Center on Innovations in Learning

Thank you for downloading

Next-Generation Teachers in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms
Tamara Sniad

from the Center on Innovations in Learning website
www.centeril.org

Next-Generation Teachers in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

Tamara Sniad

Language learning is a lifelong process. Recently, at the age of 41, I learned about "transoms," or windows that sit above doors or larger windows, during a Victorian home tour. Around the same time, I began using "squish," which, according to the online *Urban Dictionary*, refers to a platonic crush. I acquired this term through a class discussion with undergraduate education majors about my fondness for my child's first grade teacher. Whether it is gaining technical language specific to a profession or field, such as "transom"; expanding uses of existing words and structures to new meanings, such as "squish"; or incorporating brand new words added to the language through technology, pop culture, or other languages, we are continuously developing as language users. Keeping this perspective is important while reading this chapter.

All Learners Are Language Learners; All Teachers Are Language Teachers

In all the content areas—science, math, history, physical education, and the arts— effective teachers recognize and appreciate the interconnectivity of content and language. Interacting with academic content and conveying understanding requires, but is not limited to, new vocabulary, specialized structures in written and spoken language, and awareness of appropriate language styles based on contexts. As Tan (2011) argues, when content area teachers see language teaching as the responsibility of others (i.e., the English language specialists), they fail to see or take advantage of rich, meaningful language learning opportunities in their classrooms. These moments can substantially improve not only the language development of English learners (ELs), but also their connections to the content and classroom community.

Language learning inherently is personal and varied. In linguistically diverse classrooms, teachers need to be prepared to adjust, adapt, challenge, and support based on what they know about their students' abilities, approaches to learning, and experiences. High-level English users need supports in growing in their knowledge and uses of technical language and academic structures. Students learning English as a second or third language, or emergent bilinguals (EBs; Garcia, 2009c), need personalized support to

acquire the (basic) English language required to participate in class activities and content instruction (Garcia, 2009c).[1]

This chapter, therefore, is not about becoming an English language teaching specialist. Rather, it is about personalizing teaching to the English language needs, interests, and goals of all students in an academic program. This personalization, as Redding (2013) emphasizes, "ensues from the relationships among teachers and learners and the teacher's orchestration of multiple means for enhancing every aspect of each student's learning and development" (p. 6). The information in this chapter will equip teachers with background information on maximizing resources, differentiation strategies to maintain high academic standards, and techniques for promoting language acquisition in linguistically diverse classrooms.

Linguistic Diversity in U.S. Schools

The past 40 years have seen an unprecedented growth in the number of EBs enrolled in K–12 schools in the U.S. From 1980 to 2009, the number of EBs enrolled in K–12 schools rose 42% (Aud et al., 2011), making this group the fastest growing student population in the U.S. With more than 2.6 million school-age learners identified as EBs, the majority of teachers across the country likely have at least one EB in their classes. With this diversification of classrooms come new responsibilities and needs within schools, from increasing support staff for English language support and communications with families to preparing teachers for the challenges—and opportunities—this population of students brings to the mainstream classroom.

> *The past 40 years have seen an unprecedented growth in the number of EBs enrolled in K–12 schools in the U.S.*

Although the demand is well documented, schools and districts continue to struggle to meet these needs. Intentionally or not, many EBs are marginalized in their classes, relegated to the back or side of the room to "absorb" what they can. After years of not receiving the appropriate support, EBs fall increasingly behind their English-speaking peers. In 2013, fourth graders classified as EBs scored 39 points lower than their English-speaking peers (187 vs. 226) on a 500-point reading scale. The achievement gap widens to a 45-point difference among eighth graders. In math, fourth graders classified as EBs scored 25 points lower than their English-speaking peers, and eighth graders, the same year, had a 41-point gap (Kena et al., 2014). Ultimately, these trends lead to dropout rates almost twice that of native and fluent English speakers (Callahan, 2013) as well as lower employment opportunities.

Teacher Support and Preparation

To address a lack of consistency within and across states in the identification, progress tracking, and instruction of EBs, Wisconsin and Delaware partnered in 2002 to establish the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium and craft a set of standards. The group published resources, provided training, and advocated for additional states to join. Today 36 states plus the District of Columbia belong

---

[1] Garcia (2009c) convincingly argues, "Calling these children emergent bilinguals makes reference to a positive characteristic—not one of being limited or being learners, as LEPs and ELLs suggest" (p. 322). As such, the term emergent bilingual (EB) will be used in place of the more traditional English language learner (ELL), limited English proficient (LEP), or English learner (EL).

to the consortium effectively creating—or working toward—uniformity in terminology, assessment, and instructional targets. According to WIDA's website, from 2013 to 2014, ACCESS for EBs, the WIDA proficiency assessment, was administered by 33 state education agencies to 1,372,611 students.

Although more than half of the U.S. states are sharing testing and pedagogical materials related to EBs, there is less consistency in teacher preparation for teaching in the linguistically diverse classroom. According to a 2008 national survey of new teacher preparation programs, only four states require specific coursework related to second language acquisition in all of their certification programs. Seventeen states make some degree of reference to the special needs of EBs in their teacher certification standards. Another 17 states refer to "language" as an example of diversity in their general teacher certification standards (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008). The limited attention in mainstream teacher training might be attributed to outdated assumptions that either teachers will not have these students in their classrooms or emergent bilinguals will be within the purview of a school's language (ESL) specialist. To the contrary, research shows that EB students are spending the majority of their time during the school day in mainstream classrooms with teachers unaccustomed and ill prepared to address the needs of students learning a second language alongside the content of their classes (Lopes-Murphy, 2012; Reeves, 2006; Walker, Shafer, & Liams, 2004).

One of the first states to require coursework that attends to EBs is Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Department of Education teacher preparation mandate includes "3 credits or 90 course hours addressing the academic needs and adaptations for ELL students" (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2008, p. 48). The course or professional development requirements include foundational knowledge in language and language structures; processes of acquiring multiple language and literacy skills; distinctions among academic and social language; social, cultural, and learning style influences on language acquisition processes; bias in instruction, assessments, and materials; and cross-cultural interaction competencies.

As the coordinator and field placement supervisor for this required course in a Pennsylvania public university teacher education program, I have collaborated with other Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) faculty and instructors for the past several years to design and deliver a course that meets these state specifications. What follows in this chapter are the "headlines" from this work. Specifically, what is offered here is a condensed, accessible synopsis of research-based strategies and approaches most effective for K–12 educators seeking to personalize instruction for EBs in their content areas.

Closely connected to personalized learning, the perspective presented in this chapter is grounded in the ecological approach to language and learning which views language as a multifarious and complex system and language learning as a powerful, creative, and individual process (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008). Ecology, by definition, is comprehensive, dynamic and interactive, and situated (Garner & Borg, 2005). In contrast to cognitive theories, which consider language learning a relatively uniform process, the ecological approach looks holistically at the learner and learning context. Interactions among learners and their peers, teachers, and texts have long been accepted as contributors to language learning, especially when they provide opportunities for negotiation for meaning (see Moss & Ross-Feldman, 2003). Expanding on this concept, the ecological perspective

also appreciates the nuanced contexts in which these activities take place as either source or resource for learning. As van Lier (2011) writes, "at the micro level of the classroom, a focus on ecological processes can awaken in the students (and teachers) a spirit of inquiry and reflection and a philosophy of seeing and hearing for yourself, thinking for yourself, speaking with your own voice, and acting jointly within your community" (p. 99).

The following sections of this chapter offer strategies and rationales for personalized learning for EBs in the content areas, including personalized (English) language learning trajectories and strategies for broadening students' awareness, skills, and knowledge of (English) language forms and uses needed for school success.

Personalized Learning Environments in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

At the onset of each semester, I am inevitably asked some variation of, "How can I teach them [math/science/literature/history]? They don't know a word of English, and I don't speak their language." Such statements are typically followed by critiques of school structures and limitations of resources to create isolated, specialized programs. Undoubtedly, some of the greatest hurdles to educating EBs in an inclusive environment are fears, insecurities, biases, and assumptions of the school and classroom leaders. Low teacher expectations, consciously or not, are transmitted through teachers' classroom talk (Kendall, 1983; Straehler-Pohl et al., 2014) and, even when attempting to comfort students for low performance, can discourage students (Rattan, Good, & Dweck, 2012).

Not only do teachers' attitudes toward EBs in their classes potentially shape their behaviors, those attitudes can also impact the attitudes of students toward themselves and one another. If the teachers consider the instruction of EBs in their classes as extraneous work, see EBs as not "real" members of their classes, as unable to contribute productively to the classes, or as pity cases, so will the students in the class, including the EBs themselves. Before planning, preparing, and delivering instruction, teachers must reflect honestly and completely on the environment they are creating for their students. The more positive teachers' attitudes and behaviors are toward these students, the more welcoming, inclusive, and effective the classroom will be for them.

Use Table 1 to reflect candidly on your own attitudes about learners of English, their families, and communities.

Table 1. Inventory of Attitudes and Perceptions

Having EBs takes away from English-dominant students.	Having EBs enriches the learning of my English-dominant students
I'm frustrated these students are part of my class.	I'm excited these students are part of my class.
There is no way for me to communicate with them.	I can communicate using images, gestures, facial expression, and so on.
The EBs in my class are really the ESL specialist's students.	The EBs in my class are my students.
Until they are proficient in English, these students will not be able to do content area work.	EBs need differentiation; some know more about the content than my English-dominant students do.

Note: EB = emergent bilinguals; ESL = English as a second language.

Overtly Value Bilingualism

Respond to students' comments—or preemptively comment regularly—"It's so amazing to know two or more languages!" Talk about your own experiences using, learning, or trying to learn another language. Ask questions about your EBs' first languages and display interest. Have them share experiences with what Garcia (2009a) calls *translanguaging*, or how they navigate the use of multiple languages. Beyond code switching, translanguaging is "the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes...to maximize communicative potential" (Garcia, 2009b, p. 140).

As they communicate, language users draw on all their linguistic resources, whether it is using a word or phrase in one language when an equivalent does not exist—or is not known—in another, or stylizing language for emphasis, humor, or in-group marking. In addition to social and communicative benefits, translanguaging has been associated with advanced cognition, executive function, and problem solving.

Personalize the Classroom

Avoid the token or generic cultural decorations. Rather, have all students bring in something or create something that represents *them*, not their "culture" to decorate your room. As new students arrive, they can add to the environment as a step toward being part of the class community. When you have multiple classes of students in the same room, dedicate different spaces to each.

Draw on Students' Resources

Conceptualizing your students as resources will not only enhance the relevancy of your lessons but will also provide opportunities to value and build a dynamic and respectful community. Two concepts contribute to this recommendation, (a) funds of knowledge, or perspectives and (cultural) knowledge acquired in the home (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992), and (b) funds of identity, or lived experiences that contribute to a child's worldview and sense of self (Esteban-Guitart & Moll, 2014). Make concerted efforts to learn about your students' talents, personal and family experiences, and background knowledge related to academic learning and life outside of school. When you show that you want to know more about your EBs, particularly as you are making efforts to communicate using adjusted language and gestures, you will set an example for students and contribute to the relationships needed for personalized teaching and learning.

Prepare to Help Students Communicate Their Immediate Needs

A newcomer with very limited English proficiency could arrive in your class any day. Make sure you are ready. Have on hand a way these students can communicate their basic needs, such as picture cards. If a student has to go to the bathroom or is worried she does not know where one is, how to get permission to go, and so on, that student will likely not be thinking about much else. Show students how to hold up a picture card or how to get your attention.

Make Peer Support a Norm

Provide opportunities for classmates to help each other out—but do not rely on them. EBs with higher English proficiency are not in your class to translate for you and EBs with lower English proficiency. They are certainly a resource, but they should not be your sole means of communicating with the learners. Interpreting is considered a highly

stress-provoking activity, requiring "a superb command of both the source language and the target language, immaculate memory retention, and quick information retrieval from the memory vault" (Po-Chi & Craigie, 2013, p. 1035). Although building these skills can be beneficial, this can also monopolize a student's time and energy otherwise spent on academics. Rather, use and teach all of your students how to use gestures, adjusted speech, and visuals to aid communication. Include English monolingual students in the "buddy" pool and make the position a reward or honor. In other words, avoid rewarding students for helping out other students; make being a helper the reward itself.

Personalizing Content Instruction in the Linguistically Diverse Classroom

To be equitable and attainable by all learners, clearly articulated subject-related goals need to be rooted in skills that are not dependent on high levels of language to perform. Teachers miss opportunities to personalize learning when they write objectives that EBs cannot achieve, not because the EBs cannot or would not be able to do the content work, but because the content work is deeply embedded or dependent on students' abilities to use English beyond their current proficiency level (see WIDA, n.d.).

> *Because subject content and language are so intertwined, teachers may question if and how the EBs in their classes could do the work.*

Because subject content and language are so intertwined, teachers may question if and how the EBs in their classes could do the work. As a result, they might (a) lower their expectations for students, (b) change the work so that students are not working toward the same goals, or (c) give up and not try. The recommendations in this section encourage teachers to personalize modes and means to facilitate learning, maintain high academic standards for all students, and authentically assess students on their skills and knowledge.

Craft Content Objectives Achievable by All Students

As teachers work to craft clear, attainable, and measurable objectives, they must be mindful of learning goals that can only be met with certain language skills and knowledge. Specifically, objectives that require learners to "describe," "explain," "list," or "name" set expectations for language use that may well exceed the proficiency level of EBs in the class (see WIDA, n.d.). In no way does this suggest the language use targets be removed altogether from the lesson. Rather, under the umbrella term "learning goals," we need to distinguish between two types of objectives: (a) content objectives, or those that focus on the physical skill or cognitive work of the subject, which are consistent for all learners (see Table 2 for appropriate verbs), and (b) language objectives, or those that focus on the language needed to participate in the class activities or communicate content knowledge or ability. This latter set of objectives is varied, or personalized, based on the language proficiency needs, levels, and abilities of the learners.

Table 2. Measurable Action Verbs to Create English Language Learner–Inclusive Content Objectives*

Math	Science	Social Studies & History	Art, Music, & Drama	English Language Arts	Physical Education
Calculate	Record	Locate	Critique	Contrast	Manipulate
Draw	Compare	Distinguish	Perform	Sequence	Record
Identify	Predict	Analyze	Compose	Generalize	Climb
Count	Apply	Compare	Harmonize	Question	Swim
Group	Calibrate	Criticize	Display	Reconstruct	Bat
Convert	Demonstrate	Defend	Whistle	Synthesize	Pitch
Estimate	Insert	Formulate	Tap	Design	Skip
Sequence	Operate	Map	Hum	Predict	Swing
Measure	Report	Appraise	Assemble	Systematize	Predict
Solve	Conduct	Conclude	Recreate	Arrange	Measure
Operate	Dissect	Deduce	Originate	Organize	Skate
Diagram	Prepare	Evaluate	Create	Sort	Stretch
Compare	Weigh	Contrast	Illustrate	Record	Race
Predict	Convert	Induce	Produce	Represent	Clock

*The list is not exhaustive, nor are the verbs limited to the content area columns.

For example, a math objective might read, "Solve a two-digit multiplication problem and describe the process." Although this objective does meet the criteria of being measurable and clear, the language demands of the second part of the objective may well make it unattainable for EB students. Another way to look at this objective is that it contains two sets of skills—the cognitive skill of solving the math problem and the (English) oral language skills to be able to describe the process. An objective like this is best crafted as two objectives: "Solve a two-digit multiplication problem" (content objective) and "Describe, list, or name the process of solving a two-digit multiplication problem" (language objective).

Communicate Your Content in Accessible Ways

The term "input" in the field of language teaching and learning refers to language to which learners are exposed, either written or spoken. It is what they hear and see around them in the target language. It is not necessarily what they can understand or use. "Comprehensible input," a term introduced to the field by Krashen (1982), is a subset of general language input and refers specifically to what is accessible to learners. Factors that help make input comprehensible include the use of images, signs, gestures, repetition, and simpler vocabulary and grammar structure. These concepts apply to printed materials as well as oral communication. Use all of these as you guide students in content area instruction. Specifically, as you interact with EBs, personalizing their learning, point to the board or book, gesture, model, and repeat what you are saying a few times, and, when possible, use more common language to define academic terms. Provide images alongside language. Use videos and other forms of multimedia to facilitate their understanding.

Differentiate Assignments Based on Language Development Needs

The type of product or performance you request of students as part of your assessments must align with their language proficiency level, contribute to their language and academic development, and allow you to see their progress toward the content objective.

Avoid just making the assignment easier by reducing the quantity of work. In a survey conducted by Reeves (2006), teachers cited equity, or perceived equity, as a concern with modifying materials for EBs. Reeves suggests this comes from a lack of training or preparation in the types of modifications needed for language learners. Appropriate, fair instruction for EBs is neither overly simplified nor unmodified (Gebhard, 2003). "To increase equity for English language learners, schools must provide the support that these students need to engage in challenging, content-based learning tasks" (p. 35). The modifications need to be related to language levels. If the content of the class or product of an assignment requires levels of language beyond the students' current levels, teachers must make adjustments to the *language demands* to improve access.

To personalize modifications based on language needs, consider all the different ways we communicate. We demonstrate or perform, illustrate, create or build, write, speak, gesture, and so on. Just as teachers should engage in these various means to share concepts and interact with EBs, the students can and should use these as well to communicate their thoughts, emotions, and needs. To best align what you ask of students with the students' abilities, consider Table 3.

Table 3. Language Demands of Communicative Actions

Communicative Actions (by Emergent Bilinguals)	Language Demands (on Emergent Bilinguals)
Pointing, gesturing, modeling, performing (nonverbal or limited verbal), illustrating, creating, using manipulatives	Receptive oral language skills (listening and understanding oral directions) Receptive literacy skills (reading written directions)
Speaking: naming, describing, arguing, retelling, suggesting, asking, presenting, persuading (verbal), expressing opinion, joking, directing, introducing, explaining, defining	Receptive oral or literacy skills *plus* Productive oral language skills (pronunciation, vocabulary, structure, social appropriateness)
Writing: noting, creating (a story, script, essay), composing, addressing, texting, emailing, inscribing, formulating, authoring, rewriting, recording, editing, drafting, summarizing	Receptive oral or literacy skills *plus* Productive written language skills (spelling, writing conventions, structure, genre)

For example, suppose a science lesson requires students to differentiate between items that can and cannot be recycled. Students at lower levels can be asked to sort or point to items that fit categories. The language goal will be for students to respond with gestures to the oral prompts "can recycle" and "cannot recycle." Mid- and high-level English users can be asked to name or describe orally which items fit the categories or, given appropriate literacy skills, they can be asked to label as well. The concept remains consistent

across groups, but the language levels are personalized to the students' English language abilities. Other possible modifications might include pairing students to collaborate on assignments; providing language supports, such as a word bank or dictionary; or providing additional time for completion.

Last, when focusing on the content of a class and even when developing second language literacy skills, teachers may also include use of first language materials. Contrary to the belief that language learners should be compelled to exclusively use the second language to gain mastery, research has highlighted the importance of continued first language use in developing second language literacy (Cummins, 1981b; Wong Fillmore, 1991; see also Krashen, 2003).

Personalizing (English) Language Development in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

Remember, all learners are language learners, and all teachers are language teachers. Effective teachers make targeted language usage part of instructional planning for high-level EBs and native speakers as well as students with lower proficiency. As described in the introduction, the choices and attention paid to classroom language usage must be personalized to what students already know and can do as well as their language goals, needs, and interests.

Because language learning critically relies on access and input, teachers must consider not only their expectations for learners' language production or responses to language (i.e., listening and reading skills), but also, ecologically speaking, their contextualized and meaningful use of targeted language forms throughout their lessons. The recommendations in this section encourage teachers to create realistic expectations for their students as well as themselves; maintain focus on language targets; and, at the same time, remain open and flexible to language change, unexpected outcomes, and opportunities to learn alongside their students.

Language and Instructional Plans

Determine what language is needed to participate in your instructional plan. You may have key terms or phrases or there may be specific language structures students need to understand to participate in the learning activities or that you will want your students to use in some part of the lesson. Some of these targets relate to academic language, or what Cummins (1979, 1981b) refers to as cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). This includes content specific vocabulary and grammatical structures normed for academic and professional settings. Examples are using terms *equation*, *expression*, *variable*, *term*, *coefficient*, and *equality* when describing one-step linear equations and solutions (algebra) or including relative clauses in a descriptive writing activity. (See later discussion for how to personalize these language targets.)

Other language needs may be more casual or social, or what Cummins (1979, 1981b) calls basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS). Gibbons (1991) uses the term "playground language," language that "enables children to make friends, join in games, and take part in a variety of day-to-day activities that develop and maintain social contacts" (p. 3). In the classroom, BICS (or playground language) is used in group work negotiations, making requests, and relationship building. The BICS targets that teachers can set might be very scripted, such as asking, "Can I play?" when joining a game or

using basic terms to reference classroom items, family members, and social activities. Others goals might be more rule driven, such as using appropriate pronouns in speech or writing or subject–verb agreement (e.g., I am, she is, they are). Although proficiency in all aspects of BICS may be the goal, effective teachers personalize the targets for language gains based on the student's current ability and the immediate needs of the lesson.

Note: Because language learners have greater access and more frequent interactions using BICS, learners tend to acquire BICS at a quicker rate than CALP—3 to 5 years versus 5 to 7 years (Cummins, 1981a). It is important for teachers to keep this in mind and avoid assumptions about students' academic language knowledge and skills based on observations of the students' use of BICS in social settings.

Plan Language Targets Based on (Individual) Language Proficiencies

Relevant, targeted language usage for teachers and students should be part of every lesson. Typically, teachers do include language learning and usage expectations in their plans. They have vocabulary lists, key phrases, and expectations for writing and speaking structures consistent with norms of specific academic areas. However, these targets are often buried or implied in rubrics or in the "content" objectives. To be clear on how students can meet the goals of participating in lessons and demonstrating what they have learned, teachers need to isolate the language targets and explicitly set personalized, realistic, language learning targets for their students.

Keep the Focus on Meaning

Teachers often wonder when, how, and how often they should correct students' language errors. There is no straightforward answer to this. Errors are part of the language learning process and often signal progress in language acquisition. Early in language learning, EBs acquire "chunks" of language. As they gain new knowledge or awareness of grammatical forms and rules, they explore when and how to apply these rules across contexts. For example, learners lower on the WIDA scale might produce utterances such as, "I bought lunch." As they move up on the scale, they might start saying, "I buyed lunch." This error suggests that the learner has noticed a pattern of adding "-ed" to indicate past tense and is overgeneralizing the rule as he sorts out when it applies and when it does not.

Studies on feedback suggest that students have to be ready in their developmental stage to receive corrective feedback. Also, learner preferences in the types and frequency in which they receive corrective feedback play roles in their responses to the feedback offered (Borg, 2003; Grotjahn, 1991). When there is a mismatch in feedback type and preference, learners may be less likely to notice or accept the feedback. Other research studies suggest that regardless of learners' stated preferences, some forms of feedback are better than nothing (McDonough, 2007), and opportunities for learners to be exposed repeatedly to correct forms after errors contribute to their language development even if it is not aligned with learners' stated preferences (Leeman, 2003; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009). Ultimately, whether through direct or indirect feedback or through personalized daily interactions, with enough exposure to the target forms (i.e., the "bought" example) or opportunities to self-correct, learners will likely improve accuracy.

Promote Talk as Part of Learning for All Students

Although some theories of second language learning regard output, or language produced by learners, as being relatively unnecessary to the language learning process (Krashen, 1994), others have argued that learners' production of language plays a critical role. As learners actively participate in meaningful communication, they test hypotheses about language rules, get feedback on whether or not they can be understood, request more accessible input from speakers, and modify their own output to better match targets. All of these social usages of language contribute to learners' language development (Gass, 1997; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994; Swain, 2000). Recently, these activities, which not only involve production of language but also meaning making and the transforming of thinking into artifactual form, have been referred to as "languaging" (Swain, 2006).

To facilitate languaging, cluster desks and tables and design activities to encourage students to talk. Set an expectation that all students have strengths—in language, academics, social interaction, and creativity—that benefit the group. Also, throughout your class, mix up the grouping of students according to activity goals and students' strengths and needs. At times, each of your groups will need a strong writer, artist, and orator in a group. At other times, you will group students based on math abilities. Others might be based on interests, with dancers in one group and team sports participants in another. Each time you group, be aware and explicit about your expectations for inclusion and participation.

Conclusion

Linguistically diverse classrooms offer teachers and students—whether mono- or multilingual—rich opportunities to expand worldviews; deepen understandings of culture, norms, and identity; and collaboratively develop language and academic skills and knowledge. The strategies presented here support these efforts as well as suggest (new) ways to view and maximize classroom instruction and participation among all participants. By regarding every individual in the learning environment as a language learner and teacher; setting clear, attainable learning goals; valuing contributions of students; and personalizing the process and targets, teachers will not only create a context conducive for academic success but will also contribute to each student's empowered sense of self and belonging.

References

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Kena, G., Bianco, K., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Tahan, K. (2011). *The condition of education 2011* (NCES 2011-033). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011033.pdf

Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*(1), 81–109.

Callahan, R. M. (2013). *The English learner dropout dilemma: Multiple risks and multiple resources*. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, California Dropout Research Project.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question, and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19*, 121–129.

Cummins, J. (1981a). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada. A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics, 2*, 132–l49.

Cummins, J. (1981b). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3–49). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Esteban-Guitart, M., & Moll, L. C. (2014). Lived experience, funds of identity, and education. *Culture & Psychology, 20*(1), 70–81.

Garcia, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Garcia, O. (2009b). Education, multilingualism, and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Multilingual education and social justice* (pp. 128-145). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Garcia, O. (2009c). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 322–326.

Garner, M., & Borg, E. (2005). An ecological perspective on content-based instruction. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*, 119–134.

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gebhard, M. (2003). Getting past "See spot run." *Educational Leadership, 60*(4), 35–39.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Grotjahn, R. (1991). The research programme: Subjective theories. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(2), 187–214.

Kena, G., Aud, S., Johnson, F., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A.,...Kristapovich, P. (2014). *The condition of education 2014* (NCES 2014-083). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Kendall, F. E. (1983). *Diversity in the classroom: A multicultural approach to the education of young children*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 645.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1994). The input hypothesis and its rivals. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 45–77). London, UK: Academic Press.

Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and L2 development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*(1), 37–63.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lopes-Murphy, S. (2012). Universal design for learning: Preparing secondary education teachers in training to increase academic accessibility of high school English learners. *The Clearing House, 85*(6), 226–230.

Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning, 59*(2), 453–498.

McDonough, K. (2007). Interactional feedback and the emergence of simple past activity verbs in L2 English. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 323–338). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132.

Moss, D., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2003). *Second language acquisition in adults: From research to practice*. Washington, DC: National Center for ESL Literacy Education.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (2008). *The framework for special education grades pre k–8 & 7–12 program guidelines*. Harrisburg, PA: Author.

Pica, T. (1994). Questions from the language classroom: Research perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 49–79.

Po-Chi, K., & Craigie, P. (2013). Evaluating student interpreters' stress and coping strategies. *Social Behavior & Personality, 41*(6), 1035–1043.

Rattan, A., Good, C., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). "It's ok—Not everyone can be good at math": Instructors with an entity theory comfort (and demotivate) students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(3), 731–737.

Redding, S. (2013). *Through the student's eyes: A perspective on personalized learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Center on Innovations in Learning, Temple University. Retrieved from http://www.centeril.org/publications/2013_09_Through_the_Eyes.pdf

Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131–142.

Straehler-Pohl, H., Fernández, S., Gellert, U., & Figueiras, L. (2014). School mathematics registers in a context of low academic expectations. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 85*(2), 175–199.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency, and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). New York, NY: Continuum.

Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 325–342.

van Lier, L. (2011). Research in and around the language classroom: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Introduction to the Supplementary Issue. *Modern Language Journal, 95*, Supplement s1, 1–3.

Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Liams, M. (2004). Not in my classroom: Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *Journal of Research and Practice, 2*(1), 130–160.

WIDA. (n.d.). *Standards and Instruction.* Retrieved from https://www.wida.us/standards/

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6*, 323–346.