s names and
simple nouns into a Korean sentence. He inserted more English words later as he learned more English. Finally, he was acquiring English rapidly by communicating with peers and engaging in play activities.

Jinsu spent his whole day, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. at school. He was acquiring English through interactions with others, by learning from his teacher, and playing with his friends. However, his opportunities to use Korean were becoming less frequent, even though his parents used Korean at home. He had few opportunities to talk with people other than his parents, because he had no siblings and no adults like grandparents in the house. Although he was losing his speaking ability in Korean, his reading and spelling skills were much improved compared to the fall semester of 2009, according to his KLS teacher:

Jinsu is losing his speaking and listening skills in Korean, but he is learning how to write and read Korean by practicing and studying. His writing and reading skills are 100 percent improved from before. He has started combining the consonants and the vowels since the last year. He could not do it before. He did not even know any consonants and vowels when he came to the KLS for the first time. Now, he can combine the consonants and the vowels perfectly and he could read the sentences. He is also able to write simple words, although he cannot write full sentences yet.

My research began after Jinsu’s language transition was developed to some extent from Korean to English. According to my observation at the KLS, his answers were short with simple nouns for the teacher’s questions. He repeated the same words several times
and did not make complete sentences. He used utterances such as “umm” and “chokum,” which means “a little bit” in Korean, whenever he could not find a proper word for the answer, and his vocabulary in Korean was limited.

Results

Data Analysis

Data were collected from observations, field notes, interviews, assessments in English and Korean, and other documents such as a school report card, the results of standardized assessment, and writing samples. Interviews were conducted with Jinsu, the school teacher, the Koran Language School (KLS) teacher, and Jinsu’s parents. The interview questions are attached in Appendices D, E, F, and G. The interviews were audio-taped with permission and transcribed. The interviews with the KLS teacher and parents were conducted in Korean and translated in English later. The classes at Springhill Elementary School and the KLS were also audio- or video-taped and transcribed by me, and the home activities were audio- and video-recorded by Jinsu’s father.

I listened to audio and video tapes repeatedly while transcribing raw data. Then the data were read again concentrating on Jinsu: his every behavior, talking habits, and conversations with others. Specific characteristics and phenomena in oral and non-verbal behaviors were coded. Each coding was then sorted into two dimensions, language functions and social processing based on the analytical framework by Kumpulainen and Mutanen (2000).

Language functions were mainly emphasized to analyze Jinsu’s oral language interactions in detail. They were interrogative (asking question to teacher or peers),
responsive (answering questions), informative (providing information), reasoning (reasoning in language), evaluative (evaluating work or action), judgmental (expressing agreement or disagreement), argumentational (justifying information, opinions or actions), repetition (repeating spoken language), experiential (expressing personal experiences), affectional (expressing feelings), and reading aloud (reading text).

Social processing included collaborative (joint activity with equal participation and meaning making), tutoring (helping and assisting another student), argumentative (facing social conflicts which are resolved), and sharing (sharing his materials with other peers).

With further reading of data, the coding related to the KLS and home settings showed unique patterns, therefore additional language functions were added later. These were incomplete sentences (the use of unfinished sentences), wrong sentences (grammatically incorrect sentences), simple responses (answers in ‘yes’ ‘no’ or ‘I don’t know’), language habits (the use of unnecessary words), hesitation, code switching (mixing of English and Korean), honorific words (use of Korean honorific words), confirmation (asking again to make sure the meaning), and dialect (Jinsu’s parents’ dialect). The analytical framework of oral interaction is shown in Appendix H.

After this step, data from each setting were classified into several activities according to Jinsu’s type of studying and with whom and what he was studying as shown in Table 1. Finally, each activity was analyzed according to the analytical categorization of each dimension, language functions and social processing.

Activities at Spring Hill Elementary School were writing (W), Daily Language Art Review/ Daily Math Practice (DLR/DMP), group reading (GR), draw box (pair
playing) (DB), watching video (WV), reading aloud (RA), art, and playground (PG) activities. The Korean Language School activities were conversation with group (COG), conversation with Yong (COY), conversation with a teacher (COT), reading (R), comprehension checking (CC), vocabulary checking (VC), writing (W), and dictation (D). The activities at home were studying Korean with parents (KP), studying Korean with father (KF), studying English with father (EDF), and English dictation with father (EF).

Table 1

*Activities of Each Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DLR &amp; DMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draw Box (pair playing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watching Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Aloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLS</td>
<td>Conversation with Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conver. with Yong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conver. with Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Korean Studying With Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean studying With Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English studying With Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Dictation With Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Description of Jinsu’s Language Functions and Social Processing in Each Setting*

Jinsu’s English and Korean language and literacy ability will be presented first to show how they were developed during the course of this study over five months. Next, Jinsu’s oral interactions with others and his behaviors in each activity in a setting were analyzed according to the analytical categorization, language functions, and social processing.
The school setting.

**Jinsu's English ability.**

Overall, Jinsu’s English level, including reading and language arts, was above his grade level. Jinsu’s report card from Springhill Elementary School for 2009-2010 showed that his reading level improved from the 1.1 grade level to the 2.2 grade level during four grading periods as seen in Table 2. In the literacy area, Jinsu’s spelling scored an A+, and handwriting and reading were each an A. It was observed that Jinsu liked spelling tests; even in the Korean Language class, he insisted on taking an English spelling test, and his father helped him to review spelling practice at home.

Table 2

**Jinsu’s Reading Level from School Report Card**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Period</th>
<th>Reading Level</th>
<th>Reading Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; grading period</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Needs to work on sounding out words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; grading period</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; grading period</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Working harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grading period</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the result of the Terra Nova test conducted on April 9, 2010 at Springhill Elementary School, Jinsu’s score of reading and language arts was also in the above–average range. The results of the Terra Nova revealed that his estimated average of reading (77%), vocabulary (91%), reading composite (86%), language (89%), and word analysis (81%) was between the 25<sup>th</sup> through the 75<sup>th</sup> National Percentiles.

The graded reading passages (Stieglitz, 2004) was conducted twice to measure Jinsu’s English ability to read a passage and comprehend the content in it. His oral
reading miscues and comprehension errors were checked. The result of the pre-test and post-test showed that at the grade 2 level, Jinsu’s estimated reading level had changed from an instructional level to an independent–instructional level (Table 3).

Table 3

*Informal Reading Inventory: Comprehension and Words Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Reading Passages</th>
<th>Pre-Test (March, 25)</th>
<th>Post-Test (June, 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1: Independent level <em>(1/0)</em></td>
<td>Grade 1: Independent level (0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2: Instructional level <em>(5/½)</em></td>
<td>Grade 2: independent-Instructional level (4/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3: Frustration level <em>(9/1½)</em></td>
<td>Grade 3: Frustration level (11/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * means (oral reading miscues/ comprehension errors)

A story retelling was conducted to determine his comprehension ability. I chose *Floggy Goes to School* by Jonathan London and asked Jinsu to read aloud and tell the story in January. During the reading, he used picture clues and seemed to enjoy reading and frequently laughed. His retelling showed that he understood the main characters, the topic, and the story events. He described the details only for the parts he enjoyed; however, whenever I gave him a prompt, he remembered it and added more details about the event that happened in the story. He read 325 words and made 11 miscues.

Writing was used to determine Jinsu’s ability to write about a topic and story that he read. Writing samples were collected twice, once in January and once in June. Jinsu selected Mark Brown’s *Chicken Pox*, and wrote the summary of the story in one sentence in January. The sentence structure, the capitalization of the first letter of the sentence, and the punctuation mark at the end of the sentence were correct. He made four misspellings,
however, among 14 words in the sentence, including basic vocabulary such as “when” (whan) and “were” (whar). Another writing sample was collected in June from Doreen Cronin’s *Diary of a Worm*, which was one of his favorites. He read the book with emotion, giggling and laughing from time to time. His second writing sample consisted of three sentences, and he made four misspellings among 28 words. This second writing sample showed his understanding of the use of past tense, basic capitalization and punctuation rules. His grammatical error was not serious, but he still lacked a description of the central idea and organization of the beginning, middle, and ending part of the story.

**Language functions at the Spring Hill Elementary School.**

The analysis of the study was based on the analytical framework by Kumpulainen and Mutanen (2000). Its original analytical framework centered on peer group interaction and had three dimensions: language functions, cognitive processing, and social processing. However, this study considered only two dimensions, language functions and social processing.

The frequency of each language function was counted for each activity at the school setting: interrogative (How many times did Jinsu ask questions to a teacher and peers?), responsive (How many times did he respond to the others’ questions?), informative (Did his answer provide information?), reasoning (Did he use reasoning in language?), evaluative (Did he evaluate his work or action?), judgmental (Did he agree or disagree with others?), argumentational (Did he justify his information, opinions or actions?), repetition (Did he repeat any spoken language?), experiential (How many times did he express his personal experiences?), affectional (Did he show any of his feelings such as happiness, excitement, and sadness?), and reading aloud (Did he read aloud any
The behavior of raising his hand (How many times did he raise his hand?) is not a category of language function; however, it gave an important clue relating to his oral interaction and it added to language function as a non-verbal type.

Activities at Spring Hill Elementary School were writing (W), Daily Language Art Review/ Daily Math Practice (DLR/DMP), group reading (GR), draw box (DB), watching video (WV), reading aloud (RA), art, and playground (PG). The frequency of language functions at each activity at the school setting was shown in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities at School</th>
<th>Jinsu's Language Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DLR/ DMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-verbal)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities at School</th>
<th>Jinsu’s Language Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DLR/ DMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-verbal)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities at Spring Hill Elementary School were writing (W), Daily Language Art Review/ Daily Math Practice (DLR/DMP), group reading (GR), draw box (DB), watching video (WV), reading aloud (RA), art, and playground (PG). The frequency of language functions at each activity at the school setting was shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency of Language Functions in the School Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities at School</th>
<th>Jinsu’s Language Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DLR/ DMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-verbal)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the *writing activity*, Jinsu joined the class actively and looked excited. As seen in Table 4, he raised his hand 12 times and responded ten times. Both were the second highest rates among eight activities. Mrs. April talked to the students about attending a writing contest and making their own books. She provided information about the procedure of making a book. She read three books and demonstrated how the content of each story developed, what the problem was and how the author solved the problem, what kind of pattern there was and how the pattern was repeated. Motivated by Mrs. April’s modeling, Jinsu was energized during the class. He raised his hand repeatedly, asked questions, and continually talked about his ideas of how he would develop his story with his peers until the end of the class. Extract 1 below showed how he was involved in the writing activity: his questioning, raising hand, and suggestion to bring and share his own book about making a real book. Jinsu was motivated by Mrs. April’s making a book project and involved in the class actively and shared his own experience intensely.

**Extract 1**

Teacher …students need to write a story, illustrated and submitted.

Jinsu We will draw pictures?

Teacher It will be like a book. Finish a book.

Jinsu Ummm (raised his hand). Um…I have, author book, on the back of, introducing how to make a real book without staple.

Teacher Okay, you can bring it if you like to.
The *daily Language Art Review/ Daily Math Practice (DLR/DMP)* activity was conducted with a worksheet, one page of Language Arts and one page of math problems. Jinsu’s DLR/DMP activity was observed three times (March 2, April 6, and April 27) which was more than the other activities, and the total frequency of language functions revealed consistencies among all except argumentational. However, cross-comparing of each DLR/DMP activity showed differences among the three as seen in Table 5.

Table 5.

**Jinsu’s Language Functions during DLR/DMP Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DLR/DMP</th>
<th>Language Functions</th>
<th>3/2 (30’)*</th>
<th>4/6 (15’)*</th>
<th>4/27 (15’)*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgmental</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentational</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affectional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *3/2 (30’)* means March 2nd, 30 minutes observation. *4/6 (15’)* means April 6th, 15 minutes observation *4/27 (15’)* means April 27th, 15 minutes observation
The first and second DLR/DMP consisted of traditional teacher-centered activities. Mrs. April distributed the worksheet which students had finished the day before, reviewed the problems with students by asking questions, and helped them to check their answers. The first DLR/DMP activity lasted 30 minutes, but the frequency of Jinsu’s language functions (total 8 times) were much less than those of the third one (24 times) which lasted 15 minutes. The third DLR/DMP activity, unlike the first and second, was student-centered. Mrs. April asked the students to make a pair group, measure any objects with their rulers, and complete their own worksheet.

Experiential language function appeared five times during the DLR/DMP activity. Mrs. April connected tulips and their bulbs in a story from *Little House on the Prairie* to the math problem, and Jinsu shared his own experience on planting flowers, paying attention to the topic. Jinsu motivated his learning by connecting his background knowledge with the topic:

Teacher So you can find flowers that have big bulbs just as big or bigger sometimes. (Jinsu raises hand). Jinsu?
Jinsu Um, mine was growing like about this tall.
Teacher Mmmm. I’m so glad that those worked. We will plant something more later on as the weather gets warmer and you can take home and put outside.
(Drake looks behind and talks with Jinsu. They are talking about the size of bulbs.)

Jinsu’s responsive language function in the *group reading activity* showed the highest frequency rate of 30 times among all the activities. Jinsu belonged to the intermediate reading level, and the group had five students. This meant he had more
opportunities to ask and answer during the reading group activity, and this was one of the benefits of the small group. The data revealed that he joined the reading group activity energetically by answering the teacher’s questions as seen in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>What make Jim (inaudible) now? (Jinsu raises hand)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>Because um…because the book was flying (He was pretending to fly using two hands and arms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>May be. That sounds very good. If something was flying I might think that something was flying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>Look at the elf. Look at his face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Yeah. His face is pretty. How does his face look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>He likes giggle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Look how big his eyes are. Look how wide his eyes are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>She’s like um… she’s like, she’s like magic because um, she can make that book fly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>O.K. She can fly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of data showed that Jinsu’s oral interaction was the most active during the *draw box activity* among the eight activities. It was noticeable that every language function except reading aloud was revealed during the draw box activity. Interrogative (peer), reasoning, evaluative, organizational, judgmental, argumentative, repetition, experiential, and affectional language functions showed the highest frequency rate compared to other activities. When the draw box activity began, Jinsu was excited, shouting “Yeah!” and asked me in Korean to watch him play the draw box and see how fun it was.

The higher frequency rate of affectional and judgemental language functions (expression of feelings, agreement, and disagreement) revealed how Jinsu’s oral
interaction was active during the draw box activity. Jinsu was involved in pretend play with Mark. He imitated an explosion of a cannon, shouted, and screamed during the draw box activity. His expression of feeling and shouting made it hard for me to transcribe the data. This reflected how he enjoyed this part of the class and how his oral language was developed through playing with a peer:

Jinsu  Alright. I'm the knight. (He plays with the Legos)
Mark  I think the cannon’s gonna be right here, and the bad guys right here, and FIRE!!
Mark  Dan dan da da. (singing) Jinsu, this is his cross bow.
Jinsu  Watch this. Watch this.
Mark  Oh you're going to fire that?
Jinsu  Yeah... it's really cool. Watch this.
Mark  I have pirate Legos that are like this and what I did, it has a cannon like that and I put a piece of fire on top of that and then I fired it off the cannon.
Jinsu  Peeuuung (making warcraft sounds) Ahhh my heads on fire! ARRRGGGHHHH my heads on fire help!
Mark  I am fierce!!! I am knight fierce!

Jinsu’ conversation with his peers was connected to his previous memories and experiences that he felt, watched, and thought from the mass media. During the draw box activity, Jinsu’s conversations with his school mate, Mark, illustrated that his oral language was influenced by the media such as television programs, commercials, and movies. By the influence of mass media, he and his peer were gaining and sharing new knowledge and vocabularies, which I could not understand such as iCarly, a commercial on PBS Kids, and bulling invention. This could have been because of a cultural gap
between his age group and mine. He shared information and knowledge which he gained
from mass media with his peers as seen below:

Mark   That’s really cool.
Jinsu  It’s like been a week since then. Have you ever seen iCarly?
Mark   Yeah, it’s funny.
Jinsu  Have you seen the one with dance….when iCarly dancy dance?
Mark   Yeahhh…yeah.

Jinsu  Have you seen the commercial on PBS Kids, where they go…
Mark   No thank you…no thank you. They’re called (inaudible)…
Jinsu  I know they’re monkeys. (both boys make monkey noises)
Mark   Fire the cannon!

Jinsu  Have you seen the part where the guy said “Can you just please be
my girlfriend?” Do you remember when some kind of guy said
that?
Mark   Yeah.
Jinsu  Yeah I know. Then she said No! And then he asked her again and
she said No, No, No (laughs) Mine can fly.
Mark   Mine can (inaudible)
Jinsu  That’s what all guns…. (laughs) Do you remember when
when….that guy made that bulling invention, that bulling invention
and his bull teacher, right, he uh his cowboy teacher his cowboy
teacher just went on my butt? He put his butt on my back. You
remember when he said that? (laughs) That was really funny (boys
continue to play)

One of the problems English Language Learners have is a lack of oral vocabulary.

Native speakers have more opportunities to acquire the advanced level of vocabularies
from their daily conversation with their parents and older siblings at the dinner table from birth. ELLs, including Jinsu, have few opportunities to communicate with a higher level of vocabulary from their parents (his parents speaks Korean at home); however, they can acquire new knowledge and oral vocabulary from interaction with peers and the proper use of mass media.

*The video activity* was a part of Language Arts. Mrs. April compared three different versions of “Hansel and Gretel,” each made in a different country. More than half of the activity was allotted to watch the video, and Jinsu’s language function was low. He only responded twice, making a prediction of the story. However, Jinsu liked the video and was absorbed in watching it intensively without any motion during the video. This showed that the video activity was a good way for the students to understand the differences of the world by comparing the stories from different cultures, especially for the ELLs who had a different cultural background.

*The reading aloud activity* was observed three times, but data showed that there was no response in the area of informative, reasoning, evaluative, argumentative, experiential and confirming language functions. This activity was teacher-centered reading aloud time, and Jinsu’s oral interaction frequency rate was low. During the first reading aloud activity, Mrs. April read Dr. Seuss’s *One Fish, Two Fish, Red Fish, Blue Fish* and asked the students to chant the ending rhyme. Jinsu did not pay attention to the activity, and instead talked to the student next to him and played with a rubber band during the reading. His language function during the first observation occurred only once, a repetition, when they chanted the ending rhyme as seen in Table 5.
When I asked Jinsu later about the Dr. Seuss story, he replied that the book was easy, and he was bored. Jinsu’s class was a Kindergarten and 1st grade combined class, and Jinsu needed a more challenging book which would motivate him to listen. A proper level of book which will challenge Jinsu would help him to motivate his learning.

Table 5

*Jinsu’s Language Functions during Reading Aloud Activity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Aloud Language Functions</th>
<th>3/2 *</th>
<th>4/6 *</th>
<th>5/6*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative Peers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgmental Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *3/2 means March 2nd  *4/6 means April 6th  *5/6 means May 6th*

Jinsu was a hard worker during the *Art class*. Although he was often chatting with peers who were sitting on either side of him, he did pay attention to his artwork and enjoyed working happily and attentively. Whenever he had questions, he asked the teacher without hesitation (six times) and answered the teacher’s questions eagerly (three times). His experiential and affectional language function was each used three times during the art activity. He enjoyed his art work and shared his opinion on the interesting theme that his peers were talking about as seen below:

(Jinsu glues his stems)
(At the other side of the class, couple students are having discussion about Cleopatra with the teacher.)
Jinsu She’s a mother to a big kid.
Student (Inaudible)

Jinsu King Tut married his sister! (Jinsu works on his musical notes humming a song)

During the playground activity, Jinsu searched for bugs on the ground and laid down for a suntan. When he found Mrs. April was explaining to a group of students around her in a circle how to play the “Gingerella” game, he wedged himself into the group to join them. He understood the rules within a short time, responded swiftly and became one of the final three winners.

**Social processing at the Springhill Elementary School.**

Jinsu showed a good “social” relationship with his peers, as Mrs. April described him from the interview with her. He did not pick any specific friend as his partner. His partner changed during the pair group activities, such as the draw box activity and math problem solving. He was willing to share his own materials such as glue, scissors, ruler, and crayons. If somebody needed him, he helped them, and if he needed somebody’s assistance he asked for his peers’ help. He was observed frequently enjoying talking with his friends during lunch time and playground activity. He also joined the class activities, actively raising his hand time to time, even when Mrs. April did not ask anything. Jinsu also liked music. He stood up unexpectedly and pretended to play a guitar eagerly when music was being played on the tape recorder, not caring about the others students.

The frequency of hand raising was higher during the DLR/DMP (21 times), the writing (12 times), and the group reading activities (7 times), rather than the video (1), the reading aloud (4 times), and the art activities (1). The interrogative language function was the highest during the draw box activity (18 times), the responsive one was highest
during the group reading activity (30 times), and reasoning, evaluative, organizational, judgmental, experiential and affectional functions were each high during the draw box activity. This demonstrated that his social interaction was involved positively when he joined the peer group activity and small group activity. Also, he was active when the subject which he was interested in was connected to his prior knowledge, and it motivated and challenged him.

Comparing the social processing to language functions in the five activities (the writing, group reading, video, reading aloud, and art activities), the social processing did not occur, because these activities were mainly led by the teacher, based on teacher-centered instruction. The group reading activity consisted of reading and discussion time; however, even though it was also a teacher-centered activity, more opportunity to talk and share was given to the students, because of its small group numbers.

Jinsu’s social processing was more active and stronger than any other activities during the draw box activity as seen in Table 6. He showed collaborative (19 times), argumentative (6 times), and sharing (4 times) processing.

Table 6

*Frequency of Social Processing at School Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities at School</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>DLR/DMP</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>PG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the math time, a lesson on measuring, in the DLR/DMP activity, Jinsu collaborated with a peer and solved the problem with his help. Extract 2 showed that he solved the math problem with ease by scaffolding through the peer interaction. Jinsu offered his glue and ruler to him and they shared with each other (Extract 3). When Jinsu was involved in a pair group activity, he was active during the class, and his language function was diverse.

Extract 2

Jinsu  (says something to Tom and asks him for help).
Teacher  Tom, would you like to sit next each? (to Jinsu) Let Tom use it (ruler) too.
Jinsu  The more big it is, the more right. One, two, three….
Tom  (Jinsu and Tom count together) one, two, three….
Jinsu  That answer’s easy. See. That answers were easy.
Tom  One, two, three, four, five. I got five.
Jinsu  One, two, three, four, five. Me too. I got five too.

Extract 3

Jinsu  Hey you can borrow my crayons. Do you want it?
Tom  Let’s see how this really works.
Jinsu  Excuse me. (He puts his crayons back).
Tom  Oh, only one less. That was actually three. Hey, where’re your crayons?
Jinsu  I’m getting it for you. Here you go. (He takes out his crayons again).

During the draw box activity, Jinsu started to dominate the task by suggesting first that he wanted to be a knight, giving orders, and distributing the toy weapons to his peer.
However, when his peer denied Jinsu’s additional possession of a cannon, Jinsu accepted his peer’s opinion willingly and shared it fairly. Jinsu also tried to solve the problem by sharing the same legos that they both wanted to have. Mark continually insisted that the toys were for both of them, and Jinsu agreed with him, not arguing his own possession. This showed that Jinsu generally dominated the task, led his peer, and made an effort to solve the problem by himself, but he showed fair and collaborative behavior in interaction with his peer during the draw box activity as seen below:

Jinsu   Alright. I'm the knight. (plays with the legos)
         These two are yours. And these two spears are mine.
Mark   You could have a .....  
Jinsu   Can I have the cannon?
Mark   Nooo. That's for both of us.
Jinsu   Alright.
Mark   We don't fight against each other, remember?

Jinsu   I need all these.
Mark   No that's mine.
Jinsu   That's not fair.
Mark   You can have this.
Jinsu   Oh I got a good idea.
Mark   Dan dan da da. (singing)
Jinsu   Where is the other one? Can I have it? I got a good idea.
Mark   That's for both of us right?
Jinsu   Right.

These examples showed how his collaborative and friendly behavior affected his learning attitude. When he needed help from others, he asked for help without hesitation, and when someone needed his help, as well he willingly helped.
Korean Language School setting.

Jinsu's Korean language ability.

Jinsu’s Korean language proficiency was measured by informal assessment with the Korean National Textbook. Jinsu was eight years old in Korean age when the data was collected, and he would have been a first grader if he had stayed in Korea, because the Korean school semester begins in March. I chose a Korean language book for the first semester of the first grade. The pre-test was conducted with a fable story with 15 sentences from the beginning chapter of the textbook, and the post-test was selected from the ending chapter. First, I chose 15 sentences and asked Jinsu to read in order to measure his reading accuracy and fluency.

The 15 sentences of the pre-test included 77 words, and the post-test included 70 words. He read each sentence word-by-word with a long pause. He made several self-corrections, repeated some words, and needed some help with pronunciations. His reading was slow and did not show any emotion. Comparing his pre-test to post-test, he made less repetitions and self-corrections, and took less time in his post-test. However, as seen in Table 7, his reading accuracy was slightly improved from the pretest (69%) to the posttest (71%), and it did not show much progress during the six months.

Table 7

Jinsu’s Pre/Post Korean Language Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First semester front chapter</td>
<td>First semester ending chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Accuracy</td>
<td>53/77 words (69%)</td>
<td>50/70 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written vocabulary</td>
<td>13/20</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral vocabulary</td>
<td>14/20</td>
<td>17/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the written vocabulary, he could read 13 words from the front chapter and 19 from the ending chapter among 20 words. His oral vocabulary ability was 14 and 17 from 20 words, correspondingly. Oral vocabulary was measured by asking the meaning of each word. The results revealed that both vocabulary abilities were improved, however his oral vocabulary ability is to some extent behind his reading vocabulary ability. This could have been the result of less time speaking Korean, even though his parents tried to ask him to speak Korean at home. On the other hand, his written vocabulary was improved from 13 to 19. This showed that Korean study at the Korean Language School and with his father was effective.

A retelling was administrated to check his comprehension ability and to observe his speaking behavior. A story was selected from the textbook. He seemed to understand the story in part, but he did not describe it in detail and could not organize the story well. Without the help of a prompt, he could not continue the retelling of the story. His reply was short and was made in incomplete sentences, diminishing the end of the sentences or making fragment sentences.

Jinsu’s oral language ability in Korean was behind, compared to that of same-aged students in Korea. His fluency in speaking was not smooth; sentences were not completed, some words were repeated several times, and many utterances, such as “um” and “chokum” (*a little bit*) were repeated. The Korean Language School teacher and his parents rated his Korean listening and speaking ability as seen in Table 8. Jinsu’s listening comprehension was scored high compared to fluency, vocabulary, and grammar in speaking. He understood the Korean language in the daily conversations (e.g., What did you do yesterday? Did you go to school? etc.). His pronunciation in the speaking area
was also high. His pronunciation did not sound awkward, even though there was no fluency.

Table 8

*Jinsu’s Korean Oral Language Rating Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLS Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The rating scale ranged from 1 to 6 where 1 represented very poor and 6 represented very good.

The KLS teacher did not rate his writing skills. She thought his ability in reading Korean was not advanced enough to write his own thoughts (Table 9). She helped him to write words by conducting a vocabulary test (similar to a spelling test in English), however, she never asked him to write creatively during the period of observation. He wrote short words which were familiar and his Korean name. His writing practice at home was to write a short answer for the question, instead of writing a whole sentence or creating a story. Writing activity with any brainstorming or critical thinking was not performed at home or the KLS.

Table 9

*Jinsu’s Korean Literacy Rating Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLS Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jinsu’s language development in Korean made six-month’s improvement overall, and his attitude in studying has also improved as the KLS teacher described, “comparing between the beginning of the study and the ending of the study, his ability to remain attentive was improved remarkably.”

**Language functions at the Korean Language School.**

The activities of the KLS were not diverse compared to the activities of the school. The KLS class was mostly focused on the study of the Korean language and lasted less than one hour. The category of the KLS setting was mainly divided into two areas: types of conversation partners (With whom did Jinsu make a conversation?) and elements of Korean studying. As a result, the KLS setting was classified as eight sections: conversation with group (COG), conversation with a classmate, Yong (COY), conversation with Mrs. Lee (COT), reading aloud (R), comprehension checking (CC), vocabulary checking (VC), writing (W), and dictation (D). In COG, group represents all members related to the KLS school: students at different levels, the KLS teachers, and the pastor (Table 10).

Each category was analyzed using language function and social processing, the same way as at the school setting. It was noticeable that several unique language functions were found at the KLS setting only, and these were additionally attached: the use of uncompleted sentences, wrong sentences, simple response, language habits, hesitation/refusal, code switching, honorific words, dialect, and confirmation (Did he recheck his work by asking if he was correct?).
Table 10

*Frequency of Language Functions in the Korean Language School Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Functions</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>KLS</th>
<th>COG</th>
<th>COY</th>
<th>COT</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgmental</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomplete sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language habit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitate (refuse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code switching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency rate of Jinsu’s language functions was evenly displayed during the conversation with groups without any distinctive features. One noticeable thing,
compared to other categories, was his use of honorific words. The data showed that his choice of using honorific words depended on with whom he was talking. Jinsu responded with honorific words when he was talking with a person such as the pastor, who is an adult and in a socially respectable position. However, with a person who has a close relationship with him such as Mrs. Lee, he did not use honorific words much, even though she is an adult and respectable person.

When the Korean pastor asked Jinsu if he would come to the KLS next week, he answered all in Korean and with honorific words. He noticed to whom he should speak in Korean as well with whom to use honorific words.

**Pastor**  진수야! 너 다음주에 올거지? [Jinsu, Would you come next week?]
**Jinsu**  (nodding)
**Pastor**  아빠랑 같이 올거야? [Would you come with your daddy?]
**Jinsu**  왜요? 꼭 와야대요? (honorific words) [Why? Should I surely come?]
**Pastor**  뭐 같이 오지 뭐. 아빠 뭐 하시[Why don’t you come with your daddy? Is he busy?]
**Jinsu**  몰라요 (honorific words)[I don’t know.]
**Pastor**  잘 몰라? 아빠 뭐 하시는지? [You don’t know whether he is busy or not?]
**Jinsu**  예. (honorific words) [No]

Jinsu knew which language to choose, with whom and where he could speak Korean or not. He chose a language depending on the person to whom he was speaking. Jinsu’s choice was Korean when he replied to the pastor; however, he did not use Korean when he spoke to his Korean friends and other KLS classmates. When he met unknown
Korean adults at the church, he spoke in Korean first, and then switched to English, if their English was fluent or he could not continue in Korean. For a similar aged Korean child whom he did not know well, he would speak in Korean and observed his/her reaction, then he would decide which language to choose.

The type of language function of the conversation with Yong was very similar to that of the school setting. It was remarkable that Jinsu never used Korean when he spoke with Yong. Their conversations were usually gossip and common topics for kids such as friends, TV programs, and new shoes.

Jinsu: ..About my friend James who goes to this church…He accidently once ate a penny, and he was trying to poop but it didn’t come out. And his mom had to…throw it away.

Yong: He ate a penny?

Jinsu: Mmmhm (inaudible)…“and it didn’t come out...cause it had a penny in it”

Jinsu: Do you remember on the commercial, when, umm, that, umm, when those things yelled at “squirrel squirrel” and they um, like, bumped into each other.

Yong: Yeah

Jinsu: Well did you know, umm, he did that? He distracted them. Huh?

Yong: The squirrels?

Jinsu: No. Umm,, umm that old man, He actually tried to umm distract them. He was like this “Squirrel, eh eh, what!

Yong: Yeah

The data of conversation with teacher revealed that the frequency of the use of simple response, code switching, and language habits was significant. This reflected that Jinsu had difficulty speaking Korean fluently. Extract 4 below shows that his answer is
correct; however, extract 5 demonstrates that he did not listen to the full sentences and answered with a simple “yes.” Also, in extract 6, he did not understand the teacher’s question fully and gave a wrong answer. Extract 7 shows that “yes” looked like a positive answer, but the hidden meaning of it was negative. In other words, he liked me coming to his school, but he wanted his mother to come to school. The use of “yes” in extract 7 reflects that he was hesitating to answer; it was hard to say “yes” or “no” clearly. The use of “chokum” was very similar to the use of “yes” shown in extract 7.

Extract 4
Teacher 이모가 방학 할때 이거 주면서 너 이거 공부 많이 해와 그랬잖아. [I gave the book and asked you to study hard during the summer vacation, right?]
Jinsu 응. [Yes]

Extract 5
Teacher 공부하긴 했어? 이거? 어디까지 했어 [Did you study this book? This one? How many pages did you finish?]
Jinsu 응. [Yes]
Teacher 아빠랑 공부했어? [Did you study with your father?]
Jinsu 조금. [a little bit]

Extract 6
Teacher 어디까지? [How many pages?]
Jinsu 응. [Yes]

Extract 7
Teacher 진수야 있잖아. 여기 선생님이 너 학교에 가잖아 너네 클래스에. [Hey, Jinsu. Mrs. Kim goes to your school, to your class, right?]
Jinsu 응 [Hung]
Jinsu’s language habits appeared six times during COT. He used “chokum” five times and one was hesitation. “Chokum” means “a little bit.” Jinsu’s use of “chokum” varied depending on the situation, such as when it was hard to answer even though he knew the answer, when he did not understand the question, or when he answered for a correct meaning of “chokum.” His language habits revealed that his Korean skills lacked a selection of an appropriate Korean vocabulary and description of details.

Mrs. Lee was concerned about how Jinsu could keep his identity and attitude as a Korean, because he was losing the chance to learn Korean culture in American society. During the class, when she found a topic which was connected to Korean culture and identity, she helped him to remember them in his heart. For example, a part of her teaching related to Korean culture was based on traditions influenced by Confucianism: the young should respect teachers at school, obey their parents, be polite to each other, and should not cry in front of other people (Extracts 8 and 9). She also helped him to have his own identity by asking him who he was and why he had to study Korean, as seen below. The conversation with Mrs. Lee during the class was having an important effect on Jinsu in establishing his identity and Korean culture beyond learning Korean at the KLS.

Extract 8

Mrs. Lee 진수는 미국사람이야? 한국사람이야? [Are you an American or a Korean?]
Jinsu: 음, 한국사람 [Umm. I am a Korean.]
Mrs. Lee: 한국사람이지? 그러니가 한국말을 못하면 안되지. 그리고 친구들하고도 사이좋게 놀아서 싸우지 않고 부모님 말씀도 잘 듣는 그런 진수가 되겠다고 약속했지? [Right. You are a Korean, so you have to learn the Korean language. You promised you will get along with your friends and obey your parents, did you? You should not fight with your friends.]

Extract 9

Teacher: 진수는 언제 엉엉 울어? [When do you cry?]
Jinsu: 몰라 (hesitates to answer) [I don’t know.]
Teacher: 울긴 울지? [You cried before, didn’t you?]
Jinsu: 음 [Yes.]
Teacher: 진수는 엉엉 안 울고 이렇게 눈물만 닦지? [But you wiped your tears, not crying with a loud voice]
Jinsu: 음 [Yes.]
Teacher: 너무 멋있더라. 이제 안 울으러고 그러지? [You looked so nice. You are not crying any more.]
Jinsu: 음 [Yes.]
Teacher: 근데 눈물이 나면 눈을 크게 뜨지? 눈에 힘주고 [If tears are coming, do you open your eyes wide with your effort not to cry?]
Jinsu: 음 [Yes.]

Regarding Jinsu’s reading activity, I observed that Mrs. Lee wrote several sentences for Jinsu to read on the first day of the spring semester in January. She normally used the Korean National Textbook for first graders, but Jinsu took it home during the winter break and did not bring it back. He was struggling with reading the sentences. He mumbled to pronounce each word and repeated some words several times.
Mrs. Lee gave six prompts to help him to finish just one sentence as seen below. He had difficulty with reading numbers, and was confused about how to read ordinal numbers and cardinal numbers in Korean. However, his reading skills improved in three months in March. He read five sentences in a textbook and received only five prompts.

Mrs. Lee: 한번 읽어보자(to Jinsu) [would you read these?]
Jinsu: 나는 한(일) 일학년(녀어) 년이(일학년) 일(녀어) 년이 (일학년)
일학년 도(도 이) 도이 되협습니다. [I became a first grader.]

[I one, one (first) first grade (grade) grader (first grader) first (grade) grader (first grader) first grader be (bec-ame) becaame.]
(Mrs. Lee’s prompts are in parenthesis in bold)

During an observation in April, I found he did not pay attention much to reading, in comparison to other Fridays. Within a minute of starting reading, he stopped his reading to complain the story was too long and difficult for him. The story Mrs. Lee had chosen was one with a moral: people threw trash into the stream, and it began to spoil until fish could not live there, teaching that we should keep our environment clean. The story in the Korean National Textbook had many difficult words and this made him frustrated, and soon he was distracted: he touched his shoestring frequently, sat without proper posture, and screamed occasionally during the reading. In selecting a story, his reading level, interests, and motivation should be considered.

The most remarkable language function in the comprehension checking activity (CC) was the use of simple answering, which was observed 94 times. Simple answers such as “yes,” “no,” or “I don’t know” were classified as a simple response. The reason for using a simple response was varied as seen in COT. The common types of simple response in CC mostly occurred when he hesitated to answer because of uncertainty or
when he did not understand. It also appeared when he did not care about responding because of a lack of attention. This result showed that his comprehension checking was frequently led by the teacher with the teacher’s dominant questions as seen below:

Teacher  냄새 났지? [It smells bad, doesn’t it?]
Jinsu  응 [Yes.]
Teacher  그러니까 고기가 없지? 누가 여기에다 어떻게 한거야? 쓰레기를 버려서 이 강이 깨끗하지못하고했지? 그러니까 고기가 살다가 다 도망갔겠지?
[So there weren’t any fish. What did the people do? They threw away trash and the river was dirty, wasn’t it? So the fish ran away, right?]
Jinsu  응 [Yes.]
Teacher  그러면 이 물을 어떻게 해야 고기가 다시 올 수 있을것 같은가? [how do you think they will come back again?]
Jinsu  fish…
Teacher  그래 그렇게 깨끗하게 해주려면 어떻게 해주어야해? [Right, what do you do to clean water in the river?]
Jinsu  Don’t tray

The teacher was continually leading Jinsu by asking him yes/no questions when he could not answer. From the results in CC, his interrogative language function was 39 times and his responsive function was 66 times. It looked like he was involved in the comprehension activity; however, this meant that Mrs. Lee checked his comprehension by asking him questions which required a simple type of response. Questioning typically consisted of literal questions, and a few inferential and creative questions. Jinsu’s answers were mostly in English, incomplete, and incorrect as seen below:

Teacher  영수가 왜 속이 상했대? [Why was Youngsu so disappointed?]
Jinsu  Um, because of trash.
Teacher: 응. 그러면 어떻게 해 주어야 할까요? [Yes, What should we do?]

Jinsu: Keep lake... ocean and...

Teacher: 아니, 이 강물이 더러워서 냄새나고 그래서 물고기가 이사가고 그렇게 하니까 이 강물을 어떻게.. [The fish were gone because of the bad smell and dirty water, what we should do to help...]

Jinsu: Because no fish.

Teacher: 그러니까, 바다에 어떻게 해야겠어요? [Thus what we should do?]

Jinsu: (No answer)

His code switching was used 91 times, which was the highest rate in the KLS setting. He used code switching frequently during the conversation with Mrs. Lee, except when he answered with simple responses “yes”/ “no”/ “I don’t know.” There were several reasons for mixing Korean and English based on the data. First, code switching was used when he could not explain the question in Korean. As seen in the example below, he did not understand what he read and would answer in English. When Mrs. Lee asked Jinsu to use only Korean, he tried to use Korean. He mumbled and did not remember the details, but understood the main topics:

Teacher: 그런데 이건 무슨말이야? [Do you know what the story is about?]

Jinsu: 아직도 몰라 [I still don’t know.]

Teacher: 읽기는 읽었는데 잘 몰라? [You don’t know even though you already read it, do you?]

Teacher: 선생님이 한번 읽어 볼래니까 무슨 뜻인지 잘 알아야 해야해. [I will read the story for you. Tell me the story after I read aloud] (Teacher begins to read the story.)

Jinsu: It’s about... It will be...

Teacher: 한국말로 한번 해봐 무슨말이야? [Would you tell me in Korean?]
Jinsu  나나친구응착하고또응또학교도가고응그게응그게다야[I, I, friend, umm, they are kind, and, umm, and go to school, umm, that’s, umm that’s all.]

Second, Jinsu used English when he wanted to confirm the meaning of the vocabulary which he already knew in Korean. Jinsu could read the word ‘friend’ in Korean, but he answered in English when Mrs. Lee asked the meaning of ‘friend’. In this case, code mixing was used to confirm what he already knew, not because of not knowing or not finding proper vocabularies.

Teacher  요거는 누굴까(teacher is checking his vocabulary)[What is this?]
Jinsu  친구들 [friends]
Teacher  ‘친구’가 누구인지 알지? [Do you know the meaning of ‘친구/chingu’?]?
Jinsu  Friends
Teacher  이건 뭘까? [What is this then?]
Jinsu  일학교. (He pronounced wrong) [first school]
Teacher  일학년. (Teacher corrects his mispronunciation) [first grade]
‘일학년’이뭐지? [What is ‘일학년/ilhakhyon’?]
Jinsu  First grade.

Third, when Jinsu described a long sentence, he used code switching. When Mrs. Lee talked to him, he answered in Korean first, but he answered in code switching for the long sentence. He started but, I, and here in Korean, tried them again in English, mixed I in Korean and the verb studied in English, and then added 썼어 (past verb) [did] in Korean at the end of ‘studied’:

Teacher  어디한번보자 [Let me see.]
Jinsu 근데 나가 먹었어. 나 어제 먹었는데, 나 여기서 했는데[I forgot to do my homework. I forgot it yesterday, but I did it today here.]
Teacher 뭐 먹었어? [What did you forget to do?]
Jinsu 아 근데 homework.[ That’s homework.]
Teacher homework 까먹었어? [Did you forget doing your homework?]
Jinsu 근데 나 어제 when I just got here 나 studied 했어[But I did it here when I just got here I studied]
Teacher (웃으며) 어디 한 번봐.(laughing) [Let me see.]

Generally in the CC activity, the evidence of his lack of Korean skills could be found in other language functions such as the use of incomplete sentences (20 times), grammatically wrong sentences (eight times), and repetition (11 times). He could not answer with a complete sentence, and Mrs. Lee had to help him to complete sentences continually. He missed subject auxiliary words (postpositional word), and used the repetition function to make self-corrections (the word or sentence) by asking and answering repeatedly.

The language function seen in the vocabulary activity (VC) was similar to that of CC. His responsive, simple responsive, and code switching functions were high although the frequency was lower than CC. The data from VC exposed the importance of prior knowledge in vocabulary and comprehension development. For example, when Jinsu was learning a new word, 외양간, which means a “barn,” he had difficulty understanding it. The word was new to him with no experience of hearing it or seeing the object. The teacher asked him to pronounce the word and checked its meaning repeatedly, but he still was confused by the new word. If Mrs. Lee introduced a new vocabulary word using a
picture, computer, or a context before reading to connect it to his existent knowledge, this would help him to understand a new word well.

English was used to check his Korean vocabulary as seen below. Mrs. Lee asked the meaning of new words, and Jinsu answered in English. If he knew the meaning of the word in English, she moved on the next word.

Teacher: 토끼는 영어로 뭐야? 토끼 뜻 알아? [What is ‘토끼-rabbit’ in English? Do you know the meaning of ‘토끼-rabbit’?]
Jinsu: 응. Rabbit. [Yes]
Teacher: 거북이.[turtle]
Jinsu: turtle.
Teacher: 경주. [race]
Jinsu: race.
Teacher: 앞서가다. [go front]
Jinsu: that means front or ahead.

Writing at the KLS was not creative writing, but copying the textbook. After tutoring Jinsu, Mrs. Lee usually asked him to copy the textbook that he read, and Jinsu liked it. His home work was also to copy one page of a worksheet. His handwriting was good and clear. Mrs. Lee stated that his handwriting had improved a lot:

Jinsu could not even grab a pencil and draw a line when he came to the KLS last year. I was so surprised. At that age, he would be able to grab pencils and draw lines. Comparing to last year, his handwriting is much better.

Dictation was focused on words, one or two in combination, not sentences. Jinsu liked dictation in Korean as well as in English. One of Jinsu’s notable habits during
dictation was to ask again to confirm a teacher’s dictation before he began to write it as seen in below:

Teacher  소와 양 [cow and sheep]  
Jinsu  양? [sheep?]  
Teacher  응. 호랑이와 사자 [Yes. tiger and lion]  
Jinsu  와? [and?]  
Teacher  응. 와. 뭐라고 그랬어? [Yes, and. What was the next?]  
Jinsu  사자? [lion?]  
Teacher  그렇지. 사자. 잘썼다 [Yes, lion. You did a good job.]

Social processing at the Korean Language School.

Mrs. Lee’s instruction was focused on one-on-one tutoring, as a result social processing between peers at the KLS setting was minimal. As shown in Table 11, only one collaborative and one sharing process were counted.

Table 11

Frequency of social processing in the KLS Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Processing</th>
<th>KLS</th>
<th>COG</th>
<th>COY</th>
<th>COT</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the first day of the KLS class, Jinsu brought a new pencil case that someone had given him as a present from Korea. There was a pinball game board on the cover of the pencil case. Jinsu and Yong played the game collaboratively. When Yong lost the
game he encouraged her that she could do better if she practiced more. This showed that they had a good relationship:

Jinsu   I will play pinball. Ready set, go, (They are giggling playing game)
Yong    I’m really bad.
Jinsu   That’s all right. Take time to practice. Sometimes I’m bad too.
Yong    You are? me the far…(inaudible)
Jinsu   Sometimes…Sometimes I can do it.
Yong    I won the one. I mean three. My brother have soccer one. I’m really bad.

Home setting.

Jinsu was studying math and Korean regularly during weekdays with workbooks brought from Korea. Korean books are divided into several different levels and they consist of questions and simple answers (e.g. What is Minsu doing? Where do you go to buy bread?). During weekends, Jinsu watched TV, went to a movie, and played with his friends instead of studying at home, his father said. The interview with Jinsu’s parents was conducted in September of 2010 after the fall semester began. Jinsu’s father stated Jinsu’s daily schedule:

Jinsu came home at three. He did his homework from three to five. After finishing homework, he studied math and Korean. He solved the math problems, five pages a day, with a book that his mother brought from Korea. Then he finished three to five pages of a Korean language book. He read the questions and wrote the answers.
**Language functions at home.**

The home setting was classified into four sections: Korean studying with parents, Korean studying with father, English dictation with father, and English studying with father. His language function at home is shown in Table 12. Social processing at home was not counted.

Table 12

*Frequency of Language Functions at the Home Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Language Functions</th>
<th>KP</th>
<th>KF</th>
<th>EDF</th>
<th>EF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgmental Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomplete sentences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong sentence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple responsive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language habit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitate (refuse)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code switching</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Korean studying with parents was audio taped by Jinsu’s father. He was studying Korean with his father, and his mother was involved in the conversation occasionally. The frequency of interrogative, simple responsive and code switching was high when studying Korean with his parents. The data showed that Jinsu had a good relationship with his parents. He continually talked, imitated animal sounds, laughed, joked, and asked questions to his mother and father. Questions to his mother were especially diverse. He asked the meanings of unknown Korean words (“What is ‘chamsae’?”), which means ‘sparrow’), English words that he learned from school (“What is ground hog?”), and other information (“What does duck eat?”). His parents willingly answered his questions and supported his learning in many ways. His mother corrected his mispronunciation and his father asked him to bring English word cards from school and tested his dictation after giving him a few minutes to review and practice them. His father also checked a new English word from the dictionary or computer when he encountered unknown information or had no idea about the question as seen below:

Father  그래 새.새가 뭐지? [All right. A bird. What is a bird?]
Jinsu  Bird
Father  음. bird 중에 참새라는 새가 있다 [Sparrow is one of the birds]
Jinsu  H:What does it 참새[sparrow] like?
Father  쪽 siden 쪽[len][tweet, tweet]
Jinsu  아 [Aha]
While studying with his father, Jinsu’s frequency of code switching was high. There were several different situations for the use of code switching. First, English was used to check his understanding of Korean words as seen in the KLS setting. When his father checked the meaning of a Korean word, he asked Jinsu to answer in an English word. Jinsu also answered in English instead of describing the new word in Korean.

Second, Jinsu chose English when he explained something long. Third, while Jinsu was explaining in English, even though his preference was English, he reversed to Korean for
further explanation. When he could not explain in English, he tried to speak in Korean to let his father understand what he knew about the subject. The data showed that Jinsu’s father never asked him to speak only Korean at home. He seemed to not care about Jinsu’s choice, while he was teaching him Korean, frequently he himself mixed English in a Korean sentence.

Jinsu’s father used the *Korean National Textbook Grade 1* when he helped Jinsu study Korean. He also used workbooks his mother brought from Korea, which consisted of isolated skilled practice. Jinsu’s *Korean studying with his father* was: 1) to copy the letters on the worksheet and then make a complete word by filling in the letter in the circled area, 2) to practice Korean letters by singing them like an English alphabet song, 3) to read aloud the *Korean National Textbook Grade 1*, which he reviewed from the Korean Language School, 4) to memorize basic concepts such as numbers, seasons, and days, and 5) to review basic grammar rules and words of foreign origin such as *cake*, *computer*, and *television*.

Jinsu’s father helped him to improve his Korean by correcting his mispronunciation and applying reading strategies such as connecting his background knowledge to the new vocabulary and playing word games such as making a new word by altering the first letter. He also helped Jinsu to review letters, numbers, and days with a chart on the wall whenever Jinsu made a mistake.

Jinsu stated that he visited the public and university libraries often with his parents and checked out books. *English studying with his father* was mainly reading aloud books from the local library. He read the second and third level books with fluency and emotion. While studying English, his father’s main role was to correct his
Jinsu enjoyed *English dictation with his father*. He finished his dictation within a few minutes and received a perfect score. His school report showed that his spelling test was an A+. Responsive language function was the highest during the English dictation activity. The reason for this was the same as the Korean dictation; he repeated a word to confirm.

Jinsu and his father’s relationship was close, and Jinsu liked time with his father. While they were practicing ‘subject +object+adverb+verb’ patterns, his father described the meaning of ‘pretty’ with an example. The example below shows how Jinsu loved his father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>이연필이 아름다워? [Do you think this pencil is pretty?]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>(고개를 가로젓는다) (shaking his head) [No]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>그러면? [Then, what is pretty?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>우리가 [We are.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>우리가 아름다워? [Do you think we are pretty?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinsu</td>
<td>응 (작은 목소리로) [Yes.] (in a low voice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factors that Impact a Korean Child’s Literacy Learning in English**

By looking at the result of data from all these different settings, the following themes emerged from the analysis. Factors impacting a Korean child’s literacy learning in English were motivation, mass media, peer relationship, background knowledge, small group activity, teaching methods, Korean cultural background, and Korean ability.
**Motivation.**

Jinsu’s behaviors during the writing activity showed his continuous oral interaction with the teacher and his peers. This showed that motivation was one of the important elements to help him to be involved in the class activity. Mrs. April helped Jinsu to be motivated so that he would make his own story and book. Jinsu asked questions, shared his experience, and discussed his ideas about his story.

However, during the reading aloud activity, Jinsu lost interest when Mrs. April read aloud Dr. Seuss’s rhyming book. Jinsu was in a kindergarten and first grade combined class, and the story read was a lower level than his actual reading level. Instead of participating in the activity, Jinsu played with a rubber band. I was curious as to why he did not pay attention during the activity and asked him later if he liked the book or not. He answered that he had read the book before several times, and it was boring and not interesting. The few language functions revealed that choice of a book, considering his reading level and interests, was an important element influencing his motivation.

In the KLS and home setting, it was observed that Jinsu was excited and felt proud of himself when he got praise or a reward from Mrs. Lee and his father. Mrs. Lee was effective in cheering him up and encouraging him. She hugged him and patted his shoulder saying “You are so nice,” “You did a good job,” and “You are improving a lot, you can catch Yong soon.” One of the benefits of the one-on-one tutoring in the KLS was more opportunity for praising him.

Jinsu’s father also encouraged him to be motivated when teaching him how to count numbers in Korean using the chart on the wall. Jinsu liked to check the recording minutes on the video camera during Korean study. He counted the numbers in English
initially, then he counted them in Korean after he practiced with his father. Jinsu laughed with satisfaction and hummed a fanfare in a joyful voice. Jinsu’s father also offered Jinsu one of his favorite things to motivate learning. He suggested to Jinsu that they would go to see Jinsu’s favorite movie after studying. Jinsu was excited and was singing and shouting with joy during the study. Mrs. April’s book project motivated Jinsu to write his own story by helping him to find the problems, solutions, and patterns of the story. In addition, Mrs. Lee’s and his father’s praise and reward motivated him to do his work actively; on the other hand, the lower level book did not help him to be motivated.

**Mass media.**

The experiential language function, how many times he expressed his personal experiences, showed the highest rate (22 times) in the Draw box activity. Information and indirect experience he gained through mass media was used as a teaching example during the Korean study with his father (Extract 10) and was a topic he shared during a conversation with his peers (Extract 11).

Jinsu’s father was teaching him a new word *beautiful* [아름답게], in Korean. He reminded Jinsu of the movie they saw together, applied a question regarding colors, and helped him to understand the meaning of the word in Korean.

**Extract 10**

**Father**  어제 *Avatar* 봤지? 어제 *Avatar*의 flower 하고…[Did you see *Avatar* yesterday? *Flower* in *Avatar*…yesterday]

**Jinsu**  응. [Yes.]

**Father**  insect 들이 어땠어? [How were the insects?]

**Jinsu**  응? [Huh?]

**Father**  색깔들이, color 들이 어땠어? [How was the color, *color*?]
Jinsu Beautiful
Father Beautiful 하지. Beautiful 이 한국말로 뭐라고? [It was beautiful. What is beautiful in Korean?]
Jinsu 응—예쁘..아름답게 [Umm, pre… beautiful]

As seen in the example below, Jinsu was talking about a part of mass media with his peer. During the draw box activity, Jinsu asked his partner again if he had seen “iCarly,” and his partner answered “Yeah, its’ funny.” Jinsu continually asked Mark if he had seen the commercial on PBS Kids. A large part of their conversation consisted of the topic related to the source from mass media. A similar case was also found in the conversation with Yong in the KLS. Jinsu asked Yong if she had seen the commercial about ‘squirrel, squirrel’ and they continued their conversation about it in the KLS (Extract 11).

Extract 11
Jinsu Have you seen the part where the guy said “Can you just please be my girlfriend” Do you remember when some kind of guy said that?
Mark Yeah.
Jinsu Yeah I know. Then she said NO! And then he asked her again and she said NO, NO, why do I have to say this all over again. NO, NO, NO, NO, NO (laughs) (Boys continue to play)

Below is another example of how he acquired new idioms (slangs) from mass media. Jinsu and his father were talking about their Saturday schedule attending the soccer practice. He used a word “darnit” which he heard from TV, but his father did not understand the meaning of it. He learned “darnit” and “oh, man” from mass media or his peers and used them in his daily conversation. These new idioms appeared to affect his oral language.
Father: 우리는 내일 가자.[Let’s go tomorrow].

Jinsu: Oh, yeah. Man~. Darnit (주먹 쥐고 한번 우싸한 후에 피식 웃는다) (He grabs his fist triumphantly and smiles)


Jinsu: It's kind of a bad word. Oh, man (주먹 쥐고 한번 더 우싸한다) (He grabs his fist again)

Father: 친구들이 ‘Oh, man’ 하나? [Does your friend say ‘Oh, man’?]

Jinsu: 응 [Yes.]

Father: 누가 그러냐? [Who said that?]

Jinsu: Just heard from TV

In an interview with Mrs. April, she stated that watching television might be a method for ELLs to improve their English skills by providing ELLs the opportunity to learn the language and understand the culture of a new society.

**Peer relationship (small group activity).**

Among all activities at the three settings; school, KLS, and home, the draw box activity (a pair group play) showed the most active language function and social processing. Jinsu’s frequency of language function was diverse including reasoning (12), evaluative (6), organizational (5), and experiential (22) language functions. Also, his frequency of social processing in a pair group activity was remarkably higher than any other activities at the school setting.

Jinsu’s first DB activity was playing Lego games with Mark. Jinsu never stopped talking during the activity. He shared the information he acquired from mass media, took a role in a pretend play, and shared his item with his peers. Sometimes he argued for possession for the co-owned items; however, soon he solved the problem and shared the
item with his peers again. During math time, Jinsu not only asked Tom to help with what he did not understand on the worksheet, but also helped him by sharing his crayons and ruler with him. He solved the problem and built a collaborative friendship through the interactions with his peer.

This showed how Jinsu’s oral interaction and collaborative behavior was dynamic through peer interaction. He applied various strategies during the activity: how to lead the task, cooperate with others, set rules for their toys, and share his new ideas. The data showed that Jinsu’s prior knowledge and experience provided a resource for language learning and knowledge construction. This also provided opportunities for self-regulation when they made their own rules and shared their toys in accordance with the rules. Jinsu and his peer learned the goal of the activity and used creative thinking while joining the peer group activity. The findings from the DB activity allied with Vygotsky’s theory that learning occurs through cooperation in a variety of social interactions and then through the child’s culture such as language, play, and models.

Comparing Jinsu’s English ability at the school and Korean ability at the KLS and home, revealed a gap between his English skills and Korean skills. The data showed that his exposure to English at school with his peers and teacher was increasing compared to his exposure to Korean. When I interviewed Jinsu, he told me his preference was English, and he wanted to conduct the interview in English. Mrs. April also stated that he had no problem in listening, speaking, reading, and writing English at school and wondered how come he could learn English within a short period. On the other hand, his Korean ability showed slow progress. His frequent use of “ums” and “chokum” (meaning of a little bit), long pauses, and hesitation indicated his lack of competence in Korean. Even though he
was exposed to Korean when he was young, his English skills were much more
developed after he entered the school system. This showed that social interaction with
peers at school and people other than his parents greatly impacted his language learning.

**Instructional methods.**

When I compared Jinsu’s response rate in each setting, the highest frequency was
shown in the *group reading activity* (20 times) in the school setting, *comprehension
checking* (66 times) in the KLS setting, and *Korean study with his father* (255 times) in
the home setting. The high frequency of responsive language function in each activity
was related to the teacher’s instructional methods. In the school setting, the group reading
activity consisted of a small group with six students of an intermediate reading level,
where Jinsu had more opportunity to answer the teacher’s questions. Mrs. April’s
teaching strategy focused on comprehension. Although the activity was teacher-centered,
she led the students to make predictions before and during reading and continually
checked comprehension by asking questions about the story. The questions were literal,
inferential, and creative, and Jinsu’s response was dynamic.

Mrs. April also used a variety of teaching strategies. She applied the new
knowledge to the block-building work that Jinsu had completed. During the draw box
activity, she brought a mirror and taught Jinsu how to apply the concept of ‘symmetry’ to
his work. Instead of explaining the meaning of ‘symmetry’ orally, she showed an
example using his own work which helped him to understand the new word. This was a
good example of how he was learning not only social skills, but also new knowledge and
its application through playing and peer group activity.
Teacher (handing Jinsu a mirror) Use the mirror to test your line of symmetry. Do you know where the line of symmetry is? Do you have the design, Jinsu?

Jinsu Yeah.

Teacher Where is the line of symmetry?

Jinsu Here

Teacher Okay. You can test it. Look on the side. Is it the same?

Jinsu (Jinsu looks at the reflection) Yeah.

Teacher What about this way? Is it the same?

Jinsu No.

Teacher You can use that. Okay?

Mrs. Lee’s comprehension checking also included strategies such as asking questions and retelling the story; however, the difference between the school setting and the KLS setting was the type of questions used. Mrs. Lee’s questions were mainly literal questions and led Jinsu to answer in a simple response as shown below. The frequency of simple responsive (94 times) language function was considerably higher than that of the normal responsive (66 times) language function. Jinsu’s simple responses were “yes,” “no,” and “I don’t know” during the comprehension check in the KLS. This may be the result of Jinsu’s limited Korean language skills and the teacher’s role.

Teacher 영수가 왜 속이 상했대? [Why was Yeongsu upset?]

Jinsu Um, because of trash.

Teacher 응. 그러면 어떻게 해 주어야 할까요? [Yes, then what do we have to do?]

Jinsu Keep lake…ocean and…

Teacher 그러니까, 바다에 [so, at the sea…]

Jinsu (No response)

Teacher 여기 쳐다봐. 냄새 난지? [Pay attention. It smelled bad, didn’t it?]
Teacher: 그리고 고기들이 없지? 누가 여기에다 어떻게 한거야? 사람들이 쓰레기 버리고 그러니 고기들이 살다가 다 도망갔겠지? [So the fish were gone. Who did that? Everybody threw the trash, and the fish couldn’t survive and disappeared, right?]

Jinsu: 응. [Yes.]

Teacher: 다른데로 깨끗한 곳 찾아 갔겠지? 진수가 더러운 곳에 있으면 싫어하고 깨끗한 곳으로 나와서 깨끗한 공기마시잖아. [The fish have moved to the other place. If you are in the dirty place, you will come out for the fresh air. Won’t you?]

Jinsu: 응. [Yes.]

In the example above, the teacher began to ask “what/why” type of questions to check Jinsu’s comprehension. Jinsu answered in English, but soon he was struggling to describe details in a complete sentence because of his lack of the Korean language. Also, he had difficulty understanding the whole story. Thus the teacher changed her questions from “yes/no” types of questions to “what/why” types of questions. As a result, the frequency of “yes/no” questions was higher than “what/why” questions. She noticed Jinsu could not answer in Korean fully and led him to respond with a simple answer. Even though it will be hard at first, giving him a chance to tell his own opinion and use long descriptive sentences should be considered. On the other hand, there was no comprehension activity in study with his father at home. Studying Korean at home was based on the completion of worksheets, and there was no activity reading a Korean literature book.

There was a big difference in writing activity between the school setting and the KLS and home settings. Writing activity at school was observed once. Mrs. April
modeled how to create a story. Main elements of making a good story that included problem solving, a plot, and a story pattern helped these students to brainstorm their own story. Jinsu was motivated by the book making project and interested in making a story. Writing activity at the KLS was copying the textbook to review what Jinsu learned during the day or dictating vocabulary words. Jinsu’s writing activity at home was working on the worksheet which consisted of filling the letters or words in the empty spaces, circling right answers, and matching the correct sentence.

**Background Knowledge/ Korean cultural background.**

Jinsu’s experiential language function appeared high during the draw box, DLR/DMP, and art activities in the school setting. When he had an experience of planting bulbs relating to the math problem, he shared his planting experience, how his flower was tall and big, with his teacher and peers. During the art activity, several students were having a discussion about Cleopatra with the teacher while they were doing their own work. Hearing the topic of Cleopatra, Jinsu quickly joined the discussion and shared his background knowledge about Cleopatra. On the contrary, he had difficulty understanding when he encountered words for which he had no cultural background knowledge, such as Korean traditional tools that he is not familiar with.

During the study with his father, Jinsu encountered a new word “chikey”[ a kind of carrier used in old days in Korea] and his father tried to clarify it in many ways: explaining the meaning orally, drawing, looking for a definition from a dictionary, and finding a picture on the computer. However, Jinsu still did not catch the meaning of “chikey” clearly. Learning a new vocabulary word without any prior knowledge,
especially related to Korean tradition was hard for Jinsu, because he had no chance to
experience it, “chikey.”

Father 이거 한번 읽어보세요.[Read this word.]
Jinsu 지케? (‘chikhey’)?[carrier]
Father 지게 (‘chikey’)
Jinsu I though it is 지케 (‘chikhey’).
Father 지케 아니고 지게인데.[ It’s not ‘chikhey’, but ‘chikey’.] 지게는 이렇게 매는건데 나무 있잖아, 그걸 이렇게이렇게 매는거야.
한국사람들, 옛날, 지금도 하지. 그런데. [‘chikey’ is a kind of carrier
made of wood and people load it like this. In the old days, Korean
people, still they are using it…]
Jinsu I don’t know.
Father 아빠가 그림 그려줘 볼께.(He is drawing and explaining it)
[I will draw it for you.]
Jinsu 아하~(이해가 된다는 듯이) [Ahna~](He seems to understand it.)
Father 그러니까 backpack 하고 [It’s like a backpack…]
Jinsu It’s like um flat and stick out and there like keep that end?
Father (He is looking for a di ctionay) ‘chikey’, frame, carrier
Jinsu frame carrier? (He still did not understand it)
Father 아빠가 컴퓨터로 보여줭게 [I will show a picture using a computer]
Jinsu 응 [Yes.]
Father 이렇게( He is showing the picture of ‘chikey’)
Jinsu I still don’t get it. It looks weird.
Father Looks weird 하다고? [It looks weird?]
Jinsu 응.[Yes.] I need.. I need to see a real.

Difficulty in understanding the Korean culture-related words was also observed in
the KLS setting. Jinsu was reading a story about a boy who lived with a cow and rabbits
in a rural area, and the KLS teacher was teaching new vocabularies relating to farming in
Korea. Jinsu had no experience living in the rural area in Korea, and he had difficulty understanding unfamiliar words. The teacher taught him ‘oyyangkan’ (meaning a barn) and checked its pronunciation and meaning four times, but he could hardly pronounce it and did not understand what it meant.

One of the benefits of the KLS setting was the close relationship between Jinsu and his teacher, Mrs. Lee. The KLS setting, unlike the school setting, was based on one-on-one tutoring, and Mrs. Lee had more time to communicate with Jinsu than Mrs. April. Mrs. Lee connected the textbook to Jinsu’s own experience which is related to his cultural background: talking about his hometown in Korea, comparing different cultures and environments between Korea and America, and sharing his visiting experience in Korea. She tried to share new information about his traditional culture and helped him to retrieve his old memories about Korea.

Mrs. Lee’s teaching was reflective of traditional Korean values and educational expectations for Korean children. Particularly, the first day’s lesson in the KLS showed that her teaching was based on the Korean moral values from Confucianism: “I will start with a fresh and happy mind. I will study Korean hard, get along well with my friends, and obey my parents and teachers.” Unlike the school teacher, she also emphasized the importance of keeping his identity: “You have to learn Korean, because you are Korean.” Mrs. Lee also talked often about Korea: unique places to visit in Korea that are hardly found in America, the beauty of Korea, and delicious Korean food. Jinsu listened to her talk curiously and nodded that he was Korean.

Jinsu encountered the new culture and language seriously after he entered the school system in the United States. With this change in his environment, he was adjusting
to new situations, and the process of adaptation and a forfeit in his first language and culture occurred. For example, Jinsu had two names. His Korean name, Jinsu, was used at home, in the church, and the KLS. His English name, David, was used at Springhill Elementary school. When I asked his preference between the English name and the Korean name, he answered he liked both; however, he asked me to call him by his English name at school when I visited his class, because his friends did not know his Korean name.

The use of honorific words is uniquely Korean. In English, the honorific is not used commonly and developed. He did not realize the necessity of using honorific words in Korean. Although Jinsu could judge whom and where he should use Korean honorific words, his frequency of the use of honorific words was few in both the KLS and home settings. He used honorific words with his pastor formally, but not with the KLS teacher, his parents, or me. Even though he was learning the value of the Korean culture and identity in the KLS setting, the culture of the American society influenced his thinking and social attitude. As a result, Jinsu was likely to adapt to the culture of mainstream society. However, he was still keeping Korean titles such as “umma” [mama], “appa” [papa], “nuna” [sister], “seonsayng-nim” [teacher].

Jinsu and Yong are in the beginner level of the KLS, and their preference in language was English. They spoke only in English between each other. Young was three years older than Jinsu, and her English name was Anna. When Jinsu spoke English to Yong he called her Anna; however, when he spoke Korean, although this was not frequent, he called her Yong-‘nuna’ [Yong-honorific suffix]. In Korean culture, using one’s first name without adding the proper honorific suffix, when that person is older
than oneself, is considered extremely rude. Jinsu followed the Korean cultural way of naming by adding the honorific suffix when he spoke her name and the KLS teacher’s name. Jinsu called Yong “Yong-nuna” (Yong+honorific suffix). The meaning of “nuna” is sister. He also called the KLS teacher “seonsayng-nim” (teacher+ honorific suffix), instead of calling her Mrs. Lee. This showed that Jinsu’s language is still affected by Korean culture, although his Korean lacked fluency and the use of honorific words.

**English and Korean and its relationship.**

**Jinsu’s English development.**

Jinsu’s language of preference was English. When I interviewed Jinsu in June, he asked me if he could do it in English, and the interview was conducted in English. When I asked him “What is your preferential language?” his answer was “more like English.” Jinsu’s English reading level at school was 2.2 according to his 4th grading period report card. The results of the informal reading passages estimated his reading levels for both independent and instructional-reading at grade 2. Both results revealed his reading level was above his grade level. From the interview in March, his school teacher, Mrs. April said that he had no trouble at all with his English skills at school. When comparing Jinsu’s four language arts skills (writing, speaking reading and listening), she answered that his reading and writing abilities were good. His reading was not so strong at the beginning of the year, but he made a lot of improvement during the semester. His listening ability seemed to be less sufficient compared to reading and writing, however he seemed equally comfortable with them. She described the methods for ELLs to improve their English skills:
Speaking English to the other children is so important because…They play together, share idea, and listen. I think when kids get together talking is how they pick it up faster. It seems that talking and reading and television will know to extend because the television helps to learn not only hearing the language but also culture.

**Jinsu’s Korean language development.**

Jinsu had studied at the KLS for one and half years (three semesters). In the interview with the KLS teacher, Mrs. Lee stated that in Jinsu’s first semester at the KLS, Jinsu did not pay attention to studying and went to the bathroom frequently. He could not write any letters because he did not grasp his pencil firmly. However, his Korean skills showed progress in three semesters, between before and after the winter break.

My first observation of the KLS began in January right after the winter break. Mrs. Lee mentioned that Jinsu did not master the Korean alphabet and could not read a sentence before the winter break. However, on the first day of the spring semester, I found that he mastered the Korean alphabet and could read a sentence word-to-word, even though his reading was slow, he repeated the same words, and needed the teacher’s prompts. He enjoyed copying what he learned, and his hand writing was clear and good.

There were differences in the language functions between the school setting, the KLS, and home settings. Incomplete sentences, wrong sentences, simple responses, language habits, and hesitation were found at the KLS and home settings, but not in the school setting. This could explain why his Korean language ability was behind compared to his English ability at the KLS and home setting.
Jinsu’s sentences were not frequently complete and some sentences sounded awkward with language habits such as “진짜” [really], “쪼금” [a little bit], and “그거” (no special meaning like umm) at the KLS and home settings. He added a word which had no specific meaning to his speaking when it was hard to choose proper words or he wanted to emphasize what he was saying. Generally he understood what the teacher and his father were asking and talking about, but his answer in a simple response and incomplete sentences showed his struggles in Korean. In an interview with Jinsu’s mother, she described Jinsu’s Korean at home:

We use Korean at home, but because Jinsu likes to speak in English, we pretend we do not understand and answer back when he speaks in English to us. Jinsu, then, becomes frustrated and tries his best to speak in Korean. He knows (understands) he needs to speak in formal language when he meets a Korean adult. When he meets new Korean friends, he first speaks Korean. However, when he has much to say or if the friend is fluent in English, he starts to talk in English. He uses English with his closest Korean friends.

Mrs. April thought that learning Korean helped Jinsu to learn English, because the more he learns Korean vocabulary, the more it will assist him to express himself in English. Jinsu’s mother wanted him to speak Korean fluently. She hopes, one day, he will be capable to read, speak, and write fluent Korean. As a bilingual, she thought, he will have better opportunities in the American society.
**Relationship of English and Korean.**

The greatest frequency of the language functions at home and the KLS setting was the use of code switching. During Korean studying at home, Jinsu asked a question and answered in English, and even his father spoke using code switching. There were several reasons for the use of English. First, English was used to check his Korean vocabulary. Jinsu’s father asked him to answer in English when he checked new Korean words (Extract 12) Second, when Jinsu’s father asked the meaning of a new Korean word, Jinsu answered in English instead of describing it in Korean (Extract 13). Third, Jinsu used English when he explained something using a long sentence. His father asked a question in Korean, and Jinsu answered with a simple answer [Yes] in Korean; however, when he shared the details of content, he switched to English (Extract 14).

**Extract 12**

Father: 우리는 영어로 뭐야? [What is “wuli” in English?]
Jinsu: us?
Father: 응. [Yes].
Father: 세탁기는 영어로 뭐야? [What is “Setaki” in English?]
Father: 그렇자.[Right.]

**Extract 13**

Father: 새가 뭐지? [What is “sae”?]
Jinsu: Bird.
Father: 응. [Yes].

**Extract 14**

Jinsu: (He reads the text) The platypus is hungry. She scoops up a mouthful of bugs and worms.
Father: 아, bugs and worm 먹나? [Oh, Does she eat bugs and worm?]
Jinsu: 응, I knew some of them ate bugs. Some of them ate fish, I think.
Father: Fish?

Jinsu switched Korean to English, but he also switched English to Korean for further explanation in English. He tried to talk in Korean to let his father know that he knew about the subject. Jinsu spoke English only in the school setting and in conversation with peers at the KLS setting, but codes switching occurred commonly in conversation with teachers and parents at both settings. Shin (2005) stated that children’s language competence and preference seem to be one of the biggest factors that influence the amount of code switching. Jinsu’s code switching appeared often. During CC, the frequency rate of code switching was 91 times, 33 times in COT, and 34 times in VC (Table 10). The teacher asked him continually to speak in Korean at the KLS class, but Jinsu mixed English and Korean.

Mrs. Lee: 이거 읽었지? 그거를선생님한테 한번 이야기 해봐.[Did you read the story? Then would you tell me the story?]
Jinsu: 그거, 토끼가 race 했는데.[I mean, the rabbit did a race, and…]
Mrs. Lee: 누구랑 했어? [With whom did he race?]
Jinsu: 그거 거북이랑. 그거 토끼랑 race 했는데[I mean, with the turtle. I mean, did the race with the rabbit and…]
Mrs. Lee: race 가 뭐지? [What is a race?]
Jinsu: (After thinking a little while) 경-주 [race]
Mrs. Lee: 경주를 했지? [Did they race?]
Jinsu: 응 [Yes.] (It was not a honorific word)

Mrs. Lee asked Jinsu to read the story of “The Tortoise and the Hare” and checked his comprehension after reading. He did not use completed sentences. His
sentences were finished with ‘and’ without completing the sentence. When Mrs. Lee asked him to tell the story, Jinsu mixed an English word in a sentence. Mrs. Lee asked the meaning of race in Korean, and he answered, but it took longer than a second for him to retrieve the word. This showed that sometimes English words were retrieved before the corresponding Korean words. Code switching used in this case was when he had difficulty finding a proper Korean word.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine a first grade Korean child’s oral language interactions with teachers, peers, parents, and community members and to investigate how a child’s oral language impacts his literacy learning in English. The data were collected from different settings, the school, the Korean Language School, and the home. The results of data analyses showed that social interaction between the child and his teachers, parents, and peers played a role in his language and literacy development. From the analysis of the data, the following results emerged as essential elements of the first grade Korean student’s literacy development in English: motivation, mass media, peer relationship, teaching methods, background knowledge/ Korean cultural background, and Korean language ability.

The child was motivated when a challenging book which considered his reading level and interest was provided. The teacher’s good modeling, effective praise, and small group activities helped the child to be motivated, and were important elements to influence his literacy learning. Mass media provided him the opportunity to learn new vocabulary words and understand the culture of a new society. New information and new
words he gained from mass media were shared with his peers during the pair group
activity, and he applied his new knowledge to play.

During the small group activity, the child had more chance to share his opinions,
and oral interaction and collaborative behavior was active. This supports Vygotsky’
theory that learning occurs through social interactions in cooperated groups. His
interaction with peers at school affected his language learning. Connecting the text to the
child’s cultural background knowledge was a good way to improve his comprehension
skills. The Korean vocabulary also helped the child’s understanding of concepts, content,
and vocabulary in English.
CHAPTER VI: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The American educational system is undergoing a significant change with an increasing number of students from diverse backgrounds. When students are engaged in meaningful interaction in a language, they have the opportunity to develop their language and literacy skills. Teachers and parents can think of themselves as facilitators of language and literacy development. This single case study examined the outcomes of how ELLs’ social interaction through conversation within the school, the KLS, and home setting impacts a child’s learning.

This chapter includes the purpose of this study with the restatement of the research question which guided this study. Also, a description of the participant and procedures of data analysis will be addressed, as well as the conclusions, summary of results, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and a final summary will be shared.

Summary of the Study

Purpose

The main goal of this paper has been to investigate the nature of students’ social interaction, particularly oral interaction in different learning settings, and how social interaction through oral conversation contributed to a child’s literacy in English. This
study focused on the influence of oral interaction of a first grade Korean student. The following research question guided the investigation of this study:

How do oral language interactions at school, home, and in the community impact a first grade Korean child’s literacy learning in English?

**Participant**

This research is a qualitative single case study. A Korean boy, named Jinsu, was selected as the participant of the study. Jinsu’s parents moved from Korea to America to study in their late twenties, and Jinsu was born in the United States. Jinsu used Korean only at home until he went to child care when he was four years old. After Jinsu entered the school system in America, his language transition preceded, thus the research question, how his social interaction at school and home impacted his language and literacy learning in English.

Three settings were considered to observe his social interaction through conversation with others. The first setting was his regular school setting, a first grade classroom. His multi-level classroom was a kindergarten and first grade combined Expanded Learning Program (ELP) class with 13 students, and his homeroom teacher was Mrs. April. The second setting was the Korean Language School (KLS), which was one of the programs conducted by the local Korean church. Jinsu belonged to the beginner’s level, and his teacher was Mrs. Lee. Her only students were Jinsu and Yong. The third setting was his home setting. Jinsu lived with his parents and has no siblings.

Jinsu’s school teacher described him as a very active and friendly child. He enjoyed participating in group reading and pair playing activities and had a good relationship with other students, but sometimes he had difficulty paying attention in the
class. The KLS teacher stated he was very inactive and shy when he first came to the KLS two years ago, but he kept changing as time went on, and he expressed himself fully during the class. He had no difficulty in understanding Korean; however, he struggled with speaking and reading Korean. Although his reading and writing skills in Korean increased, the gap of his language abilities between English and Korean was getting larger. The use of code switching and simple answers (answering with a simple type) was evidence of his struggles in Korean.

**Procedures and Analysis**

The data were collected over the five months from January 2010 to May 2010. I visited the school setting 15 times and the KLS setting 13 times and each visit was audio or video taped. The home setting was also audio or video recorded four times by Jinsu’s father. Data was collected through observation, interviews, classroom observations, surveys, Jinsu’s writing samples and other documents such as the school report and the standard test result from school. Field notes were taken during the observations and informal assessments in English and Korean were conducted in order to find Jinsu’s language and literacy ability. Interviews were conducted with Jinsu’s parents, the school teacher and the KLS teacher, and Jinsu. Data from interviews and audio and video recordings were transcribed and translated by me using a word processor.

To add validity to the results, multiple sources and methods were used for the triangulation and data generation. Data collected included interviews, observations, field notes, and informal assessments. In addition, Jinsu’s school life was observed at various times during the days and in different places such as art class, music class, and the playground to strengthen the depth of the study. Data were also shared with committee
members to prevent bias and to view the data with as many perspectives as possible. Two codes were considered: one is an ‘external’ code which comes out of theoretical perspectives and the other is an ‘internal’ code, which comes up within the reading of the data (Graue & Walsh, 1998. P.163). The review of literature also was ongoing during the data collection and after the data transcription.

Every audio- and video-recording and interview was transcribed and read with the field notes written down during observations. After reading the data twice, coding was conducted with information gathered through observations and interviews. Coding consisted of “labeling themes that are represented by chunks of data” (Graue & Walsh, 1998. P.163). Patterns (a pattern is something that recurs in a predictable way), salience (salience was recognized by participant in the field), and thread (thread provides a coherent way of thinking about the topic of the interest of the research) were significantly considered (Graue & Walsh, 1998. P.163). When coding was conducted the focus was only on the participant’s oral interaction and related behavior.

All data were read thoroughly and coding was categorized in two general areas, language function and social processing, based on the analytical categorization of Kumpulainen and Mutanen (2000). Language functions were interrogative, responsive, informative, reasoning, evaluative, judgmental, argumentational, repetition, experiential, affectional, and reading aloud. Social processings were collaborative, tutoring, argumentative, and sharing. Activities in each setting were also categorized according to the types of events such as subject area, learning elements area, and conversation area. The school, the KLS, and home settings were each categorized as eight (writing, Daily Language Art Review/ Daily Math Practice, group reading, draw box (pair playing),
watching video, reading aloud, art, and playground activities), eight (conversation with the KLS group, conversation with a classmate, conversation with a teacher, reading, comprehension checking, vocabulary checking, writing, and dictation), and four activities (studying Korean with parents, studying Korean with father, studying English with father, and English dictation with father). Each activity was analyzed again according to the language functions and social processing. Several unique language functions were found in the KLS and home settings and additional new language functions which were different from Kumpulainen and Mutanen’s (2000) were added later. They were incomplete sentences, wrong sentences, simple responses, language habits, hesitation, code switching, honorific words, and confirmation.

**Theoretical Orientation**

This study was based on Vygotsky’s social cultural theory (1978) that the process of knowledge learning is established through the interactions within social groups. This research focuses on the role of teachers, peers, and family members in literacy learning following Vygotsky’s view. Bronfenbrenner’s ecology system theory (1976) was also addressed. Bronfenbrenner declared that the child’s social world is conceptualized with three intersecting circles: The inner circle includes school, peers, and family. Outside of this circle contained neighborhood, community, church, and media. The outermost circle consisted of cultural values, political and economic systems, and social customs (Bronfenbrenner, 1976; Schunk, 2000). These theories highlight the roles played by social and cultural factors in children’s development and learning.
Conclusions

Summary of Results

The data were collected over five months through interviews, observations, audio and video recordings, formal and informal assessments, and writing samples. The results of this study revealed that opportunities to engage in social interactions through oral conversation in meaningful context contributed to the language and literacy learning of the child observed. Data from all three settings were analyzed and six themes emerged that related to English language learning: motivation, mass media, peer relationship, teaching methods, background knowledge/ cultural background, and language relation between Korean and English. These themes allied with Bronfenbrenner’s (1976) ecology system theory: (1) individual circle; (2) school and home environmental circle; (3) community, mass media, and cultural environment circle. As a result, the following seven factors which were supported by Bronfenbrenner’ theory emerged as important elements of Jinsu’s literacy development in English.

Individual circle.

Individual factors.

Individual factors that affect his literacy learning include prior knowledge, motivation, and personal characteristics. Materials that affirmed Jinsu’s prior knowledge in English and Korean facilitated his engagement and learning. When Jinsu read or learned about unfamiliar topics, he struggled to understand the meaning. Thus, when students are exposed to new experiences, it is useful to employ experience-based learning so that students are given adequate exposure to the new experiences and topics prior to using them to promote reading and writing development. According to Hudelson (1994),
children need an opportunity to respond to what they have heard or read; hence, it is important to relate a story to students’ personal lives to construct meaning.

Based on the results of his behavior observation, Jinsu was an outgoing person and social with his peers. In Wong Fillmore’s (1979) study, the more outgoing and social child learned the most English during her study. Wong Fillmore commented that “the child was particularly motivated by the desire to be part of the social group that spoke the new language, and thus the child sought out the company of the children she wanted to be with” (p.227). Jinsu likes a variety of sports. The connection of literature and activities which consider students’ interests and experiences (e.g., field trips, songs, crafts, and sports) will motivate students and contribute to their engagement in literacy activities (Tompkins, 2010).

**The first language.**

One of the effective methods of teaching reading and writing to ESL students is to tell them stories first in their first language and translate their work into English (Lindsey, Manis, & Baily, 1999). Jinsu started to explain the definition of “steer” in English, but later he switched to Korean to explain it in detail. This supported that he used English to understand the story or vocabulary word in Korean, as well as he used Korean for further explanation of the English term. Jinsu used reciprocal methods: English to Korean and Korean to English.

Camlibel (2005) studied the English acquisition of two Turkish speaking first graders in the United States to examine the relationship between their first language and English literacy development. The author did not find any direct relationship between their L1 oral language and their literacy abilities in English which supports previous
research (Tregar & Wong, 1984; Langer, Bartolome, Vasquez, & Lucas 1990; Saville-Troike, 1984). However, Camlibel (2005) suggested that the ELLs applied similar literacy skills, such as sounding letters out and using graphic clues, in both languages; thus, literacy skills between two languages were transferred. The similar results showed that there was a positive relationship between the children’s L1 literacy development and L2 literacy development (Saville-Troike, 1984; Tragar & Wong, 1984). Jinsu’s vocabulary in Korean helped him to understand the concept in English and finally, background knowledge in Korean led him to improve his literacy in English.

According to the observations from this study, the main focus of instruction in Jinsu’s Korean study at home was on reviewing consonants and vowels combinations, sounding out each word, and copying words from a textbook. Instruction in the KLS was focused on lower level skills of literal recall rather than on higher level thinking strategies, such as problem solving and critical thinking. Snow (1990) suggested that poor academic achievement generally was not due to their limited English proficiency. Rather, it was due to the limited use of instruction in the first language. Appropriate cognitive development, adequate cultural adjustment for language, and various instructional strategies in L1 took a role in promoting educational success in school (Cummins, 1994). ELLs’ existing language skills in L1 can be used as the basis for developing literacy in school.

Code switching is a function of code choices, and it varies in different cultures or language communities, and in different social situations. This may be viewed as a ‘reflection’ of the social relationship between speaker and addressee for Korean-English bilinguals (Kim-Renaud, 1986). Goodz’s (1994) data showed code switching occurred
among all of the young bilinguals the researcher observed, and early dual language exposure did not have a negative effect on language acquisition. People commonly think code switching occurs when students’ language ability is limited; however, Shin (2005) found that code switching was a natural conversational phenomenon, and children used code switching strategically to convey various social meanings to other participants in the conversation. For example, when the children were involved in conversation, they carefully observe their partner’s speech to negotiate the language for the interaction: they considered other participants’ preferences and adapted their own language choice.

Jinsu’s choice of code switching was different depending on the situations. First, code switching occurred when Jinsu’s Korean ability was limited, and he could not explain fully in Korean. Second, he used code switching to emphasize the meaning of what he was talking about. Even though he already understood the meaning of the word in Korean, he spoke Korean first and then repeated it in English to stress the meaning of it. Next, he used code switching as one method of learning a word in English by using Korean, and Korean by using English. He checked the meaning of vocabulary in English to Korean, or switched Korean to English. His code switching showed the adaptation of language choice and supported the results of Shin’s (2005) study. His language choice was connected to social relations and was different depending on whom he was talking. He considered his preference when he talked to his peers and the adults who are fluent in English, and his language preference was English. He also adapted to the partner’s preference as well as social and cultural relationship. He used the honorific words in Korean when he talked to respected adults who are not fluent in English.
School and home environmental circle.

Teacher’s role.

The teacher’s role is a critical function in facilitating children’s literacy development (Smith, 1988). A teacher can use varied instructional strategies to help children to read and write such as considering students’ needs and interests, creating a literate classroom environment with a variety of print-rich materials, and encouraging collaborative learning (Hudelson, 1994). During the writing activity, Mrs. April led the class to brainstorm their ideas by asking questions and showing good models of story patterns, problem solving, and story development using three different books. At the school setting, the teacher used a variety of strategies to help students be involved in the class and have motivation.

However, a major concern in the KLS setting was the limited use of a variety of reading strategies and teaching materials. Teachers in the KLS have been educated in Korea where children are taught the same way as they had been taught in Korea. Their teaching mainly consisted of spelling drills, vocabulary memorization, practice of isolated skills, and copying of the text. Due to limited resources, the teacher used only one Korean National Textbook, and the use of varied literature books was rare. The data revealed Jinsu was influenced by the book level, his prior knowledge, and cooperative group activity. As a result, instructional methods that encourage the child to engage in creative thinking, problem solving, picture clues, and pair group activity should be considered in the KLS setting. Also, he needs opportunity to write one or two sentences in his own thoughts and ideas to improve his writing skills in Korean.
Au (2006) suggested that lower level skills and higher level thinking strategies should be balanced in the literacy curriculum. Lower level skills such as phonics, word identification, and spelling, are critically important for the ELLs. However, higher level thinking with comprehension strategy instruction is also vital, even in the primary grades. Jinsu’s study with his father at home lacked comprehension improvement strategies. A combination of lower and higher level skills would benefit Jinsu at the home setting. His comprehension ability should be checked by not only literal questions, but also inferential and creative questions in Korean. The comprehension strategies he learns at home will be connected to literacy learning at school, and finally this will be helpful in improving his literacy in English.

Mrs. April had time to introduce story development by comparing the different version of “Hansel and Gretel.” Regardless of student’s linguistic and cultural background, students need to understand diversity in school and the world. Therefore, Mrs. April can allow Jinsu to bring his Korean traditional books to school and introduce them to other students, which will provide an understanding of diverse languages and cultures in American society and will be a learning experience for all students. This not only helps the other students understand his culture, but supports his pride in his culture.

In conclusion, it was found that Jinsu’s learning attitude was different depending on what kind of teaching strategies were applied. If the teacher led him to the peer group activity that needed cooperative working, to the variety of books which held his interest, and to the teaching materials which connect to his prior knowledge, he will be involved in the activity more positively and his literacy ability will be improved effectively.
Peer group activity.

Hudelson (1994) viewed a classroom as a workshop where students work together. Learning occurs cooperatively and independently as the students ask questions, figure out the answers for the question, and use oral and written language to learn. Jinsu showed frequent positive interactions with his peers, including talking, cooperation, and positive participation in the activity. When students are engaged in meaningful interaction in a language it is an opportunity for the students to develop their oral language skills. Peers who speak the target language can help ELLs develop communicative proficiency in that language. Peer group activities can offer students extended opportunities for active participation, which connect to their prior knowledge and lead to language learning and knowledge construction.

Jinsu and his peers created cooperative play, set the rules, and resolved conflicts in the context of sharing during his age-appropriate peer group activity (e.g., building a cannon ball; playing at being a knight). Jinsu’s conversation with his friends included gossiping, sharing knowledge from mass media and his experiences, and listening to the opinions of his peers. Such conversation enhanced his social rules and understandings of others. Through peer group activity, Jinsu was not only developing oral language skills, but also social skills. Jinsu was influenced by the teacher, other adults, or peers who are more knowledgeable. This supported the zone of proximal development which is the interpersonal space where new understandings can arise through collaborative interaction and inquiry (Vygotsky, 1978).

According to Wong Fillmore (1985b), pair work or small-group work with teachers and other students is useful and meaningful for ELLs as linguistic input for
learning. Johnson (1994) also suggested that the small group setting is ideal for a variety of activities. This supported the effectiveness of Jinsu’s small group activities. Jinsu’s writing (1st grader only group) and reading group activities (intermediate reading group) provided him a challenge on the right level and led to appropriate and motivating follow-up activities.

As evidence indicated that the pair group activity was related to the child’s social development and language learning, more opportunity for social interaction should be provided with play materials and activities for the students. They will learn communication skills and social processes of peer support. In the KLS setting, where the student’s numbers are limited to two students, a pair group activity such as pair reading and reading theatre would help him to motivate his reading and develop his oral language skills.

Children’s relationships with their peers and friends are associated with the development of their school adjustment and achievement (Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003). Students who are rejected by their peers are undergoing academic difficulties due to the lack of motivation to attend school. Understanding early friendships will contribute to comprehending the development of social skills and social interaction with peers.

**Parent’s support.**

The results of informal Korean pre/post tests showed Jinsu’s Korean reading and writing ability was improved. His school report and informal reading inventory also demonstrated his English ability at school was improved. Jinsu’s oral interaction at home occurred while studying with his parents. His mother corrected his wrong pronunciation in Korean during conversation. Jinsu’s father supported his English reading, English
dictation, and Korean studying with worksheets. His father continually talked to Jinsu while they were practicing Korean words and provided information about new vocabulary. Jinsu’s father used a variety of tools to teach new vocabularies such as a dictionary, a computer, and pictures. Jinsu’s parents also read aloud before bedtime, praised him when he worked well, and provided reading environments by regular visits to the local and university libraries.

Cummins (1994) asserted that ELLs’ academic and linguistic skill was significantly increased when parents consider themselves as co-educators of their children. Parents can serve an important role in promoting their child’s academic progress by showing effective models, praising their child when they attempt to read and write, and assigning to their child the importance of becoming bi-literate (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). Jinsu’s parent showed good modeling of family support. Both parents’ encouragement of communicating in Korean at home and continual support affected his Korean ability.

Heath (1986) suggested that children’s academic language skills do not depend on which language they use at home, but what quality of language experiences children have in their home and how these are applied in school. Based on this view, Jinsu needs high quality language experiences, and this might include comprehension skills such as higher level thinking and a variety of communication experience. However, his father’s help was limited to vocabulary and reading, and lacked comprehension strategies.

Jinsu also needs to have more opportunities to speak with elders or adults in the Korean community to gain a wider vocabulary. His reading and hand writing were improved, because of learning and practicing from KLS and studying with his father.
However, his father still used toddlers terms at home such as ‘ krist’ (it means “poop”), and Jinsu’s oral vocabulary ability in Korean is below his age group. If Jinsu’s parents help him to use proper vocabulary words that are suited to his age when addressing various people across different ages, his Korean vocabulary, including the use of honorific words, will most likely increase.

When young children begin to acquire L2 before they have had the opportunity to master their L1, language loss occurs and they fail to gain proficiency in L1 (Wong Fillmore 1991).

Jinsu’s mother wanted him to speak Korean fluently; however, Jinsu’s language loss already occurs. The family plays an important role in ELLs’ first language maintenance. His parents’ plan of studying Korean with literature books regularly at home and visiting Korea is necessary. Visiting Korean during summer vacation will give him an opportunity to develop his oral language by meeting his grandparents, cousins, and friends.

**Community, mass media, and cultural environmental circle.**

**Mass media.**

From the observation of Jinsu’s conversation with his peers and father, Jinsu was gaining information and conversation topics from mass media such as TV programs, TV commercials, and movies. In an interview with Jinsu’s teacher, she recommended that watching TV is one of the ways to improve Jinsu’s L2 ability and to understand the culture of a new society. However, the many hours that children spend watching TV and listening to the radio, are shrinking their vocabularies (Eisenberg, 1996). Although it was hard to say if there were any direct relations between mass media and his learning
academically, Jinsu was learning new vocabularies and information from mass media, and mass media were good tools to communicate with his peers.

**Korean culture and identity.**

In the KLS setting, Jinsu was learning the value of the Korean culture and the importance of his identity. Mrs. Lee mentioned the Korean culture and tradition when she found vocabulary that related to them and when she checked his comprehension or vocabulary. He was educated to obey his parents, use honorific words with elders, to study Korean, and to be a good Korean. He realized why he had to learn Korean and go to Korean Language School every Friday afternoon.

Jinsu also noticed with whom he should use honorific words. Normally he used honorific words with adults such as the pastor who were formally related to him. Although Jinsu used honorific words with adults, he did not always use honorific words with the KLS teacher and the researcher who were familiar to him. The KLS teacher said during the interview that he always used honorific words when he was young, but not anymore. In English, there are no honorific words like in Korean. As his language pattern has changed from Korean to English, his way of thinking also might have changed to an English pattern. As a result, he did not realize the necessity of using honorific words in Korean. Thus, if someone who knows Korean listened to him, he/she would think Jinsu was rude. This might be problematic for him when he grows up to be an adult and speaks Korean in Korean society. Because of this, Jinsu’s parents should consider emphasizing the use of honorific words at home.

There was no evidence that Jinsu’s Korean culture and identity affected his literacy development in this study based on a short-term research; a longitude study
might be necessary. This study did not find any relation between cultural identity and literacy development in English; however, several researchers suggested the importance of keeping a strong identity for ELLs. Pease-Alvarez and Vasquez (1994) argued that ELLs who came to school with distinctive identities interpret the social world in a profound way and negotiate new social situations. Cummins (1994) also pointed out that a focus on identity is crucial in understanding the educational difficulties of ELLs. The zone of proximal development (ZPD) is the interpersonal space where new understandings can arise (Vygotsky, 1978). The notion of the zone of proximal development assumes an understanding of students’ personal development, specifically to the negotiation and construction of identity among ELLs (Cummins, 1994).

**Limitations of the Study**

A qualitative case study requires multiple investigations and methods to confirm the findings. This case study was conducted under three different settings for the multiple sources of data. However, there were limitations in collecting data on oral and social interaction in each setting. In the school setting, the child’s social interaction occurred anywhere and any time during the class, lunch time, recess, and other extra activities; however, the observation at school was limited mainly to Mrs. April’s classroom. The child’s interaction during music class and physical education class were not observed. The activities at recess on the playground and lunch time were observed once, but they were not recorded.

In the KLS setting, instruction was based on one-on-one tutoring because of the small number of beginner level students. The class mostly consisted of teacher-centered instruction and any group activity was not conducted. As a result, the observation of
language functions and social processing between peers during the KLS class was limited.

The recording of the home setting was conducted by the participants’ father, therefore the personal observation of the home setting was not possible. One of the limitations at home was that the recording was conducted only during the studying time, and the data excluded the daily conversation at home, such as playing with his parents and conversations with his parents at the dinner table. Also, the participant’s mother was not involved much in his interaction, and this was another limitation of the data.

My role was different depending on the setting. During the school setting, I observed and recorded the participant’s interaction, however, during the KLS observation, I was asked to assist teaching the participant while the teacher was tutoring the other student. She asked me to check his copying, read a book, and check his comprehension. The data from working with me was excluded from the analysis. While I was observing the class next to Jinsu, Mrs. Lee asked me to take charge of Jinsu partly or entirely, and I was involved in teaching him unintentionally sometimes. Data from the session I was entirely involved in was eliminated from the analysis.

Another limitation of this research was the community setting. The observation of community was only conducted at the KLS. Activities at church and sports club will be necessary for more accurate results. The process of language and literacy development is complicated. It takes time to observe how a child acquires another language and how his cultural view and identity influence his language and literacy learning. A longitude study, rather than a study conducted within a short period of time, is necessary for the study of language and literacy learning.
Implications for Practice

In modern society, the world is changing rapidly, and young people should be engaged in higher level thinking (Smith, 2004) more than ever before. In the past, literacy ability meant reading with expression, but in today’s classroom, it involves the capacity of reading and writing complex documents with comprehension, summarization, and interpretation (Au, 2006). Thus, teachers currently face the challenge to bring all students, including ELLs, to high levels of literacy. However, the academic gap between ELLs and the native speaking students is increasing, and teachers’ main concern is how to improve the literacy achievement of ELLs.

According to Au (2006), one of the main reasons for this gap is due to literacy instruction. Large numbers of ELLs are given instruction focusing on skills such as spelling and phonics, because of their limited English skills. To achieve high levels of literacy in school, effective literacy instruction with an emphasis on in-depth comprehension strategies should be developed. The findings of this study pointed to this fact that parents help their children’s literacy development, however, their literacy instruction is likely to be limited to spelling checking and isolated skills practice. Without supports focused on higher level thinking such as comprehension and vocabulary meaning, the literacy achievement gap will be seriously increased when the children move to the upper grades.

In traditional classrooms, teacher-centered whole class lecture and individual seatwork were the common methods. One of the benefits of teacher-centered activity is that ELLs feel comfortable in the large group. This also provides students the contexts for sharing meanings in an academic and social function. ELLs feel that they are an
important part of the group rather than isolated in the view of related social functions (Johnson, 1994). The advantage of individual work is that ELLs can follow their own pace. They can read a book at their own speed, stop to think about the meaning of what they read, or go back to retrieve prior content.

However, it is also important for the ELLs to have varied opportunities for meaningful interactions by using a variety of participation structures such as pair work, cooperative learning groups, and small group activities (Johnson, 1994). The findings from this study align with Wong Fillmore (1985b) that pairs and small group activities provide ELLs opportunities for communicative interaction in spoken and written language. Pair group activity in the school setting offers students social cooperative skills and information sharing ability. Pairing two students of different proficiency levels in Korean can be effective for language and content learning. Johnson (1994) stated that both students at low levels and high levels of language proficiency actively contribute to the task in their own way. Research also indicated that content they discussed in the first language can be associated with and connected to later academic growth in English (Saville-Troike, 1984). Cooperative learning group activity enhances not only meaningful tasks such as cross-cultural relations but also content and language learning.

In addition, the support of parents in the home environment and teachers’ attitude contribute to the child’s language and literacy learning. The children benefit from exposure to a variety of reading and writing activities (Goin, Nordquist, & Twardosz, 2004). Multicultural children’s literature is a powerful way to connect students’ essential background knowledge to literacy development at home and in the classroom. When stories are taken from the culture of the students, students can identify with the stories
being read and this can trigger personal expression. Bialystock and Mitterer (1987) find that bilingual children have notably advanced abilities in judging grammatical accuracy than monolingual children and they are superior when required to separate out individual words from meaningful sentences. They understand what a word is and have knowledge of the relationship between word and sentence meanings. As a result, young bilinguals’ awareness of two languages and knowledge of words and sentence meaning at an early age facilitates children’s early literacy.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study was a single case study, and the results might be subjective depending on the environmental factors. Future research should investigate subjects who had different environments. More research is needed with ELLs with different family members, in different educational programs, with different first-language backgrounds, and in different age groups.

For example, Jinsu’s family consisted of his parents and him, and he had no brothers or sisters. Research comparing two case studies, one who has siblings and the other who has no siblings, is necessary to find the influence of siblings on language and literacy learning. In addition, research comparing two subjects, one who attends the KLS and the other who does not go to the KLS, is needed to examine the role of the KLS in language learning. Also, research which compares two children who have different backgrounds, a child who was born in Korea and moved after he reached school age and a child who was born in and grew up in the United States, might be helpful to understand the effect of the cultural background on the language learning. The subject of this study was a first grade child, and additional research on higher grade ELLs is also necessary to
compare the literacy learning and the language loss and maintenance between those two groups.

It is not clear how early literacy skills might relate to later literacy outcomes. Longitudinal studies would allow time to examine more closely how a child develop literacy learning. Thus, future studies are also needed that observe one subject from first grade to fifth grade (higher grade) to investigate how the child develops his/her literacy ability in both L1 and L2 languages, and how the child’s Korean culture and identity affects literacy learning.

**Final Summary**

Learning is a complex process, and the process of a child’s language and literacy development is influenced by many factors. This study was a single case study to investigate how a first grade Korean child learns language and literacy skills through social interactions in different contexts. In Heath’s (1983) ethnographic study conducted in two speech communities, she suggested that the significance of studying all the environments within a community, included “ways of living, eating, sleeping, worshiping, using space, and filling time” (p.3). Data were collected from three different settings to understand how a child engaged in interaction within the contexts of different situations. Multiple sources of data methods were used for the in-depth understanding of the child’s language and literacy learning.

The analysis of data showed that social interaction, especially oral interaction between a child and his teachers, parents, and peers played a role in his language and literacy development. In this study, factors that influence literacy development in English emerged from the data are the following: individual factors such as personal motivation
and background knowledge, social interactional factors such as interaction between peers, parent, and teachers, and environmental factors such as mass media and Korean culture and identity. The results supported Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978) and Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory (1976). Both theories emphasized that interactions between adults and peers and their environments affect children’s language and literacy learning.
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Appendix A

Parental Permission and Student Consent Form

Dear Parent(s),

Your child will participate in a research project. The purpose of the study is to investigate how your child’s oral language interactions with teachers, parents, peers, and community members impact his literacy learning in English. Language and literacy learning occurs from the social interaction with others.

For this project your child will be asked to take informal assessments twice (pre/post) in Korean and English and interviewed regarding reading attitudes and interests in language and literacy learning. It will take approximately 20 minutes to take each assessment, and 30 minutes to conduct the interview. The researcher will visit your child’s classroom, Korean Language School classroom and your house and observe his interactions with others in language and literacy learning. The observations will be each conducted approximately twenty times, for fifty minutes to one and half hours, once a week, from January 2010 to May 2010. Your child will be audio taped five times and video-taped five times, a total of 10 times for the accuracy of the data under your agreement: each month one audio taping (first or second week of the month) and one videotaping (third or fourth week).

You will be asked to participate in a short interview. It will take 30 minutes and the interview will be audio taped for the accuracy of the data under your agreement.

The data will include other documents such as your child’s assignments, report cards, writing samples, and journals. These documents will be photo copied under the agreement of the teacher, child, and his parents and returned to the child within 2-3 days of obtaining the documents.

All data will be maintained as confidential and no identifying information such as names will appear in any publication or presentation of the data. All paper data and tapes will be stored safely in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s home. The data will be destroyed in five years after the study is completed.

The benefit of this study is to provide you a better understanding of how English Language Learners’ social interactions with others impact their literacy learning in English.

There are no foreseeable risks or ill effects associated with this study. The only anticipated concern from participating in this study is that you or your child may not feel comfortable answering some of the questions. You or your child may choose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may stop the interview when you feel uncomfortable.

You and your child’s participation in this study are completely voluntary and you and your child are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice from the investigator. Please feel free to contact the researcher or your classroom teacher to ask any questions before signing the Parental Permission form.
For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact Research Compliance, Sponsored Programs Office, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

I, _____________ (print your name), give permission for my child to participate in this research project entitled, “The Role of Social Interaction in English Literacy Learning.” I have read the description of this project and give my child permission to participate. I understand that I will receive a copy of this Informed Consent Form to keep for future reference.

____________________________________                             ___________________
Parent’s Signature                                                                            Date

I, _____________ (print your name), would like to participate in this research project. My parent has discussed this project with me and I agree to participate in the research.

____________________________________                             ___________________
Student’s Signature                                                                           Date

Principal Investigator                                    Faculty Supervisor
Kwangok Kim, Graduate Student                           Dr. Linda Martin
Elementary Education                                      Elementary Education
Ball State University                                     Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47304                                         Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765)214-2066                                 Telephone: (765)285-8552
Email: kokim@bsu.edu                                     Email: lmartin@bsu.edu
Appendix B

Consent Form for the School Teacher

Dear Mrs./Mr. ______,

The purpose of the study is to investigate how children’s oral language interactions with teachers, parents, peers, and community members impact their literacy learning in English. Language and literacy learning occurs from the social interaction with others. There is a great need for research to investigate how a child develops his language and literacy based on the social and cultural interaction at school, home, and in the community.

For this project you will be asked to participate in a short interview. It will take approximately 40 minutes and be audio taped during the interview with your permission. The researcher will also observe your classroom. The observation will be conducted approximately twenty times, for fifty minutes, once a week, from January 2010 to May 2010. Your classroom will be audio or video taped.

All data will be maintained as confidential and no identifying information such as names will appear in any publication or presentation of the data. All paper data and tapes will be stored safely in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s home and the data will be destroyed in five years after the study is completed.

There are no foreseeable risks or ill effects associated with this study. The only anticipated concern from participating in this study is that you may not feel comfortable answering some of the questions. You may choose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may stop the interview when you feel uncomfortable.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice from the investigator. Please feel free to contact the researcher to ask any questions before beginning the study, and at any time during the study.

The benefit you may gain from your participation in this study is a better understanding of how English Language Learners’ social interactions with others impact their literacy learning in English. Finally, this information will provide teachers, parents and other researchers with how to help ELLs develop their higher literacy acquisition and academic improvement at school.

For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact Research Compliance, Sponsored Programs Office, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

I, _____________ (print your name), would like to participate in this research project entitled, “The Role of Social Interaction in English Literacy Learning.” I understand that I will receive a copy of this Informed Consent Form to keep for future reference.

____________________________________                   ___________________
Signature                                                                            Date

Principal Investigator                                               Faculty Supervisor
Kwangok Kim, Graduate Student                            Dr. Linda Martin
Elementary Education                                              Elementary Education
Ball State University                                                Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47304                                                    Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765)214-2066                                       Telephone: (765)285-8552
Email: kokim@bsu.edu                                            Email: lmartin@bsu.edu
Appendix C

Consent Form for the Korean Language School Teacher

Dear Mrs./Mr. _______,

Language and literacy learning occurs from the social interaction with others. The purpose of the study is to investigate how children’s oral language interactions with teachers, parents, peers, and community members impact their literacy learning in Korean.

For this project the researcher will visit your classroom and observe your class. The observation will be conducted approximately twenty times, every Friday (4:00-6:00), from January 2010 to May 2010. Your classroom will be audio or video taped, a total of 10 times for the accuracy of the data under your agreement. You will be also asked to participate in a short interview. It will take approximately 40 minutes and be audio taped during the interview.

All data will be maintained as confidential and no identifying information such as names will appear in any publication or presentation of the data. All paper data and tapes will be stored safely in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s home and the data will be destroyed in five years after the study is completed.

There are no foreseeable risks or ill effects associated with this study. The only anticipated concern from participating in this study is that you may not feel comfortable answering some of the questions. You may choose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may stop the interview when you feel uncomfortable.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice from the investigator. Please feel free to contact the researcher to ask any questions before beginning the study, and at any time during the study.

The benefit you may gain from your participation in this study is a better understanding of how Korean American students’ social interactions with others impact their literacy learning in English and Korean. This information will provide teachers and parents how to help Korean Americans to develop their higher literacy acquisition in Korean and English.

For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact Research Compliance, Sponsored Programs Office, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

I, ___________ (print your name), would like to participate in this research project entitled, “The Role of Social Interaction in Korean Literacy Learning.” I understand that I will receive a copy of this Informed Consent Form to keep for future reference.

____________________________________                             ___________________
Signature                                                                            Date

Principal Investigator                                               Faculty Supervisor
Kwangok Kim, Graduate Student                            Dr. Linda Martin
Elementary Education                                              Elementary Education
Ball State University                                                Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47304                                                    Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765)214-2066                                       Telephone: (765)285-8552
Email: kokim@bsu.edu              Email: lmartin@bsu.edu
I. General questions
   1. What are your favorite sports?
   2. Tell me about your family.
   3. Which one is your preference, Korean or English name? Why?
   4. Which language is convenient when you speak at home, school, and in the church?
   5. Tell me more about yourself.

II. School related questions
   1. How was your school day?
   2. What was your first impression when you entered the first grade classroom?
   3. What is your favorite subject in your class?
   4. When is your happiest time in school?
   5. Who is your best friend at the school and the church? Why do you like him/her?

III. Reading related questions
   1. Do you like to read?
   2. Do you think you are a good reader? Why?
   3. How many times do you go to the public library?
   4. How many hours do you spend reading at home?
   5. What is the most difficult for you when you read in English?
   6. What do you do when you do not understand what you have read?
   7. Do you read Korean children’s books?
   8. Which do you like better, reading in Korean or in English? Why?
   9. Do you think reading Korean books help you to improve your English?
Appendix E

School Teacher Interview Questions

I. General questions
   1. How long have you been teaching in the elementary school?
   2. How many years have you worked at East Washington Academy?
   3. How long have you worked in the first grade classroom?

II. General English Language Learners related questions
   1. Do you think social interactions of ELLs are important in literacy learning?
   2. What kind of difficulty do you have when you teach ELLs?
   3. Do you believe reading in the first language promotes learning to read in English?
   4. Do you think ELLs should use their first language while they are learning English?
      Why? (What are the advantages of maintaining the first language in learning English?)
   5. What do you believe ELLs should do to improve their English skills?
   6. What do you believe ELL’s parents should do to help their children at home?

III. Student related questions
   1. What do you think of A’s reading skills?
   2. How do you think A’s adjusting to school?
   3. What do you think about A’s friend relationship and social interactions with others?
   4. What are A’s weaknesses and strengths in language and literacy learning at school?
Appendix F

Korean Language School Teacher Interview Questions

1. How long have you worked at Korean Language School?
2. Why do you think should students learn Korean in this society? What are the advantages of maintaining the first language in learning English?
3. What kind of difficulty do you have when you teach Korean at Korean Language School?
4. What are the main problems for the young Korean students maintaining Korean staying in the United States?
5. Do you believe skills acquired from the first language may be helpful learning the second language, English?
6. What is the Korean parent’s role in improving their children’s Korean?
7. How would you describe A’s Korean ability, writing, reading, speaking, and listening skills?
8. How would you compare A’s Korean abilities of previous year and those of this year?
9. What is your suggestion for A’s improvement of Korean?
Appendix G

Parents Interview Questions

1. When did Jinsu start to learn English? Where?
2. Does he feel comfortable using both languages, Korean and English at home?
3. Do you think native-like English skills will help him to be successful in this society?
4. What do you want your child to be in his society?
5. What do you think about the first language loss and maintenance?
6. What are the effective methods to keep your child’s first language? What age is proper for the starting of second language acquisition?
7. What are the parents’ role to develop your child’s language and literacy improvement?
8. Do you have any expectations from his school teacher and Korean Language School teacher?
Appendix H

Analytical Framework of Oral Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Analytical Categorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Functions</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>answering questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>informative</td>
<td>providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reasoning</td>
<td>reasoning in language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td>evaluating work or action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judgmental</td>
<td>expressing agreement or disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>argumentational</td>
<td>justifying information, opinions or actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>repeating spoken language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>expressing personal experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affectional</td>
<td>expressing feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non verbal</td>
<td>raising hand</td>
<td>raising hand to answer the questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Processing</td>
<td>collaborative</td>
<td>joint activity characterized by equal participation and meaning making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td>students helping and assisting another student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>argumentative</td>
<td>students are faced with cognitive/social conflicts which are resolved and justified in a rational way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>student sharing his materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source:* Kumpulainen and Mutanen (2000)

Additional Language Functions at the KLS and Home settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Analytical Categorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Functions</td>
<td>Incomplete sentences</td>
<td>use of unfinished sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wrong sentences</td>
<td>use of grammatically incorrect sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simple responsive</td>
<td>answer in ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘I don’t know’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language habit</td>
<td>use of unnecessary words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hesitate</td>
<td>hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>code switching</td>
<td>mixing Korean and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>honorific words</td>
<td>use of Korean honorifics words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>use of dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confirmation</td>
<td>make sure the meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>