

International and Cultural Psychology Series

Series Editor: **Anthony Marsella**, *University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i*

ASIAN AMERICAN MENTAL HEALTH

Assessment Theories and Methods

Edited by Karen S. Kurasaki, Sumie Okazaki, and Stanley Sue

COUNSELING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Clients from Around the World

Written by Nancy Marie Arthur

THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY ACROSS CULTURES

Edited by Robert R. McCrae and Jüri Allik

LEARNING IN CULTURAL CONTEXT

Family, Peers, and School

Edited by Ashley E. Maynard and Mary I. Martini

POVERTY AND PSYCHOLOGY

From Global Perspective to Local Practice

Edited by Stuart C. Carr and Tod S. Sloan

PSYCHOLOGY AND BUDDHISM

From Individual to Global Community

Edited by Kathleen H. Dockett, G. Rita Dudley-Grant, and C. Peter Bankart

TRAUMA INTERVENTIONS IN WAR AND PEACE

Prevention, Practice, and Policy

Edited by Bonnie L. Green, Matthew J. Friedman, Joop T. V. M. de Jong, Susan

D. Solomon, Terence M. Keane, John A. Fairbank, Brigid Donelan, and Ellen

Frey-Wouters.

Learning in Cultural Context *Family, Peers, and School*

Ashley E. Maynard

University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i

Mary I. Martini

University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i

A continuation Order Plan is available for this series. A continuation order will bring delivery of each new volume immediately upon publication. Volumes are billed only upon actual shipment. For further information please contact the publisher.

2005
Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers
New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow

The research for this paper was conducted as part of a larger study on the language socialization of morality among middle school students in performing arts classes.

This research was made possible in part through a Dissertation Improvement Grant in Linguistics from the National Science Foundation. I would also like to thank Marjorie Jarness Goodwin for her guidance as my Dissertation Chair and Debra Friedman for her critique of an earlier draft of this paper. An earlier version of this paper was presented as part of a panel on "The Embodied Mind and Consciousness: Developmental Perspectives" at the Piaget Conference (2002).

Correspondence may be addressed to Laurie Schick, Dept. of Applied Linguistics & TESL, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1531. Email is: chick@humnet.ucla.edu.

Chapter 9

Enacting the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy in a Culturally Relevant High School Program

Lois A. Yamauchi, Tasha R. Wyatt,
and Jacquelin H. Carroll

THE FIVE STANDARDS FOR EFFECTIVE PEDAGOGY

The Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy are principles of instruction for teaching students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The Five Standards are (a) teachers and students working together in productive activity; (b) supporting students' language development across the curriculum through extensive speaking and writing; (c) contextualizing new information with what students already know, (d) supporting complex thinking by focusing on higher level thought and providing feedback; and (e) enacting instructional conversations—teaching through small group discourse (Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000). Each of the Standards is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

The Five Standards derive from Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory. Vygotsky believed that social interaction was the basis of all higher psychological processes such as one's beliefs, values, strategies, and ways of viewing the world. According to this perspective, children interact through language and other symbols with adults and more capable peers and eventually appropriate those symbols. The Five Standards are helpful to educators because they translate sociocultural theory into pedagogical practice (Tharp et al., 2000). For example, they emphasize that teachers need

to organize activities so that they have opportunities to discuss concepts with students and provide assistance for students as they engage in problem solving, analysis, and other higher level thinking.

The Five Standards can be considered aspects of good instruction for all students. However, they are particularly important for those who have typically had more negative experiences, as those individuals are the ones who have the most to benefit from reorganizing education in ways that maximize learning. The Standards emphasize an active role of teachers in the classroom. Although the cooperative learning movement focused attention on the importance of peer assistance, teachers often became less present in those settings, and students lost opportunities to learn from them.

The Five Standards also highlight the importance of the cultural context of learning. For Vygotsky (1978), all learning is situated in a particular sociocultural context that determines what, how, and from whom one learns. All students come to school with a unique history of knowledge, expectations, and goals that are shaped by interactions within their cultural communities. Those who have difficulty in school may have different goals and expectations than that of school personnel (Tharp, 1989; Tharp et al., 2000). For example, students who come from a more collective home culture, where the goals of the group are emphasized over that of the individual, may have difficulty adjusting to a more competitive and individualistic school environment.

In addition, some groups of students may have little experience with the concepts being taught in school. The third Standard, *Contextualization*, emphasizes that learning is promoted when new information is connected to students already know and expect from home, school, and community (CREDE, 2003; Tharp, et al., 2000). This includes teaching in ways that are familiar to students and using curriculum that connects academic concepts to students' prior knowledge. In this chapter, we discuss the Hawaiian Studies Program (HSP) at Wai'anae High School, a high school program that is exemplary for its contextualization of students' cultural experiences with more traditional academic learning. The purpose of the chapter is to describe program and to discuss the application of the Five Standards.

THE HAWAIIAN STUDIES PROGRAM (HSP)

The HSP is a community-based, culturally contextualized program for students in grades 10–12. The program is located at Wai'anae High School, a public high school on the rural, western tip on the island of O'ahu, Hawai'i. The primary goal of the HSP is "to empower students to become

self-sufficient, productive, contributing members of their own community and of the global community, caring for the land and natural resources that make life possible" (Hawaiian Studies Program, 1997, p.2). The program was conceptualized as a science-based academic program that would help students make connections between academic concepts and the Hawaiian culture.

In 1995, three teachers, along with members of two community-based organizations, approached the principal of Wai'anae High School about starting a Hawaiian studies program. Their vision of the program included improving academic outcomes and making school more engaging and relevant for students. At a school where over half of the student population is Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, it made sense to develop a program that was centered around Hawaiian cultural issues in order to nurture students' self of sense and to connect what students learn in school to what they already know.

The HSP founders saw firsthand the evidence of students' disconnectedness to and lack of success in school. The drop-out rate at Wai'anae High School is one of the highest in the State (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2002a). Even when students stay in school, many fail to earn enough credits to advance to the next grade (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2002b; 2003). In addition, standardized test scores at Wai'anae also tend to be low. The HSP founders were also motivated by evidence that Hawaiian students, in general, do not perform as well as other groups of students on standardized test scores, have higher drop out and grade retention rates, are under-represented in higher education, and over-represented in special education (Kanaiaupuni & Ishibashi, 2003; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 1994; Takenaka, 1995; University of Hawai'i Institutional Research Office, 2002).

What resulted was the Hawaiian Studies Program at Wai'anae High School (HSP), a program that integrates the learning of Hawaiian values, knowledge, and practices with more traditional secondary curriculum in science, social studies, and English. Although the majority of students in the HSP is Native Hawaiian, the program is open to all students at the high school in Grades 10–12. Students who enroll in the program come from a wide range of academic backgrounds, including honors students, those in special education, and some who are at-risk for dropping out.

The program is built around weekly field work in the Wai'anae community that is conducted in cooperation with community members. For example, students participate in archaeological surveys and excavations of cultural sites in the Wai'anae Valley that are led by professional archaeologists. With consultation from the governmental agency that regulates water use, other students and teachers conduct chemical and visual

tests of the Wai'anae and Makaha Valley stream environments to study the effects of diverting water for household consumption. Another group of students conducts field work at the Wai'anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center, shadowing health care professionals, planning and implementing community health care initiatives, and assisting in patient care.

There are a number of indicators that the HSP is succeeding in its goals to promote student learning and academic engagement. HSP students have good attendance, are less likely to drop out of school, and are more likely to enroll in post-secondary institutions of higher education or training than students in the high school at large (Carroll, 1999). Enrollment in the program is also associated with an increase in students' grades. In the only school year in which these data were analyzed (1998–99), 86% of first year Hawaiian Studies students and 64% of second year Hawaiian Studies students increased their GPAs from the previous year. An external evaluation of the program found that compared to peers at Wai'anae High School who were not enrolled in the program, HSP students felt more connected to their school and local communities, were more likely to agree that they were valued members of those communities by peers and adults, reported being more knowledgeable of and interested in Hawaiian history and culture, and also to be more likely to have thought about careers and post-secondary education (RMC, 2003).

Success of the program is also evident in HSP student awards and honors. Prior to HSP students entering the State Science Fair in 2000, students at Wai'anae High School had not entered the competition in 16 years. The first year that HSP students entered, they became the State first place winners in two categories. In 2001 and 2002, teams of HSP students also won another statewide science competition to create a model of a watershed. In 2001, students were invited to present their work at four national and regional water quality conferences, and a HSP student won the district science fair competition in Behavioral Sciences.

Enrolling about 2,000 students, Wai'anae High School is a large public high school. Such a large school enrollment itself presents challenges for youth adjustment. A national study of health-related behaviors showed that as school size increased, adolescents' feelings of connectedness to school and academic achievement decreased (Morrison, 2002). Students in larger schools also are more likely to drop out and are less likely to have parents who are involved in their education (Raywid, 1999). The HSP uses teaming and looping to create a smaller learning environment within a large high school. Teaming refers to a small group of teachers working with a sub-section of the student population (Trimble & Miller, 1998). Looping involves teachers moving with their students to the next grade level (Black, 2000; Little & Dacus, 1999).

In the HSP, three to four teachers teach 60–100 students, who remain with them for two years. Although the numbers of sophomores who elect to enroll in the HSP is increasing, most HSP students enter as juniors and remain for their senior year. Thus, for at least two consecutive years, students have the same teachers and peers for the majority of their course work. Students identify with their peers and the program and develop a connection to the HSP teachers and community partners. When asked what they liked most about the program, students most often mentioned the sense of *'ohana* or family in the program (Ceppi, 2000).

ENACTMENT OF THE FIVE STANDARDS IN THE HAWAIIAN STUDIES PROGRAM

The Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence (CREDE) is a federally-funded research and development center at the University of California. CREDE sponsored 31 research projects nationwide that focused on how to best educate students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. In 2001, CREDE adopted the HSP as a demonstration school because it exemplified enactment of a number of the Five Standards (Yamauchi, 2002). As part of the demonstration site activities, HSP teachers receive professional development to learn about the Five Standards and plan for ways to enact the Standards in their classroom and field instruction. The teachers also evaluate enactment of the Standards by watching videotaped excerpts of each other's instruction and rating the lessons using the Standards Performance Continuum (SPC), an instrument developed by CREDE researchers to measure enactment of the Standards (CREDE, n. d. a.).

The SPC provides criteria for evaluating the enactment of each Standard along a continuum of "not observed" to "integrating." The highest level of intergrating is achieved when three or more of the Standards are rated at the enacting level. Thus, for each of the Standards, evaluators must decide whether a particular lesson meets the criteria for "not observed," "emerging," "developing," or "enacting." In the following sections we describe the Five Standards and discuss some of the ways they have been enacted in the HSP. We refer to criteria from the SPC that is used to determine the extent to which each Standard is observed in a particular lesson. (See Table 1).

Joint Productive Activity

Joint Productive Activity (JPA) is the process in which teachers and students engage in activities that result in tangible or intangible products

Table 1. Criteria for the Developing and Enacting Levels of the CREDE Standards Performance Continuum (SPC)

Standard	Developing	Enacting
Joint Productive Activity	The teacher and students collaborate on a joint product in a whole-class setting, OR students collaborate on a joint product in pairs or small groups.	The teacher and a small group of students collaborate on a joint product.
Language and Literacy Development	The teacher provides structured opportunities for academic language development in sustained reading, writing or speaking activities.	The teacher designs and enacts instructional activities that <i>generate</i> language expression and development of content vocabulary, AND <i>assists student language expression and development</i> through questioning, rephrasing, or modeling.
Contextualization	The teacher makes incidental connections between students' prior experience/knowledge from home, school, or community and the new activity/information.	The teacher integrates the new activity/information with what students already know from home, school, or community.
Challenging Activities	The teacher designs and enacts activities that connect instructional activities to academic content OR advance student understanding to more complex levels.	The teacher designs and enacts challenging activities with clear standards and performance feedback AND assists the development of complex thinking.
Instructional Conversation	The teacher converses with a small group of students on an academic topic AND <i>elicits student talk</i> with questioning, listening, rephrasing, or modeling.	The teacher: designs and enacts an instructional conversation (IC) with a clear academic goal; listens carefully to assess and assist student understanding; AND questions students on their views, judgments, or rationales. All students are included in the IC, AND student talk occurs at higher rates than teacher talk.

Note. From "Standards Performance Continuum," by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence (CREDE), n.d.a, Santa Cruz, CA: Author

(Tharp et al., 2000). Tangible products include artifacts such as reports, concept maps, math problems, debates, games, and plays. Intangible products are more conceptual, such as elaborated understandings, procedures, or other ideas. JPA goes beyond cooperative learning in that it requires that teachers become actively involved in group work, not just designing and observing student activity. Cohen and her colleagues (e.g., Cohen & Lotan, 1997) caution against teachers dominating participation in classroom conversations and other activity settings. While this can be a problem, teachers' presence in classroom activity is also necessary to push students to think in more complex ways (Tharp et al., 2000). For example, teachers and other adults can use their expertise to ask the right questions, provide feedback, model and use other forms of assistance that scaffold students' thinking.

Enacting JPA requires *collaboration* between teachers and students. CREDE (n. d.b) defines collaboration as "joint activity that results in shared ownership, authorship, use, or responsibility for a product." Group member contributions must add to the final product. For example, in order for a discussion to be a JPA, student and teacher comments should build toward the group's common understanding, what Vygotsky (1978) called intersubjectivity.

Implementing JPA at the enacting level also requires that the joint activity occur between teachers and a *small* group of students (typically defined as 5–7 individuals). A small group is necessary because it provides more assurance that all members will contribute in meaningful ways. Large group activities allow some students to be more passive or silent, and this can go unnoticed by the teacher. Thus, a teacher's collaboration in a whole class setting, or students collaborating in pairs or small groups without the teacher, is only considered to be JPA at the "developing" level.

An early assessment of the enactment of the Five Standards in the HSP, suggested that JPA has always been a strength of the program (Ceppi, 2000). This may be because the program was designed to incorporate small groups of students, teachers, and community members collaborating during weekly field work. The nature of the field projects lend themselves well to enacting this Standard in that students are divided into small groups and the projects are often organized around the development of tangible products (e.g., an archaeological map, a stream assessment, or a video to promote healthy behaviors). The projects often develop from community needs and focus on real problems for which the teachers may not have necessarily had a particular answer in mind. In addition, HSP teachers often do not have all the knowledge and skills necessary to solve problems generated by the field work and look to community partners to provide assistance in these less familiar areas. Thus, in the field, the teachers become

learners with their students, adopting a role that fits well with the notion of JPA.

JPA in the HSP is also prominent in the development of student portfolios. Throughout the year, students are required to collect evidence that indicates how they are meeting the program objectives. The students are required to reflect on these work samples and to compile this documentation in a portfolio. Students work on the portfolios in their English classes, but are also encouraged to discuss what to include in the portfolio with other teachers and community members who are involved in their field work. Teachers meet with small groups of students to discuss the meaning of the program objectives, what students might include in the portfolio, and why students believe selected artifacts reflect the objectives.

At the end of the year, students participate in a mock job interview that involves presenting their portfolios to "sympathetic strangers," consisting of community members from the university, government and local businesses. Teachers, community members, and peers provide students with suggestions on how to add more clarity to their portfolio reflections and how to best present themselves in the mock interview. Teachers and students role play and engage in practice interviews that are sometimes videotaped. After watching the videotapes, students provide self- and peer-critiques of the interviewee's performance.

Language and Literacy Development

The second Standard focuses on the goal of developing language and literacy in all classrooms, not just those designated as language arts (CREDE, n. d.c; Tharp et al., 2000). When teachers plan and enact activities that are designed for students extended reading, writing or speaking, their lessons are considered at least at the "developing" level of this Standard. In order to be scored at the "enacting" level, the lesson must actually generate students' oral or written language (CREDE, n. d.a). In addition, there should be evidence that the teacher assisted students' language development by questioning, rephrasing, or modeling language production. Thus, these criteria reflect both a teacher's focus on language development and students' willingness to produce the language initiated by these activities.

Language generation is viewed as important for two reasons (Hilberg, Doherty, Tharp, & Estrada, n. d.). When students are engaged in extended speaking and writing, they are often using higher level cognitive processes that require more elaboration of meaning, compared to when they are just listening or responding to brief, repetitive exercises. Second, sustained speaking and writing provides opportunities for students to use the

vocabulary of the content area they are studying and to receive feedback on their use of language in these contexts.

In an example of the Language and Literacy Development Standard enacted in the HSP, Michael Kurose, the social studies teacher, conducted a lesson on the politics of funding public education in Hawai'i. To start the discussion, Mr. Kurose asked the students to generate a list of deteriorating facilities at their school. The teacher and the students came up with a list of items that included peeling paint, large amounts of trash on the ground, graffiti, and lack of toilet tissue in the bathrooms. Mr. Kurose and the students then took turns reading an article about which schools had received funding that year for various improvements. Mr. Kurose explained that funding for Hawai'i public schools derives largely from state taxes and determined by State legislators. The legislators are supposed to allocate money to health and safety repairs before extending funds to other development. However, only 10 of the 60 projects that were funded were those that dealt with health and safety. These included an all-weather track around the University of Hawai'i's athletic field, electrical upgrading and air conditioning of two schools, and extending another school's parking lot. Most of the schools on the list were not funded.

Mr. Kurose used the article as a springboard for a class discussion of the differences in political treatment of schools based on the income level of the communities they serve. He asked students to consider why politicians will advocate for new development at some schools, while overlooking repairs needed at others. The discussion was emotional and lively. The majority of the 15 students participated in the discussion, responding to peer and teacher comments. The lesson concluded with the students writing letters to their legislators about the conditions at Wai'anae High School and calling for more consistency and clarity in the way that money is spent on public education in the State.

Applying the SPC criteria to this lesson, the Language and Literacy Development Standard would be evaluated at the enacting level because Mr. Kurose designed and implemented activities that generated sustained student speaking and writing. He also assisted student language expression by questioning students about the topic. At one point, Mr. Kurose asked the students, "Which communities are growing fastest? What happens to the Kalihi and Wai'anae (two communities on the island that have large low income populations)? Who do you think speaks out more, those with money or those who have no more money?"

Mr. Kurose also assisted students' language development by rephrasing students' statements. For example, as a student read the article aloud, she came across the word "fiscal" and had difficulty with the pronunciation. Mr. Kurose, took the opportunity to pronounce the word correctly

and then expanded on its meaning to ensure that the students understood its meaning. He explained that, "Fiscal just means financial. It just means financial terms. Every year they allow a certain amount of the money to be spent. So, when they say a fiscal year, it means a year in which they have to calculate how much money was spent during that time period."

Contextualization

Teachers contextualize instruction when they tie new information with what students already know from prior experiences in their schools, homes and communities (CREDE, n.d.d; Tharp et al., 2000). If new information is contextualized, it is better remembered and understood. When students see the relevance to what they are learning to their lives outside of the classroom, they may also be more motivated to participate. The criterion for teachers enacting this Standard at the developing level of the SPC involves their make incidental connections between students' prior knowledge and the new knowledge of the lesson (CREDE, n.d.a). Incidental connections are unplanned comments or questions to students made "on the fly" as the lesson unfolds.

An example of incidental integration of students' prior knowledge comes from Dan Forman's English class. Mr. Forman was reading a novel aloud to his class when they came across a phrase that many students did not understand. Mr. Forman tried to clarify the meaning, "What does wreaked havoc mean? Yeah, havoc is your clue. Caused turmoil. Caused confusion. Messed up. Turmoil is like when you catch a wave and you eat it and you are swimming around." This is an example of an *incidental* connection between students' prior knowledge and the academic content because Mr. Forman decided to connect the meaning of the word *havoc* to the situation of "wiping out" in surfing. As Wai'anae High School is located on a beach and surfing is a common past time of many residents in the community, many students probably could relate to this comment. It is considered incidental because Mr. Forman probably did not plan this in advance. It was something he added at the moment to help his students better understand a new concept. The connection is also *incidental* because it deals with only a relatively minor aspect of the lesson, rather than being more integral.

In order for a lesson to be rated at the enacting level of Contextualization, the teacher needs to *integrate* new information with students' prior knowledge or experiences. This might be accomplished by designing an activity that requires students to apply academic concepts to a context from their homes or communities. This is exactly what the HSP founders had in mind when they conceptualized the field component of the program. The

field projects were designed to apply academic concepts to a context that was familiar to students. For example, in their science classes, students learn about the scientific method and about concepts such as *ecosystem* and *sustainability*. In the environmental field rotation, those concepts and principles are applied as students' collect and analyze data on the ecosystem of the stream environment and discuss the sustainability of native plants and animals. Likewise, HSP teachers can use knowledge of students' field experience to contextualize their classroom instruction. For example, the HSP science teacher, Erich Smith, planned a lesson that involved groups of students constructing working models of a watershed that demonstrated knowledge about the sources and paths of water. This required students to use their knowledge of the Wai'anae Valley, developed both through field work and from living in the community.

Integration of prior information into a lesson can also refer to planning activities that build upon concepts that were learned previously in the same or other classes. The teaming of HSP teachers provides opportunities for teachers to be more informed about what their colleagues are emphasizing in their curriculum. This information can then be incorporated into their own lessons, so that students recognize how concepts from the different disciplines are related. For example, in their English classes, HSP students read accounts of political and environmental activism in Hawai'i. Discussions of these readings allow their teacher, Mr. Forman, to weave in references to concepts student have learned from their social studies, science, and field instruction.

Challenging Activities

The Challenging Activities Standard refers to teachers promoting students' engagement in complex thinking (CREDE, n.d.e; Tharp et al., 2000). There are four ways that this can be accomplished. First, teachers can ask students to consider the "why" and not merely the "what" or "how to" (CREDE, n.d.a). Second, teachers can implement activities that require students' use of complex thinking processes such as generating information, elaborating, analyzing, classifying, experimenting, synthesizing or interpreting. Third, teachers can make connections between the activity or content of the lesson and a more abstract idea or concept. For example, when Mr. Forman supervises students in their native plant field work, he explains that their effort to restore of native plants to a community area involves the Hawaiian value of *mālama i ka 'āina* (caring for the land) and the scientific concept of sustainability. These connections advance students thinking to more complex levels. Finally, teachers can assist students in improving their critical thinking, problem solving, or metacognitive skills. If teachers

instruct students on how to develop an outline or a concept web of their ideas in order to organize their writing, they are also assisting students in their complex thinking.

If any of the above criteria is met, a lesson would be considered at least at the developing level of the Challenging Activities standard (CREDE, n.d.e). In order for it to be considered at the enacting level, the following additional criteria also need to be present: (a) students should be aware of the standards upon which their performances will be judged, (b) students should receive feedback on their performances, and (c) the teacher should assist students in the development of complex thinking.

An example of the Challenging Activity standard implemented at the enacting level of the SPC comes from a social studies lesson in which the students were learning about the effects of imperialism in the Hawaiian Islands by examining the political, economic, and cultural changes that resulted when American businessmen overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy. Students examined arguments between imperialists and the anti-imperialists presented in different texts. Their teacher, Mr. Kurose, divided the class into three groups, and each group focused on a particular text for 20 minutes before rotating to another. In one case, a group discussed the meanings inherent in two poems, one from each side of the imperialist debate. The lesson was designed to engage complex thinking in that the students were required to analyze the texts in order to interpret the messages they conveyed. Mr. Kurose also asked the students to consider the author's voice, tone, and political intentions. Complex thinking was also engaged by connecting the activities to the more abstract concept of imperialism.

There was also evidence that the lesson incorporated the other criteria needed to consider it at the enacting level of Challenging Activities (CREDE, n.d.e). The students knew the standards upon which they would be judged because Mr. Kurose gave them guidelines for what he would use to judge their interpretations (clear reasoning, reference to the text, connections to imperialism). Mr. Kurose also *assisted* students' complex thinking through questioning and by demonstrating his own interpretation of a quote from one of the poems. Finally, he provided feedback to students about their interpretations and reasoning. The following excerpt exemplifies how Mr. Kurose helps one student interpret Kipling's poem *White Man's Burden*:

Mr. Kurose: Who is the half devil, half child?

Cyrus: The White Man.

Mr. Kurose: Is it? Is he referring to the White Man? Who is he talking about?

Cyrus: No, he is referring to everybody else.

Mr. Kurose: He's referring to everybody else, right?

Cyrus: Everybody but the White people.

Mr. Kurose: So, instead of using the word, half devil, half child, what is he saying about them?

Cyrus: They are savages.

Mr. Kurose: They are savages. They are uncivilized right? So, what is he saying that we should do?

Cyrus: It is saying that they got to take care of them and teach them, yeah?

Mr. Kurose: Yes, that's right! So, when he says, "Take up the White Man's Burden," what is the White Man's burden?

Cyrus: Civilize all of the savages.

Instructional Conversation

The fifth CREDE Standard, Instructional Conversation (IC), applies Vygotsky's (1978) emphasis on learning through discourse (CREDE, n.d.f; Tharp et al., 2000). IC is like other conversations in that (a) all individuals are expected to participate in the discussion, (b) what one conversational partner says influences how others respond, and (c) all contributions may steer the discussion onto different paths (CREDE, n. d.f; Tharp et al., 2003). An IC is unlike other conversations in that there is a focus on a particular learning goal. In ICs, teachers ask questions to assess what students know, and use this information to guide them toward new and more sophisticated understandings. This kind of talk contrasts with that of a more recitative classroom, where teachers dominate the discourse, asking questions for which the answers are already known, and students try to guess what their teacher is thinking (Mehan, 1979).

For a classroom discussion to be rated at the developing level of Instructional Conversation on the SPC, teachers need to converse with a small group of students and to elicit student talk through questioning, listening, rephrasing, and modeling (CREDE, n.d.a). Like the requirement of a small group necessary for Joint Productive Activity, it is necessary to have a small group of students to implement an IC because a more intimate group maximizes the possibility that all students will participate and that the teacher can be responsive to students' interests and comments.

In order for a lesson to be considered to be at the enacting level of IC, (a) the teacher must also question students on their views, judgments, and rationales; (b) all students must participate in the IC; and (c) student talk should occur at a rate higher than that of the teacher (CREDE, n.d.a). In our work with the HSP, we have found that this Standard is the hardest one for teachers to enact consistently. Part of the reason for this may be that

the criteria for IC at the highest level requires teachers to organize their lessons in ways that would allow them to have extended discussions with students about academic topics. In secondary classrooms, this may be a challenge because of large class sizes.

Tharp and colleagues (Tharp et al., 2000) suggest creating space and time for small group discussions by organizing the classroom into multiple centers where students work independently on academic tasks. This frees the teacher to have extended conversations with smaller groups. Whereas such a model of classroom organization may be familiar to elementary teachers, particular those working in early childhood education, many high school teachers may not be exposed to such an organizational structure and need assistance in conceptualizing how it works. Our teachers commented that planning for multiple centers can be labor intensive and requires students to be more self-regulated than when a teacher is standing by to keep them on track. HSP teachers also suggested that IC was the most difficult standard to meet because the criteria for the enacting level includes students speaking at higher rates than the teacher does. In order for this to be realized, students must be comfortable being active participants in discussions with teachers and peers, and teachers must adopt a very different discourse pattern than may be typical for them.

One place in the HSP that ICs do occur frequently and easily is in the teachers' field instruction. Part of the reason for this may be that the field instruction has been designed as a small group activity involving students and teachers. In the field, the teacher is also not necessarily the expert and the problems to be solved are "real" issues of significance to the community that engender authentic conversations about them. Perhaps being outside of the classroom helps this situation as well, as teachers and students may find that they do not as easily fall into the discourse patterns they have developed over the years for instructional interactions that involve teachers doing most of the talking and students listening.

For example, Mr. Smith and the students he supervises for the environmental science field rotation must hike for approximately 40 minutes to reach the three sites where they routinely collect data for their stream analyses. During those hikes, Mr. Smith interacts with a smaller group of students than is typical of high school instruction. The small group is made possible by dividing students into small field groups that are supervised by teachers, community members, or a combination of the two. The long hikes provide excellent opportunities for Mr. Smith to engage students in ICs about the purpose of their field work and the scientific concepts that apply.

On one of their hikes into the valley, Mr. Smith conducted an IC about the relationships between dissolved oxygen, the amount of canopy cover,

and the presence of invertebrates in the stream. He questioned students about these relationships and the factors that might influence them. For example, as part of their routine data collection, one student was trying to determine the amount of algae on the underside of a rock. Mr. Smith asked him how the algae might affect the general health of the stream, "Why would it be a worse rating if you had a lot of grass? What would that tell you about stream health?" Mr. Smith connected this point to their broader discussion on dissolved oxygen, the canopy, and invertebrates. Different students contributed their ideas until the group collectively decided that different amounts of sunlight filters through to the stream, depending on the density of the canopy. The sunlight influences plant growth in the water, which in turn supports varying numbers of invertebrates.

This example can be considered an application of IC at the enacting level because the teacher designed and enacted a discussion with a clear academic goal—Mr. Smith wanted students to analyze the relationships between three variables of the stream environment (CREDE, n.d.a). He listened to what students had to say, in order to assess and assist students' understanding by building on what they already knew. In addition, Mr. Smith questioned students on their views, all students were included in the conversation, and students spoke at rates higher than their teacher.

The Cultural Nature of Teaching and Learning

The Five Standards were designed to provide teachers with guidance in designing instruction that would promote achievement of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Each of the Standards reflects the cultural nature of teaching and learning. Joint Productive Activity and Instructional Conversation (Standards 1 and 5) are structures that develop intersubjectivity or common understanding among teachers and students. When teachers and students come from different cultural communities, they may start the school year with little in common. IC and other forms of JPA help to or build common experiences that become the basis of assisted performance and concept development.

Emphasizing language and literacy across the curriculum and complex thinking (Standards 2 and 4) are vehicles for students' acculturation into particular disciplinary communities. In order for students to learn science, they need to use the language of science, to engage in scientific thinking, and to receive assistance for these performances. This perspective views disciplines such as science and mathematics as cultural entities themselves, that include specific language, values, and ways of thinking.

Finally, Standard 3, *Contextualization*, highlights the importance of culturally relevant instruction by emphasizing the importance of connections between what is being learned and what students already know. Teachers can contextualize instruction by linking new information with students' prior knowledge both incidentally and through more "integrated" and planned actions. Contextualization can also be achieved by teaching in ways that are consistent with the interaction patterns found in students' homes and communities.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we described the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy, principles for effective instruction that developed from sociocultural theory and research on how to best educate students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. We also presented how the Five Standards have been applied in the HSP, a culturally relevant program designed to improve education for students from a predominantly Native Hawaiian community. The Five Standards provide a framework for our work in assisting HSP teachers' instruction. They fit well with the teachers' and our beliefs that learning is situated and that positive outcomes can be fostered by presenting academic concepts within a context of what is familiar and comfortable to students. The Five Standards also provide a structure by which teachers can capitalize on what students do know and are familiar with to promote extensions to new ideas and more complex ways of thinking.

The design of the HSP—the use of weekly community based field work, teaming, and the integration of cultural values and knowledge—lends itself well to the Standards of Joint Productive Activity and Contextualization (Yamauchi, 2003). The other Standards, Language and Literacy Development, Challenging Activities, and Instructional Conversation, are also compatible with the program, but appear to require more deliberate planning and reflection in order for them to be consistently enacted. Over the last three years, we have implemented professional development activities for the teachers focused on the Five Standards. In these sessions, teachers meet regularly with a university facilitator to discuss the planning and implementation of the Standards. The first year of professional development focused on teachers learning about the Five Standards and conducting a baseline of teachers' enactment of the principles in classroom and field instruction. Later sessions focused on how to enhance implementation of the Standards.

In these more recent professional development sessions, teachers watch excerpts of each other's videotaped instruction both in the classroom and in the field and rate these lessons using the Standards Performance

Continuum. The group also reads articles about the Five Standards and related approaches (e.g., applying constructivism to one's classroom), seeking to further their understanding about how to implement these principles and why they are important. The approach to professional development also attempts to model enactment the Five Standards. Collaborative activities are planned for the teachers and facilitators to work together in coming to an understanding of the level at which the Standards were enacted (Joint Productive Activity). The facilitator plans activities to generate and assist the teachers' language expression and development (Language and Literacy Development). The activity integrates what teachers know about the Five Standards and their past teaching experiences (Contextualization). Teachers are required to analyze how the Standards are enacted in their lessons and also receive feedback about their performance from the group (Challenging Activities). Finally, the main activity of the sessions is a small group discussion about the Five Standards, where participants' views and rationales are questioned, there is a high level of participation, and "student" talk often occurs at higher rates than that of the facilitator's (Instructional Conversation).

The HSP teachers have suggested that the Five Standards substitute for Effective Pedagogy is a useful framework for their continued efforts to improve their instruction. After two years of professional development framed from this point of view, the teachers still felt that continuing to focus on the Five Standards would enhance their pedagogy because the Standards are complex and can be implemented in many different ways. We also note that the Five Standards can be useful to more novice educators in that they highlight important aspects of teaching that make a difference in student learning. This can be helpful because novice teachers are often overwhelmed by the details of teaching and are often unable to discern the most important things to focus on (Berliner, 1992). In the same way that the Five Standards are appropriate for all students' learning, not just those from diverse backgrounds, they provide a framework for all teachers to reflect on and improve their instructional practice.

REFERENCES

- Berliner, D. C. (1992). The nature of expertise in teaching. In F. K. Oser, A. Dick, & J. L. Patry (Eds.), *Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis* (pp. 227-248). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Black, S. (2000). Together again: The practice of looping keeps students with the same teachers. *American School Board Journal*, 18(6):40-43.
- Carroll, J. (1999). Final Report of the Field Initiated Studies Grant. Wai'anae High School Hawaiian Studies Center; Culturally Relevant Contextualized Education. Author, Honolulu, HI.

- Ceppi, A. K. (2000). *Examining a culturally relevant, community based, secondary education program: The Wai'anae High School Hawaiian Studies Program*. University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI (Unpublished Dissertation).
- Cohen, E. G. and Lotan, R. A. (1997). *Working for equity in heterogeneous classrooms: Sociological theory in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- CREDE (n.d.a). Standards performance continuum: A rubric for observing classroom enactments of CREDE's Standards for Effective Pedagogy. (Available from the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064).
- CREDE (n.d.b). Joint Productive Activity, University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, (November 15, 2003); <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/standards/1jpa.shtml>
- CREDE (n.d.c). Developing language across the curriculum University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, (November 15, 2003); <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/standards/2ld.shtml>
- CREDE (n.d.d). Contextualization, University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, (November 15, 2003); <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/standards/3cont.shtml>
- CREDE (n.d.e). Teaching complex thinking: Challenge students toward cognitive complexity, University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, (November 15, 2003); <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/standards/4chal.act.shtml>
- CREDE (n.d.f). Teaching through conversation: Engage students through dialogue, especially the Instructional Conversation, University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (November 15, 2003); <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/standards/5inst.con.shtml>
- Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2002a, Wai'anae High School School Status and Improvement Report, Fall 2002, Hawai'i State Department of Education (July 31, 2003); arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/2002/leeward.html
- Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2002b, Enrollment 2002-2003, Hawai'i State Department of Education (July 31, 2003); arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/2002/leeward.html
- Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2003, 2002-03 Official Enrollment—School-by-School/Grade-by-Grade, Hawai'i State Department of Education (July 31, 2003); arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/2002/leeward.html
- Hawaiian Studies Program (1997). Mission statement. Author, Honolulu, HI.
- Hilberg, R. S., Doherty, R. W., Tharp, R. G., and Estrada, P. (n. d.). Standards Performance continuum manual for classroom observation. (Available from the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064).
- Kana'iaupuni, S. M., and Ishibashi, K. (2003). Left behind? The status of Hawaiian students in Hawai'i public schools. (PASE Report No. 02.03.13). Kamehameha Schools, Honolulu, HI, (June 2003).
- Little, T. S., and Dacus, N. B. (1999). Looping: Moving up with the class. *Educational Leadership* 57(1):42-45.
- Mehan, H. (1979). "What time is it, Denise?": Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice*. 18:285-294.
- Morrison, D., 2002, Classroom management linked to lesser teen alienation from school, University of Minnesota, Center for Adolescent Health and Development (July 31, 2003); http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2002-04
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs (1994). The Native Hawaiian Data Book. Author, Honolulu, HI.

- Raywid, M. A. (1999). Current literature on small schools. ERIC Digest. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse of Rural Education and Small Schools (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. FD 425 049).
- RMC (2002). CREDE evaluation report: Waianae High School. Author, Denver, CO.
- Takenaka, C. (1995). *A perspective on Hawaiians*. A report to the Hawai'i Community Foundation. Hawai'i Community Foundation, Honolulu, HI.
- Tharp, R. G. (1989). Psychocultural variables and constraints: Effects on teaching and learning in schools. *American Psychologist* 44:349-359.
- Tharp, R. G., 1999, Effective teaching: How the Standards come to be. University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (November 15, 2003); <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/standards/development.shtml>
- Tharp, R. G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S., and Yamauchi, L. A. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony*. Westview, Boulder, CO.
- Trimble, S. B., and Miller, J. W. (1998). Principals' and teachers' perceptions of the work of teaming teachers in restructured middle schools. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly* 21:1-13.
- University of Hawai'i Institutional Research Office (2002). Enrollment of Hawaiian Students, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Fall 2001. Author, Honolulu, HI.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Yamauchi, L. A. (2003). Making school relevant for at-risk students: The Wai'anae High School Hawaiian Studies Program. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*. 8:379-390.

AUTHOR NOTE

We wish to thank the Hawaiian Studies Program teachers, Dan Forman, Linda Galano, Mike Kurose, and Erich Smith, for their assistance and commitment to our study of their instruction. We also acknowledge the participation and support of HSP students and community partners. We are grateful to Barbara DeBaryshe, Ernestine Enomoto, and Tracy Trevor for feedback on earlier drafts of this paper and to Valerie Duttut for technical assistance. This research was supported under the Education Research and Development Program, PR/Award R306A6001, the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE), as administered by the Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI), National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students (NIEARS), U.S. Department of Education (USDoe). The contents, findings, and opinions expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of OERI, NIEARS, or the USDoe.

Correspondence concerning this chapter should be addressed to Lois A. Yamauchi, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Hawai'i, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu, HI 96822. Phone: (808) 956-4294. Email may be sent via Internet to yamauchi@hawaii.edu.