Journal of Modern Education Review, ISSN 2155-7993, USA
July 2021, Volume 11, No. 7, pp. 750–762
Doi: 10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/07.11.2021/006

http://www.academicstar.us

Theory and Practice, an Examination on How Second Language Acquisition Literature, and English as a Second Language Literature Address Students' Identities

Alejandra Franco Garzona
(College of Education, University of Washington, USA)

Abstract: There is much research done in relation to language and identity. I believe that the backgrounds of the scholars that are looking into these areas are as diverse as ELL students (e.g., English as second language teachers, ESL scholars, and learning sciences scholars). Their contrasting and/or similar perspectives regarding the learning of a second language are influenced by distinct theoretical perspectives. To better understand how identity is recognized in the literature, I will focus particularly on the differences and similarities between ESL and SLA articles. I intent to merge theory with practice, although, we cannot understand how these articles relate to each other without discussing how the theoretical perspectives consider identity development and learning of a second language.

Furthermore, I will take a raciolinguistic perspective (Rosa & Flores, 2017), since I believe that language and race cannot be separated, as conventional theories would posit. While often separated, raciolinguistics seeks to examine the interacting roles of language ideologies, racial differences, and linguistic differences (Educational Linguistic, 2015).

Key words: English second language, second language acquisition, identity development, language theories

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This literature review has the purpose to explore the literature and research regarding the identity of English language learners (ELL) in the K-12 system, a literature I will refer to here as English as a Second Language (ESL). A second purpose is to compare the ESL literature with a second research literature, which I will refer to here as Second language acquisition (SLA), specifically around how this second literature addresses the identity of students learning a second language.

The importance of language and identity, as reflected in the ESL literature, was explained by Norton (2000), stating that language is not just a medium of communication, but also a tool for ELLs to gain access to social networks that provide them opportunities to express themselves and negotiate their identities in their classrooms. In addition, ELLs can be unseen in the mainstream classroom or detached from the learning process if their cultural

Alejandra Franco Garzona, Graduate Student, College of Education, University of Washington; research areas: literacies in context, identity development. E-mail: jafg92@uw.edu.

identity is not being acknowledged (Sumaryono & Ortiz, 2004).

On the other hand, the idea of identity is not necessarily foregrounded in SLA theories. Within the SLA perspective, the focus is on students as individual learners and their cognition rather than students as actors within social activities (Vygotsky, 1978). A critical difference between SLA and English as a Second Language (ESL) is that SLA is rooted in theory, rather than methodology (Hansen-Thomas & Grosso, 2013). Therefore, identity might not have the same importance that is given it within ESL, althoug hidentity is addressed by some SLA teachers and scholars. With this in mind, I examine how the SLA and ESL literature spay attention to the ELL population mentioned above, and to the development of their language identity in the process of learning a new language.

1.2 Rationale

According to Beare (2019) there are approximately 1.5 billion English-language learners worldwide. In the United States alone, there were nearly 5 million English language learners — ELLs — in 2015 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018), and these ELL students are characterized as being a diverse group that migrated to the U.S. The most common languages spoken at home for these students are Spanish, Arabic, Chinese and Vietnamese (Bialik, Scheller & Walker, 2018). In addition, the highest percentage of ELL learners are between kindergarten and fifth grade (Demographics for English Language Learners, 2017).

On the other hand, enrollments in language programs other than English (i.e., SLA programs) were approximately 1.4 million in 2016, according to the Modern Language Association of America (2018). Although, the enrollments have declined in recent years, there are considerably high numbers of enrollment for Spanish and French, followed by American Sign Language. The majority of these students are undergraduate students fulfilling a language requirement in their respective universities, and many of the students enrolled in such second language acquisition (SLA) classrooms are racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse. Furthermore, the majority of these classrooms adopt full language immersion programs, focusing on students as individual learners and their cognition (Stein-Smith, 2019).

Moreover, in both ESL and SLA classrooms, language is not just a medium of communication, but also a tool to gain access to social networks that provide students the opportunities to express themselves (Norton, 2000) and negotiate their identities in their communities. If international students and immigrants do not feel empowered enough in their English proficiency and certain linguistic practices are invalidated, their ways to construct their identities will be hindered and therefore their learning, engagement, and participation will affect their success in education.

Finally, language is a complex symbol system through which individuals' personal identity, social identity, racial identity, ethnic identity, and national identity are enacted during the language learning process within certain family and community settings, as language learners acquire basic ways of acting, believing, and making sense of the world. It is also important to note that an individual's sense of self is evolving through the language learning process, as it is dynamic and changes over time, contributing to more learning outcomes. As emergent bilinguals or multilinguals, students' linguistic practices do reflect certain identities of their home culture. Vygotsky was one of the first researchers to emphasize the relationship between culture and the development of bilingualism/multilingualism. Moll (2000) expanded Vygotsky's understanding of culture by explaining that "we seek culture in human practices, situated in people's involvement with (and creation of) the multiple contexts that constitute their social worlds. In other words, people live culturally rather than they live cultures" (pp. 257–258).

2. English Language Learners and Identity in the SLA Literature

There are numerous ways to refer to students that are learning English as an additional language: Limited English Proficient (LEP) (Mora, 2002; Nero, 2005), Language Minority (Cummins, 1981). However, throughout this literature review the term English Language Learner (ELL) will be used to describe students who speak another primary language and are learning English. By using the term, I do not look to label students, since there are many aspects to the students' identity, besides being a learner of English (Rao, 2011)

Moreover, language is deeply rooted in social and personal history; it is not as static as race and ethnicity, playing an important role in the formation and expression of identity. The person is able to consciously or unconsciously express multiple identities by the choices they make when it comes to expressing themselves (e.g., code-switching). Multilingual people make and remake who they are by the language/dialect choices they make every day (Warschauer, 2001).

In school settings when immigrant students enter schools that devalue their native language, they often feel forced to choose between maintaining their connection to their native culture or being engaged in school. According to Urdan (2012) these decisions have repercussions in later generations. For example, many immigrants and their children take up the task of learning the "primary" language of their new countries, and sometimes families lose their connection to their native language, especially by the second and third generation.

Many researchers in ESL literature show interest in successful language learners and the characteristics they have. Norton (2000) explains that the success depends on their access to a variety of conversations in their communities rather than their control of linguistic forms and meanings. This perspective is consistent with Vygotsky's theoretical idea of social speech and his conclusion that language develops mainly from social interactions (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In addition to language, social interactions also benefit the construction of their identities in relationship of what Wenger (1998) refers as *communities of practice,* the concept is also used by Rogoff (2003), she expanded the idea that "people develop as participants in cultural communities" (p. 3). For instance, a classroom of undergraduate students learning a language other than English, Wenger (1998) would claim that the connection between identity and practice is profound. In order for the students to engage in meaningful conversations in the target language, it requires the formation of community where the members can negotiate their identity in classroom activities such as identity texts.

In previous years, there have been studies conducted to identify effective instruction with ELL students, where a variety of practices were identified, practices such as explicit teaching including illustrating or modeling, assessing student understanding and scaffolding ELL students to complete the task independently (Lin, 2012). For instance, Gersten and Jimenez (1994) explored the effective instructional strategies among ELLs. After two years of observations, the researchers reported that experienced teachers incorporated scaffolding in their practices, practices such as visual scaffolding, academic language scaffolding and vocabulary development. These strategies provided support and clarification for students' language learning. Similarly, Allen and Park (2011) studied lessons produced for sixth-grade ELL students, and they concluded that multiple scaffolding strategies such as visual materials and peer interpreters give ELLs opportunities to engage in complex tasks and make them more accessible. This process of achieving the completion of a task is supported through adult guidance or in collaboration with peers, consistent with what Vygotsky referred to as the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Vygotsky defined ZPD as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult

guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978a, p. 86).

In addition, to support ELLs with classroom tasks, explicit instruction in academic concepts and vocabulary is necessary, as well as instruction in language and reading comprehension. For this to happen, Lin (2012) argued that teachers must modify their instruction, and the changes must be aimed at ELL students' backgrounds, socioeconomic status, immigration status, culture, and language limitations. Lin's (2012) argument echoes the Vygotskian idea that children's learning begins before attending school, that the learning children encounter in formal settings always has a previous history (Vygotsky, 1978).

Furthermore, according to Nieto (1999), many times instructional efforts are concentrated around students being able to speak English as soon as possible without valuing students' ability to speak two languages. For instance, Cummins (1994) introduced the concept *subtractive bilingualism* in which the second language is implemented at the expense of the first language and culture, devaluing what the student brings into the classroom. Acknowledging their multiple cultural and linguistic identities, reinforcing student-teacher relationships, and strengthening students' sense of worth will ultimately boost their academic performance while supporting student identities (Nieto, 1999). From the ESL perspective, identity is a complex and expansive concept; it can be understood as the way one sees oneself and is seen by others. This identity construction is going to be influenced by many factors such as family, customs, friends, schools, and society (Rao, 2011). Therefore, the individual alone does not necessarily have control over the construction of the self.

For ELL students, school experiences can impact their identities, which can be sculpted by the perception of others and what is conceived as valuable. Such external influences could be associated to *internalization*, a concept introduced by Vygotsky, yet not fully explained. Bruner (1997) explains it as a new structure incorporated into our thinking that progressively spreads to older concepts. In addition, Bruner asserts the important role of language, arguing that "Social interaction is principally constituted and mediated by speech, what gets internalized into the child's stream of thought are the meanings and forms generated in verbal exchange which themselves are products of the broader cultural-historical system" (Bruner, 1997, p. 68).

Similar to Bruner's argument that what is internalized by the individual will be mediated through speech and the cultural-historical system, Nasir (2010) uses the term *racialized identities* with the intention to emphasize the idea that identities are made racial through social interaction, positioning, and discourse. Bakhtin (as cited in Rao, 2011), also emphasizes the importance of dialogue which depends on the context, participants, and history of interactions between two individuals; the position of the observer is essential during the dialogue. However, language is often overlooked as one of the most important cultural means that individuals have for differentiating themselves from others. Regarding this differentiation, Alim (2016) argues that racial identities are influenced by language and can change across contexts and interactions. Hence, Flores (2013) conceptualized the term raciolinguistic as "racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects" (p. 150). The raciolinguistic perspective builds from the cultural-historical system that Bruner (1997) associates with *internalization*, where monolingualism in a standardized national language is considered the norm to which all language-minoritized students should aspire (Flores, 2013).

In addition, Alim (2013) provides a clear example regarding the connection between raciolinguistics and identity. He studied Barack Obama's speech pattern; in his findings he includes an analysis of how Obama's speech changed depending on his audience. Alim argued that Obama had to speak in different ways, such as black preacher style and Standard English, in order to make people comfortable with him. Obama has had to regularly

navigate between discriminatory discourses of race, citizenship, religion, and language. By employing different linguistic resources according to his audience, he also engaged in processes of identification (Alim, Rickford & Ball, 2016). It is very common that minorities adjust their linguistic repertoires according to what Inoue (2006) refers as *listening subjects*. According to Flores and Rosa (2015) even when students seem to use forms that correspond to Standard English, they can be seen as using nonstandard forms from the perspective of the white listening subject.

Thereby, raciolinguistics considers the ways that Standard English is conceptualized, based on the racialized ideologies of *listening subjects* rather than the repertoire of linguistic practices of *speaking subjects* (Flores & Rosa, 2015). The multiple discursive practices in which *speaking subjects* engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds (García & Wei, 2013) are commonly discouraged in what Cummins (2000) defines as subtractive educational models. In such subtractive education models, the main goal is to increase competence in Standard English, with minimal or no value given towards minoritized students linguistic practices.

One instructional approach that is considered an additive approach (Cummins, 2000) and has been gaining more attention throughout the years is translanguaging. Translanguaging practices include (but are not limited to) codeswitching, writing in one language while speaking in another, or reading in one language while writing in another, or inviting a language from the speaker's repertoire that is not usually used in a given setting. According to García and Wei (2013) translanguaging reflects the flexible use of different linguistic resources that students use to make sense of their worlds. She adds that as a pedagogical practice, translanguaging has the potential to liberate the voices of language-minoritized students. Otheguy, García and Reid (2015) describe translanguaging as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages" (p. 281). Moreover, Canagarajah(2011) writes extensively about translanguaging and draws on the observation that multilingual speakers engage in translanguaging practices all the time in everyday life.

Since translanguaging is a commonly used language practice among bilingual students, we can refer to it as a cultural tool, more specifically a psychological tool according to Vygotsky (1986). Therefore, as a cultural tool translanguaging is tied close together to identity construction (Rao, 2011) and as a psychological tool can be used to guide learning and behavior (Daniels, 2001). In addition, cultural tools assist in the development, outline, and change of mental processes (Cole & Wertsch, 1996).

Translanguaging is a valuable tool for children that are learning and developing cognitively, while simultaneously making sense of who they are and what their identities are in the classroom. Is very common that students do not understand the language they are being taught in, creating difficulties in the construction of meaning and learning. Baker (2006) argues that one of the advantages of translanguaging is the way it can support understanding of the subject matter by the use of ZPD. For instance, Martin-Beltrán, Guzman and Chen (2017) analyzed a transcripts of students and teachers interactions, and they identified that teachers were able to raise language comprehension and cultivate a zone of proximal development in a linguistically diversified classroom by the use of translanguaging as mediational tool to understand and acknowledge students' needs, embracing students' *funds of knowledge* (Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992) to expand language learning opportunities. Similarly, Pollar (2002) studied the effects of code-switching on subject matter learning. Pollar highlighted the benefits of Code Switching within a bilingual education program. Pollar compared bilingual education programs with immersion programs to examine the role of code-switching, the use of both L1 and L2 in the same discourse. The author found that code switching during the expression of subject matter functioned in a positive way in the

bilingual program to support learning, compared to the immersion program where the students were not unable to express subject matter because code switching was not allowed.

Finally, Canagarajah (2011) draws on the observation that multilingual speakers engage in translanguaging practices all the time in everyday life. Translanguaging is common and natural. In fact, Grosjean (1997) argues that a bilingual is never two monolinguals in one but rather a speaker with one combined repertoire that comprises all the speaker's languages. From this perspective, allowing bilingual/multilingual speakers to practice translanguaging is key to their identity formation. However, our current monolingual educational system often places restrictions on practices, and this also includes classrooms dedicated to teaching a second language, other than English.

3. Second Language Acquisition and Identity

SLA theory and research also examines the foundations of second language learning. Research on SLA has broadened over the past years, and the number of studies have increased as researchers have addressed a large range of topics, answered new questions, and worked with multiple theories, such as Behaviorism, Innatism and Krashen's SLA hypotheses.

Much early literature and research on SLA did not address students' identities, and Norton (1995) stated that SLA researchers "had not developed a comprehensive theory of social identity that integrates the language learner and the language learning context" (p.12). In recent years, however, publications in SLA have featured identity as a key concept, and SLA researchers have shown interest in the relationship between language learner and the larger social world (Norton, 2012).

Much of SLA literature has examined what kind of instruction is most effective (explicit vs implicit). Many researchers conclude that explicit instruction is effective in stimulating language learning (Norris & Ortega, 2001). For instance, Rahimpour and Salimi (2010) studied the effects of explicit instruction on SLA, and the findings indicated that explicit instruction of the language results in students' improvement in the second language. Lin (2015) defines explicit instruction as a form of learning a second language which is based on memory, repetition and fully controlled by the teacher. The emphasis on repetition is central in Behaviorism (Watson, 1913), and there have been several SLA studies that have demonstrated the advantage of repetition. For example, Mcleod and McDade (2011) studied how storybooks' repetition would help children learn more words, with the children having a total of three exposures to a reading of a storybook that included target words. Their findings showed that through repetition, children learned more words when a story was repeated more than twice than when a single story was read. Furthermore, the ability to understand new concepts in a second language may be enhanced through instruction that uses routines, redundancy in lessons, and explicit instruction of vocabulary and structure (August & Hakuta, 1997)

The process of explicit instruction requires making the learner fully aware of concepts and grammatical structures in order to reach a high level of proficiency. This explicit instruction has been used for many years and is considered a traditional method compared to implicit instruction that is relatively a new concept in SLA (Akakura, 2012). We might argue that explicit instruction is rooted on the behaviorist conviction that "practice makes perfect" (Shormani, 2014). However, practice by itself would not be enough; it should be accompanied by what Skinner (1954) refers as reinforcement. According to Skinner when children attempt to imitate the language they hear, they would receive *positive reinforcements* such as praise or just successful communication. The main influence of the behaviorist perspective on SLA was encouragement of students to practice until they formed

habits of correct language use. This behaviorist theory gives great importance to the environment and repeated exposure to a given stimulus (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). While the environment is important from such a perspective, the emphasis is not as strongly on the social and cultural aspects of learning, as in SLA.

Moreover, the lack of attention given to social factors in second language acquisition classrooms is not surprising according to Pavlenko (2002), since the field is strongly influenced by the Chomskian view of language. Noam Chomsky is one of the most influential scholars in linguistics, and his claims about language was strongly rooted in the idea that all human languages are innate and that they all have the same universal foundations (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). The SLA literature based on the innatist perspective views learners as biologically programmed for language, therefore environment makes a minimal contribution to the learning. According to Gardner (1995) the Chomskyan view is too dismissive, compared to behaviorism, of the role of caretakers and adults, since adults and caretakers are needed to help children build a strong vocabulary and most importantly help to distinguish culturally acceptable and unacceptable modes of expression. Although literature on SLA stating an explicit innatist perspective is scant, Dulay and Burt (1974) studied the grammatical errors made by SLA students. They concluded that the process of acquiring first and second language was not necessarily identical, however, the study showed that they are similar processes. Structures such as phonology, vocabulary, and grammar of the first language can provide essential scaffolding for building knowledge in the second language (Genesee, 2004).

In contrast to the innatist and behaviorist perspectives, the interactionist theory gives an important role to caregivers, and takes into consideration the influence of both nature and nurture in the language acquisition process (Peregoy & Boyle, 2013). I believe that interactionist theory can be linked to notions of identity. The interactionist theory, as the name implies, gives an important role to the interactions between the language-learning child and an interlocutor (Lightbown & Spada, 2006), and Krashen (2003) has articulated one of the most influential interactionist theories in SLA (Muho & Kurani, 2014).

Krashen has been deeply influential in SLA literature, with his well-accepted interactionist theory, and much of his research has involved the study of non-English and bilingual language acquisition (Schütz, 2009). Krashen's theory of SLA consists of five main hypotheses. First the *acquisition-learning hypothesis* is the most widely known and the most fundamental. Krashen (2003) states that there are two separate processes for developing competence in SLA: acquisition and learning. The difference between acquisition and learning is that the former is a similar process to how children develop ability in their first language, in other words, is a subconscious and implicit process. The latter refers to a conscious and explicit knowledge of the rules of a language.

Secondly, Krashen (2003) refers to *natural order hypothesis* as a predictable order to learn a language. For instance, according to the natural order hypothesis, the order of acquisition of grammatical morphemes in SLA shows similarities to first language acquisition. Third, the *monitor hypothesis* builds from the *acquisition-learning hypothesis,* in the way that the acquisition system makes assertions while the system monitor inspects, and correct errors made by the acquisition system. Moreover, Krashen (2003) states that the *monitor* can make contributions to the accuracy of second language learning, however, such monitoring should be limited in order to avoid focusing on accuracy, as opposed to fluency. According to Bilash (2009) finding a balance between fluency and accuracy is crucial in the monitor *hypothesis,* and this balance is also known as communicative competency.

Krashen's (2003) fourth proposition is the *input hypothesis,* and with this hypothesis Krashen tries to answer the question how do we acquire a second language? The main premise is that the use of the target language in the classroom facilitates the goal of students communicating effectively by providing them as much input as possible.

Krashen's claim is consistent with perspectives of researchers like Lightbown and Spada (2006), who state that comprehensible input is the main foundation of all language acquisition, including second language acquisition. Another proponent for Krashen's input hypothesis is Brandl (2008), who argues that in language learning, input cannot be meaningful unless is understandable. Likewise Lee and VanPatten (1995) advocate that "the learners must be able to understand most of what the speaker (or writer) is saying if acquisition is to happen, the learner must be able to figure out what the speaker is saying if the goal is to attach meaning to the speech stream coming at him" (p. 38).

Some programs in SLA are based on Krashen's input hypothesis, programs such as structured immersion program (Krashen, 1991) and communicative language teaching (Brandl, 2008). These SLA programs are characterized by comprehensible subject matter instruction, and first language instruction is kept to the minimum. SLA programs that are established on *input hypothesis* principlesplace a considerable emphasis on native-like language skills and the rich input that the students need to develop the target language. However, the minimal use of the first language in SLA classrooms can create emotional obstacles that manifest during language acquisition. According to Krashen (2003) the obstacle to overcome is related to his *affective filter hypothesis*, his fifth hypothesis. He states that emotional variables can prevent learning a second language; however, the affective filter does not impact acquisition directly but prevents input from reaching the left hemisphere of the brain, which develops the function of acquiring and using language. Bilash (2009), mentions different variables such as anxiety, self-confidence, motivation, and stress, and for these reasons it is important to create a safe welcoming environment where students can learn. Although, Krashen gives importance to these variables, he does not necessarily acknowledge that such affective factors are socially constructed, changing overtime and space, and possibly coexisting in contradictory ways in the student (Norton, 2012).

Krashen (cited in Schütz, 2009) argues that the best methods to teach a second language are those that supply learners with comprehensible input in low anxiety situations, containing information that interests the student. These SLA methods do not seek to force early production in the second language but allow the freedom of production when the student feels ready. These methods also recognize that in order to improve acquisition it is important to supply learners with communicative and comprehensible input, and not focus on correction of production. Lastly Krashen emphasizes meaningful interaction in the target language, in which speakers are concerned with the messages they are providing and understanding (Schütz, 2009). Therefore, social participation in a given setting is essential for the learner primarily to increase their language acquisition via meaningful interactions involving accurate representations of the target language provided by native speakers.

Cummins, another influential researcher in the SLA literature, places more explicit emphasis on language and student identity (e.g., Cummins 1984). For example, Cummins et al. (2005) explored how identity texts can support bilingual and multilingual students in the classroom. Identity texts are products created by the students which can be written, spoken, visual, musical, dramatic, or any of the combination. They characterized themselves by having positive statements that the students make about themselves. After creating their identity texts, the students were able to contribute their ideas and experiences to the classroom. They were also able to participate in class discussion about how to translate vocabulary and expression from one language to another. Furthermore, according to Cummins and colleagues (1984; 2005), through membership in their communities, learners can come to be seen as individuals that posses particular traits and language habits. Such a view contrasts with many SLA theories, such as Krashen's, that focus more on the target language and culture (Morgan & Clarke, 2011).

4. Theoretical Comparisons Across ESL Literature and SLA literature

There are similarities and differences that have become visible in this literature review. One author whose work spans ESL and SLA literature is Cummins. For instance, Cummins (1984) expressed the notion of *additive* and *subtractive bilingualism*. According to his research, an *additive bilingualism* environment helps ELL students succeed, compared to subtractive bilingualism environments where students' first language and culture are devalued by their schools and by the wider society (Cummins, 1994). Cummins' notions of additive versus subtractive bilingualism provide a useful lens with which to compare the ESL and SLA literature and the perspectives they are grounded in.

First, ESL literature is rooted in Vygotsky's theoretical idea of social speech and his conclusion that language (and all learning) develops mainly from social interactions (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Many researchers in ESL (e.g., Lin, 2012:Gersten& Jimenez, 1994: Allen & Park, 2011) provide for an important role of the students' identity, cultural background, and language practices. Such a stance is consistent with Cummins' (1994) conceptualization of *additive bilingualism* within ELL classrooms, where the first language continues to be developed and the first culture to be valued while the second language is added. In addition, ESL literature raises awareness of mediational tools such as translanguaging. According to many ESL researchers, the use of translanguaging aids students to increase their comprehension in the second language and cultivate a zone of proximal development in a linguistically diverse classroom. Thus, the use of mediational tools helps teachers to understand students' needs and embrace *funds of knowledge* that students bring to the classroom (Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992).

In contrast to much ESL literature, SLA literature reflects two main theories, behavioral and interactionist. One of the goals of SLA literature is a very practical goal: To test and find the types of instruction that are most effective in supporting language acquisition. Many researchers (Norris & Ortega, 2001; Rahimpour &Salimi, 2010; Lin, 2015) state that explicit instruction is effective in the acquisition of a second language. Explicit instruction is based on memory, repetition and is controlled by the teacher. These concepts are based on behaviorism, a theory introduced by Watson (1913). However, these practices can be categorized into what Cummins (1994) refers to subtractive bilingualism, in which the second language is implemented at the expense of the first language and culture, devaluing what the students bring into the classroom.

A second prominent theory of SLA, one that has gained popularity in the past years, is the interactionist theory, exemplified by Krashen's second language acquisition hypotheses. Krashen (2003) provides an explanation of five SLA hypotheses. However, only two — the input *hypothesis* and the *affective filter hypothesis* — refer to students' interactions with the teacher. First, the *input hypothesis* emphasizes the use of target language in the classroom, and instruction on the first language is kept to the minimum (Brandl, 2008). Consequently, the option for students to bring their language practices and psychological tools (Vygotsky, 1986), as mentioned in ESL literature, to the classroom is null. Since Krashen (2003) does not emphasize students' identities or backgrounds in acquiring a second language acquisition, his perspective might also fall under the concept of subtractive bilingualism (Cummins, 1994). On the other hand, Krashen's *input hypothesis* is also somewhat consistent with Vygotsky's theoretical idea of *instructional scaffolding*, where the objective is to pair a learner with an experienced individual to achieve a specific task or to solve a problem (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976).

Still, Krashen's *input hypothesis* might be criticized from the perspective of a concept in ESL that SLA does not recognize: raciolinguistics. SLA programs that are established on *input hypothesis* give a considerable

emphasis to native-like language skills and the native-like input that the ELL students need to develop the target language. However, Huang and Varghese (2015) state that the idea that native speakers consistently model the target language more accurately than their non-native counterparts reflects what is known as the native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992). From a raciolinguistic perspective, Rosa and Flores (2017) demonstrated the racialized ways in which ideologies of accent stigmatize language learners even when they are engaging in linguistic practices that would be perceived as appropriate when produced by native speakers.

The goal that Krashen states in his *input hypothesis* of acquiring a native-like accent can be related to his *affective filter hypothesis,* which states that emotional variables can hinder learning a second language. Norton (2012), a predominantly ESL literature author, explains that emotional variables related to language are socially constructed and change overtime and space. Hence, the idea that gaining a native-like accent can produce anxiety and stress in students (due to racialized perceptions of accents reflecting L1) is more strongly acknowledged in ESL literature. Related concepts that are recurrent in the ESL literature are language ideologies and raciolinguistics, and SLA has little recognition of these perspectives.

Regarding student's identity, the ESL literature has shifted from a focus on instruction in academic concepts and vocabulary to a sociocultural perspective in which the instruction is aimed at ELL students' cultural background, language practices and their identities that are brought into the classroom. Such a sociocultural perspective is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) idea is that children's encounters in formal settings always have a previous history and therefore ignoring their history is detrimental to their learning. By taking into consideration their histories, practices, and experiences outside of the classroom the ESL literature considers students' identities (social, racial, ethnic, national, and linguistic). Learning a new language, especially English, involves certain concepts that ESL literature has developed throughout the years, for instance how the concept of raciolinguistics considers the ways that Standard English should be conceptualized, based on racialized ideologies towards ELL students and how these ideologies affect the learning and identity development of students.

On the other hand, SLA literature seems to focus more on pedagogical interventions directed to changing learners' attributes to align them towards a native speaker competence (Firth & Wagner, 1997). In contrast to Vygotsky's notion of students' history, SLA literature does not recognize students' identities outside of the classroom. Many SLA practices are grounded on behaviorist theory, where students are trained to repeat and produce language with the fewest possible errors. Although, Krashen's (2003) work within SLA attempts to shift away from theories such as behaviorist and innatist, by giving importance to interactions, I believe he does not take into consideration important aspects of social interactions. For instance, interactions and participation in the social world or communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) are not mentioned in his hypothesis. Also, Krashen's lack of attention and acknowledgment of student's identities, cultural background, and language practices they bring to the classroom make it difficult to separate him from behaviorist theories.

5. Conclusion

Understanding that ELL teachers must have knowledge and skills in ESL pedagogy, SLA literature has provided the foundation of ESL classes and has influenced ESL practices for many years. However, in more recent years ESL research and practitioners have given emphasis to aspects that SLA literature has not been able to address identity and how identity affects students learning. In order to support their claims, ESL researchers have adopted a sociocultural perspective, emphasizing that language develops mainly from social interactions

(Lightbown & Spada, 2006), that ELL teachers must modify their instruction, and that the changes must be aimed at ELL students' backgrounds, socioeconomic status, immigration status, culture, and language practices (Lin, 2012).

ESL researchers argue that SLA theorists struggle to conceptualize the relationship between the language learners and the social world because they have not developed a comprehensive theory of social identity which integrates the language learner and the language learning context (Norton, 1995). Although, research on SLA has broadened over the past years there are still many studies reflecting behaviorist perspectives and Krashen's SLA hypothesis. SLA has been a field of study that has attracted much theoretical and empirical work, and progress has been made in gaining understanding on how a second language is acquired. While researchers in ESL literature have been paying more attention to sociocultural theories and raciolinguistics, in order to understand how does student identities affect their learning in the classrooms, the SLA literature has been paying more attention to efficient instruction in academic concepts and vocabulary. I believe that their agendas can be integrated with one another, but in order to achieve this integration it is important to pay attention to researchers that are already trying to unify both theory and practice, particularly as they attend to student identities.

References

Akakura M. (2012). "Evaluating the effectiveness of explicit instruction on implicit and explicit L2 knowledge", *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 1–29.

Alim S. (2016) "Highlight link between language and race", available online at: https://news.stanford.edu/2016/12/27/link-language-race-new-book/.

Alim S., Rickford J. and In Ball F. (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Allen H. and Park S. (2011). "Science education and ESL students", *Science Scope*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 29–35.

August D. and Hakuta K. (1997). *Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children*, Washington, DC: National Academy Press

Baker C. (2006). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Beare K. (2019, November). "How many people learn English?", available online at: https://www.thoughtco.com/how-many-people-learn-english-globally-1210367.

Bialik K., Scheller A. and Walker K. (2018, October). "English language learners in U.S public schools", available online at: https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/10/25/6-facts-about-english-language-learners-in-u-s-public-schools/.

Bilash O. (2009, June). "Krashen's 6 hypotheses", available online at: https://sites.educ.ualberta.ca/staff/olenka.bilash/Best%20of%20Bilash/krashen.html.

Brandl K. (2008). *Communicative Language Teaching in Action Putting Principles to Work*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ Prentice-Hall.

Bruner J. (1997). "Celebrating divergence: Piaget and Vygotsky", *Human Development*, Vol. 40, pp. 63–73.

Canagarajah S. (2011, May). "Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy", *Applied Linguistics Review*, Vol. 2, pp. 1–28.

Champlin M. (2016, May). "Translanguaging and bilingual learners: A study of how translanguaging promotes literacy skills in bilingual students", available online at: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1326&context=education_ETD_masters.

Cole M. and Wertsch J. V. (1996). "Beyond the individual-social antinomy in discussions of Piaget and Vygotsky", *Human Development*, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 250–256.

Cummins, J. (1981). "Bilingualism and minority language children: Language and literacy series", The Ontario Institute for Studies of Education, available online at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED215557.pdf.

Cummins J. (1984). *Bilingual Education and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*, San Diego: College Hill.

Cummins J. (1994). "The acquisition of English as a second language", in: Spangenberg-Urbschat K. & Pritchard R. (Eds.), *Reading Instruction for ESL Students*, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Cummins J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedgogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins J., Bismilla V., Chow P., Cohen S., Giampapa F., Leoni L., Sandhu P. and Sastri P. (2005). "Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms", *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 38–43.

Daniels H. (2001). *Vygotsky and Pedagogy*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Dulay H. C. and Burt M. K. (1974). "Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition", *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 129–136.

Educational Linguist (June 2015). "Raciolinguistic perspective", available online at: https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2015/06/14/why-we-need-raciolinguistics/.

Firth A. and Wagner J. (1998). "SLA property: No trespassing!", *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 82, pp. 91–94.

Flores N. (2013). "Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States", *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, Vol. 10, pp. 263–287.

Flores N. and Rosa J. (2015, December). "Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education", *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 85, No. 2, pp. 149–171.

García O. and Wei L. (2013). *Translangauging: Language, Bilingualismc and Education*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner H. (1995). *Leading Minds*, New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Genesee F. (2004). *What do We Know About Bilingual Education for Majority Language Students?*, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Gersten R. and Jimenez R. (1994). "A delicate balance: Enhancing literature instruction for students as a second language", *Reading Teacher*, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 438–449.

Grosjean F. (1997). "The bilingual individual", *Interpreting*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 163–187.

Hansen-Thomas H. and Grosso L. (2013). "How SLA theory changed my practice: Content area teachers of ELLs talk", *Mextesol Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 2.

Huang M. and Varghese M. (2015). "Toward a composite, personalized, and institutionalized teacher identity for non-native English speakers in US secondary ESL programs", *Critical Inquiry Language Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 51–76.

Inoue M. (2006). *Vicarious Language: Gender and Linguistic Modernity in Japan*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Krashen S. (1991). "Bilingual education: A focus on current research", *Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education*, Vol. 3, pp. 1–12.

Krashen S. (2003). *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use: The Taipei Lectures*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lee J. and VanPatten B. (1995) *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*, New York: McGraw-Hill

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages Are Learned*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lin J. (2012) "Principles of effective English language learner pedagogy", available online at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED562799.pdf.

Martin-Beltrán M., Guzman N. and Chen P. J. (2017). "Let's think about it together: How teachers differentiate discourse to mediate collaboration among linguistically diverse students", *Language Awareness*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 41–58.

McLeod A. and McDade L. (2011). "Preschoolers' incidental learning of novel words during storybook reading", *Clin. Res. Preschool*, Vol. 32, pp. 256–266.

Modern Language Association (2018, June). "Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions", available online at: https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Enrollments-in-Languages-Other-Than-English-in-United-States-Institutions-of-Higher-Education.

Moll L. C. (2000). *Inspired by Vygotsky: Ethnographic Experiments in Education — Vygotskian Perspectives on Literacy Research: Constructing Meaning Through Collaborative Inquiry*, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mora J. (2002). "Caught in a policy web: The impact of education reform on Latino education", *Journal of Latinos and Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 29–44.

Morgan B. and Clarke M. (2011). "Identity in second language teaching and learning", *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 2, pp. 817–836.

Muho A. and Kurani A. (2014). "The role of interaction in second language acquisition", *European Scientific Journal*, Vol. 16.

Nasir N. S. (2012*). Racialized Identities: Race and Achievement for African American Youth*, Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (2018, May). "English Language learners in public schools", available online at: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp.

Nero S. (2005). "Language, identities, and ESL pedagogy", *Language and Education*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 194–211.

Nieto S. (1999). *The Light in Their Eyes, Creating Multicultural Learning Communities*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Norris J. and L. Ortega (2001). "Does type of instruction make a difference?", in: R. Ellis (2001), *Substantive Findings From a Meta-analytic Review*, pp. 157–213.

Norton B. (1995). "Social identity, investment, and language learning", *Tesol Quaterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1, p. 9.

Norton B. (2000). *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change*, United Kingdom: Pearson Education Limited.

Norton B. (2012, November). "Identity and second language acquisition", available online at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0521.

Otheguy R., García O. and Reid W. (2015). "Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics", *Applied Linguistics Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 281–307.

Pavlenko A. (2002). "Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in second language learning and use", in: Cook V. (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 User*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Peregoy S. F. and Boyle O. F. (2013*). Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for Teaching K-12 English Learners* (6th ed.), Boston, MA: Pearson.

Phillipson R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Platt E., Mendoza M. and Lucas T. (2014). "Analyzing theories of second language learning", available online at: https://www.esolinhighered.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Ch6SLATheoriesRevisedbyAuthors-282-29.pdf.

Pollar S. (2002). "The benefit of code switching within a bilingual education program", available online at: https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=hispstu_honproj.

Rahimpour M. and Salimi A. (2010). "The impact of explicit instruction on foreign language learners' performance", *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 2.

Rao A. (2011, June). "Beyond the language program model: The importance of student identity for the English language learner", available online at: https://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1041&context=soe_etd.

Schütz R. (2009, October) "Stephen Krashen's theory of second language acquisition", available online at: https://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash-english.html.

Skinner B. F. (1954). "The science of learning and the art of teaching", *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 86–97.

Stein-Smith K. (2019, April). "Foreign language classes are becoming more scarce", available online at: https://digitalpromise.org/2019/04/16/foreign-language-classes-are-becoming-more-scarce/.

Sumaryono K. and Ortiz F. (2004, May). "Preserving the cultural identity of English language learner", *Voices From the Middle*, pp. 16–19, available online at: https://lead.nwp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/preserving_cultural_identity_ell.pdf.

Rogoff B. (2003). "Orienting concepts", in: *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*, Oxford University Press.

Rosa J. and Flores N. (2017). "Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective", *Language in Society*, Vol. 46, No. 5, pp. 621–647, doi: 10.1017/S0047404517000562.

Shormani M. (2014). "Mentalo-behaviorist approach to language acquisition", *JTTE*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 76–92.

Urdan T. (2012). "Factors affecting the motivation and achievement of immigrant students", *Educational Psychology Handbook*, pp. 293–313.

Vélez-Ibáñez C. G. and Greenberg J. B. (1992). "Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U. S. Mexican households", *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 313–335.

Vygotsky L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky L. (1978a). "Interaction between learning and development", available online at: https://oerafrica.org/sites/default/files/L%20&%20L%20reader_section%20one-reading_4.pdf.

Vygotsky L. (1986) *Thought and Language*, Cambridge, MS: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Warschauer M. (2001). *Language, Identity, and the Internet*, New York, pp. 151–170.

Watson J. (1913). "Psychology as the behaviorist views it", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 158–177.

Wenger E. (1998*). Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.

Wood D., *Bruner* J. S. and *Ross* G. (*1976*). "The role of tutoring in problem solving", *Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 89–100.