

Realizing Opportunities for English Learners in the Common Core English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards

George C. Bunch, *University of California, Santa Cruz*
Amanda Kibler, *University of Virginia*
Susan Pimentel, *StandardsWork®*

Students who meet the Standards readily undertake the close, attentive reading that is at the heart of understanding and enjoying complex works of literature. They habitually perform the critical reading necessary to pick carefully through the staggering amount of information available today in print and digitally. They actively seek the wide, deep, and thoughtful engagement with high-quality literary and informational texts that builds knowledge, enlarges experience, and broadens worldviews. They reflexively demonstrate the cogent reasoning and use of evidence that is essential to both private deliberation and responsible citizenship in a democratic republic. In short, [they] develop the skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening that are the foundation for any creative and purposeful expression in language. (Standards, p. 3).

This brief paper is intended to contribute to a larger—and longer—conversation about what those collectively responsible for the education of English Learners (ELs) must consider in order to maximize the affordances presented by the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (hereafter referred to as the “the Standards”).¹ In order to address how opportunities presented by the Standards can be *realized* for ELs—both *understood* and *actualized*—we focus on four particular areas emphasized by the Standards as necessary for career and college readiness and for becoming “a literate person in the twenty-first century”: engaging with complex texts; using evidence in writing and research; speaking and listening in order to work collaboratively and present ideas; and developing the language to do all of the above effectively. Each of these areas represents a shift from how language and literacy instruction has often been approached, both in mainstream English language arts (ELA) and in separate courses for ELs, such as English language development (ELD).²

The selected areas also highlight the fact that literacy instruction is a shared responsibility among teachers in *all* disciplines. In grades K–5, the standards articulate expectations for students in the areas of reading, writing, speaking and listening that apply to all subjects; in grades 6–12, the standards are divided into two sections—those specifically for ELA and those for history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. This interdisciplinary approach reflects the crucial role ELA teachers play in developing students’ literacy skills while at the same time acknowledging the impact other subject matter teachers have in students’ literacy development. The Standards acknowledge that college and career readiness requires reading with “an appreciation of the norms and conventions of each discipline” and writing with consideration of different kinds of tasks, purposes, and audiences.³ This focus on disciplinary literacy presents new challenges for both content-area teachers and English and ESL instructors.

For each of the domains included in the Standards (reading, writing, listening and speaking, and language), we first outline what the Standards call upon students to do, emphasizing the simultaneous challenges and opportunities for ELs. We then offer insights, derived from both research and theory, for addressing the challenges and realizing the opportunities. Before turning to each of the areas, however, it is important to emphasize the following overarching considerations:

- Any discussion about potential affordances for ELs must consider variation among ELs, including age, grade level, native languages, language proficiency levels, literacy background both in English and other languages, and quality of previous schooling.⁴
- Instruction for ELs must include both “macro-scaffolding,” in which teachers attend to the integration of language and content within and across lessons and units, as well as “micro-scaffolding” during the “moment-to-moment work of teaching.”⁵
- Because language and literacy practices vary from discipline to discipline, realizing opportunities for ELs must involve collaborative efforts across a number of different instructional settings, including ELA, ELD, and other content-area classrooms.⁶
- Practices called for by the Standards, such as *argument* and *critique*, are grounded in particular socially and culturally specific values and practices that may or may not align with those of students from different backgrounds; students from non-dominant linguistic and cultural groups may position themselves in various ways vis-a-vis mainstream expectations.⁷
- Socialization into new academic discourse communities involves not only the acquisition of new language and literacy skills, but also potential “internal and interpersonal struggles” and “emotional investment and power dynamics.”⁸

Our comments in this paper can best be understood in the context of insights about language, literacy, and learning outlined in several other papers prepared for this project⁹:

- All learning builds on students’ prior knowledge and experiences; instruction for ELs must consider *and expand* what ELs bring to the classroom.
- Instruction should provide apprenticeship for ELs in communities of practice with teachers and peers in order to develop students’ independence.
- Language development and cognitive development are interrelated and mutually dependent; ELs learn language as they learn content.
- Language can best be understood as action, rather than “form” or “function” alone; students learn to do things with language when they are engaged in meaningful activities that engage and challenge them.
- Literacy involves social practices as well as cognitive processes; reading and writing, as well as other forms of meaning-making, always represent *activity* (whether intended or not by teachers) in which participants have different purposes and take on different roles and identities.

- In order to develop the ability to read complex texts and engage in academic conversations, ELs need access to such texts and conversations, along with support in engaging with them.
- Learning languages involves expanding *linguistic repertoires* in order to engage in a wide variety of situations, with a wide variety of audiences, for a wide variety of purposes.
- With support, ELs can build such repertoires and engage productively in the kinds of language and literacy practices called for by the Standards for both ELA and other disciplines, even though their developing language will be marked by “non-native” or imperfect features of English.

1. Reading: Engaging with Complex Texts to Build Knowledge Across the Curriculum

The Standards require students to read and comprehend both literary and informational texts that represent steadily increasing complexity as they progress through school. Text complexity, according to the Standards, involves not only the grammatical features of a text and its vocabulary demands, but also elements such as the multiple levels of meaning embedded in a text, the explicitness with which the author’s purpose is stated, the typicality of genre conventions, and the extent to which the text employs figurative language.¹⁰ The Standards require that 50% of the complex texts read by students at the elementary level be informational in character—shifting to 75% in high school—reflecting the role of texts in building students’ knowledge across K-12 disciplines and after high school.

Accessing and comprehending texts featuring complexity of the kinds outlined above present challenges for all students as they grapple with new and cognitively complex ideas and concepts, particularly for those who have had limited access to such texts either at home or at school. Those reading in a second language face additional challenges, as they are called upon to process “intricate, complicated, and, often, obscure linguistic and cultural features accurately while trying to comprehend content and while remaining distant from it in order to assess the content’s value and accuracy.”¹¹ To meet this challenge, second language readers draw on a variety of potential resources, including knowledge of the (second) language they are reading in, literacy skills in their first language, reading comprehension strategies, background knowledge related to the target reading, and interest and motivation.¹²

Beginning-level ELs in the younger grades learning to read for the first time face particular challenges, as they are attempting to learn to decode written text in a language they are at the very early stages of acquiring. The use and development of oral language is particularly important at this stage, as it serves as one foundation that students use to build early reading skills. The standards themselves emphasize the importance in the early grades of students’ participating in discussions, asking questions, sharing their findings, and building on others’ ideas. It is important to note that research has shown that ELs can develop literacy in English even as their oral proficiency in English develops. Meanwhile, ELs’ early literacy experiences, including those in students’ first languages, support subsequent literacy development, and “time spent on literacy activity in the native language—whether it takes place at home or at school—is not time lost with respect to English reading acquisition.”¹³

Throughout the grades, learning about ELs’ language and literacy backgrounds, interests, and motivations provides teachers with clues as to what supports might help students to compensate for the linguistic and textual challenges presented by different kinds of texts.

Understanding students' knowledge and interests does not mean that only texts that already fit within ELs' "comfort zones" should be assigned—indeed, one of the opportunities afforded by the Standards is the promise of access to a wide variety of texts that can expand those comfort zones. Leveraging students' existing background knowledge, and building new knowledge, can be accomplished in a number of ways before and during a lesson or unit of study—without preempting the text, translating its contents for students, telling students what they are going to learn in advance of reading a particular text, or "simplifying" the text itself.¹⁴ Possibilities include pre-reading activities and conversations that access and build on students' background knowledge and set up excitement and purpose for reading in a unit; text annotations that gloss crucial vocabulary or provide necessary contextual information without paraphrasing the text for students; and activities during and after reading that allow students to engage in knowledge-building with their classmates and teachers.¹⁵ Crucial to all of the above is teachers' understanding that texts are approached differently for different purposes, and that students need opportunities to approach texts with these varied purposes in mind.¹⁶

A consideration of students' second language proficiency, literacy backgrounds, and background knowledge can also inform instructional efforts to enhance the strategic moves students can apply to engage successfully in independent reading across the curriculum—especially when called upon to read texts beyond their English language proficiency levels. Such instruction can do the following:¹⁷

- Induce readers to consider (or even research) the topic at hand using more accessible texts (including those in a students' L1 for ELs who read in their first languages) in preparation for reading more difficult texts as part of the same lesson or unit.
- Assist readers in deciding which words in a given text are critical for particular uses of the text and which can be skipped.
- Focus readers' attention on meaning-critical grammatical structures (and how those might compare with how grammar is used to make similar meaning in students' first languages).
- Build on and expand readers' knowledge about how different kinds of texts are structured.
- Focus readers' attention on specific features of text complexity by choosing authentic and original texts that emphasize one or two features at a time (such as a linguistically more accessible text that features multiple meanings, a lexically dense piece with a simpler grammatical structure, or a text in the students' native language that includes the challenging text structures of an unfamiliar genre).
- Integrate a focus on vocabulary-building with meaningful activities centered around texts.¹⁸

When envisioning how to support ELs' reading of the kinds of complex texts called for by the Standards, and how to recognize students' developing ability to do so, it is also important to consider how "comprehension" is defined and measured. As is the case with struggling readers in the general student population, ELs' developing ability to "make decisions about a text and to subsequently evaluate and revise those decisions"—arguably the kind of reading valued by the Standards—may be masked, and even stifled, by instruction that only values "correct" interpretations of what a text "really" means on one hand, or the use of a pre-ordained set of "reading comprehension" strategies on the other. In other words, especially for ELs who may be called upon to read texts with increasingly unfamiliar content matter expressed in language that

is beyond their English proficiency levels, what is important to foster and recognize is ELs' use of texts and textual evidence for sense-making, even if their inferences and processes do not initially match those of the more experienced readers or native speakers of English. This is not to say that a focus on "correct answers" is never justified. Especially in content area classrooms, such clarification may be crucial. But in terms of fostering—and recognizing—students' ability to make sense of complex text, both literary and informational, ELs may be well served by opportunities to explore—and justify—their own "textual hypotheses," even if their initial interpretations diverge from those of the teacher.¹⁹

2. Writing: Using Evidence to Inform, Argue, and Analyze

The Standards call upon students, by the time they graduate, to be adept at sharing information accurately to help readers better grasp a topic or concept, presenting arguments logically to defend interpretations or judgments, and crafting written language skillfully to achieve their purposes. The Standards draw on studies showing that a nexus of skills—using evidence, analyzing information in writing, and conducting research—is essential for success in the argument-based culture of universities as well as today's diverse, information-rich professional environments.²⁰ As students progress through the grades, the Standards ask them to demonstrate their growing ability to cite specific evidence in defense of the claims they make as well as consider the strength of the evidence others provide when making arguments.²¹ The standards also incorporate and integrate a focus on research skills in order to prepare students to ask questions and solve problems independently. The goal is to ready students for college and careers so that they are able to conduct investigations, analyze information, and create products that reflect the increasing emphasis research receives in an information-based economy. In relation to research-based writing specifically, ELs not only face the common obstacles all students experience in attempting to gather, manage, and organize the flow of information; they also must analyze and evaluate what they read while negotiating a second language. This research process requires students to read complex texts and use evidence in writing (and/or orally) while navigating conventions of textual ownership and citations, an area that offers challenges for all students in an electronic age but that can be particularly challenging for EL students who have learned these culturally defined practices outside of U.S. academic settings.²²

Just as teachers can carefully scaffold the reading of complex texts, they can also assist ELs to develop the ability to write for the wide variety of audiences and purposes emphasized by the Standards. Like first language writing, second language writing develops gradually over time, with considerable variation in individual learners' progress through different stages of development.²³ However, second language writing development is also distinct. Although second language writers are still acquiring oral language proficiency in English, they already possess age-appropriate oral language proficiency in their home language(s). Depending on their age and background, some may also have home-language literacy skills from which they can draw.²⁴ EL writers, however, are a diverse group. Some young children are exposed to writing for the first time in English-medium ELD or ELA classes. Others learn to write in more than one language in bilingual classrooms, at home, or in the community. At the secondary level, some ELs bring first-language literacy skills to the task of writing in English, but many write only in English, not having acquired home language literacy in the school or home. For individuals with prior literacy background, writing skills can transfer across languages, although questions remain regarding how these processes occur.²⁵ ELs' opportunities for classroom writing also vary according to teacher expectations, course placement, and content area, and for students with limited exposure to English outside of school, writing development may occur very slowly.²⁶

Just as print exposure improves students' long-term writing development in their first language, the features of texts read by ELs influence the writing they subsequently produce.²⁷

Several instructional strategies hold promise for ELs in meeting the Writing Standards. Overall, such strategies focus on developing what is called for by the Standards (e.g. writing different text types for different audiences and purposes and presenting knowledge gained through research) rather than ELs' production of mechanically and grammatically "flawless" writing.²⁸ Accordingly, writing instruction can do the following:

- Maximize the use of ELs' existing linguistic and cultural resources by ensuring that students have meaningful ideas to write about, allowing them to use their home languages or varieties of language during the writing process, employing technology that students already use, and drawing upon their background knowledge, practices, and experiences.²⁹
- Provide ELs with meaningful exposure to the types of texts they will be writing, guiding students through the linguistic and rhetorical patterns found in different genres.³⁰
- Ensure that writing instruction creates meaningful opportunities to communicate rather than mechanical exercises for text production.³¹ These opportunities include interactions with peers and teachers about ELs' writing and sensitive yet substantive feedback about the content of their writing at multiple points throughout the writing process.

In relation to research skills specifically, instruction can:

- Encourage students with L1 literacy backgrounds to draw upon this resource to help them locate, evaluate, and analyze information.
- Assist students in selecting reading and drafting strategies appropriate for varied research tasks.
- Provide explicit guidance on the conventions of textual ownership and citations in U.S. academic settings, alongside clear yet critical explanations of the purposes these conventions serve.
- Create opportunities that allow ELs to learn research processes by participating in teacher-guided and collaborative endeavors before attempting research independently.

Teachers can use such approaches to aid students in learning how to conduct investigations, analyze information, and create final products that meet the expectations of the Standards while strengthening and deepening the understanding students have of L2.

3. Speaking and Listening: Working Collaboratively, Understanding Multiple Perspectives, and Presenting Ideas

The Speaking and Listening Standards call upon students to listen critically and participate actively in cooperative tasks. They require students to build upon others' ideas, articulate their own ideas, and confirm their understandings through informal, collaborative group interactions as well as formal presentations that integrate information from oral, visual, quantitative, and media sources for different audiences, tasks, purposes, and disciplines. The Standards also expect students to interpret information; explain how it contributes to target topics, texts, and

issues; and “present claims and findings by sequencing ideas logically and using pertinent descriptions, facts, and details to accentuate main ideas or themes.”³²

As with reading, the comprehension of oral language requires a number of interrelated knowledge sources.³³ Effective listening comprehension also requires the use of strategies, such as focusing on relevant parts of a message, making predictions, and monitoring one’s own comprehension.³⁴ At the same time, speaking and listening in the classroom involve more than individuals acting alone. Students use *interactional competence* to participate in the social context of the classroom, negotiating, constructing, and sometimes resisting norms of interaction governing various typical classroom participation structures.³⁵ Classrooms feature a number of different speech events, each of which is “directly governed by the rules or norms of the use of speech.”³⁶ Even within a single speech event, norms can be quite complex.³⁷

For ELs to realize opportunities presented by the Listening and Speaking Standards, teachers across the curriculum can support students by offering a wide variety of classroom discourse structures. Many of the interactive structures conducive to building knowledge and discussing ideas also hold promise for language development.³⁸ Teachers can do the following:

- Engage students in individual, small group, and whole-class discussions that move beyond traditional initiation-response-evaluation structures to “bridging discourses” that encourage ELs to produce extended oral discourse and engage with academic registers.³⁹
- Develop collaborative tasks that require effective and linguistically rich discussions.⁴⁰
- Allow ELs to collaborate in their home languages as they work on tasks to be completed in English.⁴¹
- Teach ELs strategies for using their still-developing English language proficiency to engage in different communicative modes.⁴² For example, listening comprehension activities can help ELs to “arrive successfully at a reasonable interpretation of extended discourse,” rather than to process every word literally, which is impossible even for native English speakers to do.⁴³

4. Language: Using and Developing Linguistic Resources to Do All of the Above.

The Standards maintain that in order to be college and career ready, students need a “firm control over the conventions of standard English,” but also that “they must come to appreciate that language is at least as much a matter of craft as of rules.”⁴⁴ According to the Standards, students must be able to “choose words, syntax, and punctuation to express themselves to achieve particular functions and rhetorical effects.” It is important to understand that ELs, by definition, will use “imperfect” (i.e. non-native-like) English as they engage in these functions and achieve these effects. By focusing on language as it relates to communicative and academic endeavors, rather than merely as the acquisition of “good” English, teachers can help students develop and use grammatical structures, vocabulary, and written and oral conventions as resources for making meaning, for learning, and for communicating with an increasing number of audiences for an increasing number of purposes.

In the context of the expectations for all students articulated by the Standards, “language instruction” for ELs can no longer be envisioned as isolated from the context of meaningful and

engaging academic work. Although the decontextualized teaching of discrete elements of a second language (e.g. verb tenses, grammatical structures, vocabulary) may be effective for inducing the use of those elements on restricted tasks and tests that highlight them, it is unclear whether such instruction is effective for fostering the use of those elements in wider communication.⁴⁵ This is not to say that an explicit focus on language is not called for, but rather that such a focus must occur in conjunction with, and in the service of, meaningful academic work across the curriculum.⁴⁶

In supporting the development of ELs' language, it is also important to keep in mind that all school-age children (barring either extreme impairment or severe early childhood abuse and isolation) already have the linguistic resources in at least one language to engage in a wide range of communicative settings.⁴⁷ All students, therefore, have first-hand knowledge of the conventions and the rhetorical craft of language as used in their own communities of practice.⁴⁸ In fact, children who are in the process of developing more than one language may have a heightened awareness of such functions and effects because they use two or more languages.

At the same time, students' linguistic backgrounds will be more or less closely aligned with the varieties of language privileged in school, and it is undoubtedly in the interest of ELs to expand their linguistic repertoires to include those varieties. In supporting students to do so, a couple of final points are important to keep in mind:

- ELs' incomplete acquisition of standard varieties of English should not be interpreted as students' inability or unwillingness to participate in a wide range of learning, language, and literacy practices across the disciplines, including those called for by the Standards.
- With appropriate supports, ELs' participation in the key practices called for by the Standards—especially those highlighted in this paper— can promote the development of both language and literacy.

Conclusion

We conclude by pointing out that “shared responsibility” for preparing ELs for the language and literacy called for by the Standards rests not only with teachers across the disciplines, but also with curriculum developers, textbook writers, assessment specialists, teacher educators, administrators, researchers, policymakers, and others. Our hope is that the brief comments in this paper can serve as a starting point for envisioning what role each of us—individually and collectively—might play in realizing the opportunities potentially afforded to English Learners by the Standards.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Guadalupe Valdés, Judit Moschkovich, Kenji Hakuta, Martha Castellón, Aída Walqui, Lydia Stack, David Pook, Laura Alvarez, Lucinda Pease-Alvarez, and David Pearson for helpful conversations that contributed to the formulation and articulation of ideas for this paper.

Notes

¹ Our intention is not to render a judgment regarding the content of the standards, the assumptions about literacy upon which they are based, or the appropriateness of the standards for ELs. Nor is it to provide a systematic review of the empirical literature available on the language and literacy development of ELs (for such reviews, see American Educational Research Association, 2004; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010).

² Other terms to refer to these classrooms include English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and English as a Second Language (ESL).

³ Standards, p. 60 and p. 63.

⁴ Helpful discussions of the range of characteristics necessary to consider can be found in Walqui (2005), Olsen (2010), Valdés, Bunch, Snow, & Lee (2005), and Enright (2011).

⁵ Schleppegrell & O'Hallaron (2011, p. 7); see also Walqui (2006) and Walqui & van Lier (2010).

⁶ Lee & Spratley (2010); Olsen (2010); Schleppegrell (2004); Shanahan & Shanahan (2008); Valdés et al. (2005); Wineburg, Martin, & Monte-Sano (2011).

⁷ Canagarajah (2004), Pennycook (2000).

⁸ Duff (2010, p. 170).

⁹ See especially VanLier & Walqui (2012); Hull (2012); Wong Fillmore & Fillmore (2012); Walqui & Heritage (2012)

¹⁰ See Appendix A of the ELA and disciplinary literacy standards for further information about how text complexity can be defined and determined.

¹¹ Bernhardt (2011, p. 19).

¹² While research on second language readers has only begun to study the ways in which these various factors interrelate, it is likely that second language readers use the resources they have in some areas to compensate for those they are lacking in others (Bernhardt, 2011).

¹³ Riches & Genesee (2006); see also Goldenberg & Coleman (2010).

¹⁴ Available research on second language reading indicates that text simplification is ineffective for promoting comprehension and may even be counterproductive (see Bernhardt, 2011, pp. 59-60).

¹⁵ See Walqui & vanLier (2010) for helpful suggestions for creating such activities.

¹⁶ Also important to understand is that readers play multiple roles when approaching any text. Gibbons (2002) draws on Luke and Freebody (1990) to point out that readers are simultaneously *code breakers*, *text participants*, *text users*, and *text analysts*; see also Schleppegrell & Colombi (2002).

¹⁷ Many of these strategies are elaborated upon in Bernhardt (2011).

¹⁸ For examples, see Kelley, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Faller (2010) and Scott, Skobel, & Wells (2008).

¹⁹ This paragraph draws heavily from Aukerman (2008), and the quotations are from that source.

²⁰ See Graff (2003); Postman (1997); Williams & McEnerney (n.d.).

²¹ Using evidence is particularly emphasized in Reading Standard 1 and Writing Standard 9.

²² See Pecorari (2003) and Flowerdew (2007) for recent perspectives on textual borrowing and second language writers.

²³ R. Ellis's (1994) contention that acquisition of an L2 grammar occurs in stages is echoed in findings for first language writing (Loban, 1976; Henderson, 1981; Graves, 1983). See Fu (2009) and Valdés (2001) for differing descriptions of stages observed in L2 writing development.

²⁴ See Harklau (2002).

²⁵ See Grabe and Kaplan (1996) and Grabe (2003).

²⁶ See Fu (1995), Harklau (1999), Hartman & Tarone (1999), Valdés (2001), and Valdés & Sanders (2006).

²⁷ For the effects of exposure to print in the L1, see Wagner and Stanovich (1996); for the impact of texts read on L2 writing, see Samway and Taylor (1993).

²⁸ See Truscott's (1996) review claiming no evidence supporting grammar correction in writing instruction and Ferris' (1999) rebuttal and subsequent publications (2002, 2003).

²⁹ See the recent collection edited by Manchón (2011) regarding the use of writing in the learning process. For uses of the first language while writing, see Fu (2009), Kibler (2010), National Council of Teachers of English (2012), and Souryasack & Lee (2007). Black (2005) and Smythe & Neufeld (2010) suggest the use of various technologies to

facilitate writing. See Langer (1997), McGinnis (2007), and Trueba, Moll, Diaz, & Diaz (1984) regarding use of students' background knowledge, practices, and experiences.

³⁰ Such instruction can focus explicitly on the role of grammatical and lexical features in making meaning for different audiences and purposes (e.g. Achugar, Schleppegrell, & Oteiza, 2007; Aguirre-Muñoz, Park, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2008; Gebhard, Harman, and Seger, 2007; Gebhard & Willett, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2004).

³¹ For an example, see Bunch, Lotan, Valdés, & Cohen (2005); see also Valdés (2001) and Valdés & Sanders (2006).

³² Standards, p. 49.

³³ Sources of information required for listening comprehension include schematic knowledge (factual, sociocultural, and discourse-related background information), contextual knowledge (physical settings, participants, and what has been/will be said), and systemic knowledge (semantics, syntax, and phonology) (Anderson & Lynch, 1988).

³⁴ See Anderson & Lynch (1988) and Goh (2005). It is also important to understand that because comprehension rests on such a broad base of knowledge and strategies relevant to a given situation, the fact that ELs and their interlocutors encounter difficulties in spoken interaction is not surprising: second language listening research has documented a range of lexical, grammatical, and conceptual causes of misunderstandings for non-native speakers in spoken interactions (Rost, 2002).

³⁵ Cazden (1986, 2001); Mehan (1979); Philips (1972, 1983).

³⁶ Hymes (1972, p. 56).

³⁷ In classroom presentations, for example, students are often asked to manage the floor, either as individuals or as a group, while also being ready to respond to the teachers' unpredictable interjections and directives at moment's notice, as well as often engage with the student audience's questions and comments after the delivery of information (Bunch, 2009). Meanwhile, during the entire presentation, students are called upon to address different audiences simultaneously. In almost every presentation, students are asked to address their fellow classmates while knowing that the teacher is the audience who will ultimately be evaluating them. Some presentations additionally call for students to imagine that their audience knows nothing about the topic they are presenting on (even if this is not the case), or to engage in a roleplay in a contemporary or historical context. Engaging in whole-class discussions or group work involve different, but similarly complicated, rules of interaction and audience engagement.

³⁸ See Gutiérrez (1995); Hawkins (2004); McGroarty (1993); McGroarty & Calderón (2005).

³⁹ See Mehan (1979) and Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) for an overview of the three-part classroom discourse structure; the term "bridging discourses" comes from Gibbons (2006); see also Wells (1999) and Valdés (2004).

⁴⁰ See Bunch (2006, 2009); Bunch, Abram, Lotan, & Valdés, (2001); Bunch et al. (2005).

⁴¹ See Anton & DeCamilla (1998); Brooks & Donato (1994); DeGuerrero & Villamil (2000); Kibler (2010); Swain & Lapkin (2000).

⁴² These include the *interpersonal mode*, which requires moment-by-moment, unplanned interaction but affords the opportunity for immediate clarification of meaning; the *presentational modes*, which allows for planning but requires anticipating audiences' needs; and *interpretive mode*, which does not require production but does not generally allow for clarification of understanding (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996).

⁴³ See Brown & Yule (1983, p. 57). A number of helpful instructional activities for focusing on listening comprehension in the context of K-12 academic content instruction are available in Gibbons (2002) and Zwiers (2008).

⁴⁴ Standards, p. 51.

⁴⁵ See Valdés, Capitelli, & Alvarez (2011) for a review of the literature on this topic.

⁴⁶ For examples of integrating a focus on discrete language features with meaningful academic work, see Gebhard, Harman, & Seger (2007); Schleppegrell (2004), Kelley, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Faller (2010); and Scott, Skobel, & Wells (2008).

⁴⁷ All students, regardless of their language or cultural background, speak one or more variety of a home language, and that variety is associated with students' geographical background, racial and ethnic community, and identity affiliations; there are no speakers of any language without an "accent," and, from a linguistic standpoint, there are no varieties of English (or any other language) that are superior to any other variety (see MacSwan, 2000; MacSwan, Rolstad, & Glass, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005).

⁴⁸ See Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martinez (2009); Gutiérrez & Orellana (2006); Orellana & Gutiérrez (2006).

References

- Achugar, M., Schleppegrell, M., & Oteíza, T. (2007). Engaging teachers in language analysis: A functional linguistic approach to reflective literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Technique*, 6(2), 8-24.
- Aguirre-Muños, Z., Park, J. E., Amabisca, A., & Boscardin, C. K. (2008). Developing teacher capacity for serving ELLs' writing instructional needs: A case for systematic functional linguistics. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 31, 295-322.
- American Educational Research Association (2004). English language learners: Boosting academic achievement. *Research Points* 2(1). Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net/ResearchPoints.htm>.
- Anderson, A., & Lynch, T. (1988). *Listening*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Anton, M., & DeCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314-353.
- Aukerman, M. (2008). In praise of wiggle room: Locating comprehension in unlikely places. *Language Arts*, 86(1), 52-60.
- Bernhardt, E. B. (2011). *Understanding advanced second-language reading*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Black, R. W. (2005). Access and affiliation: The literacy and composition practices of English-language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 118-128.
- Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispana*, 77(2), 262-274.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bunch, G. C. (2006). "Academic English" in the 7th grade: Broadening the lens, expanding access. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5, 284-301.
- Bunch, G. C. (2009). "Going up there": Challenges and opportunities for language minority students during a mainstream classroom speech event. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 81-108.
- Bunch, G. C., Abram, P. L., Lotan, R. A., & Valdés, G. (2001). Beyond sheltered instruction: Rethinking conditions for academic language development. *TESOL Journal*, 10(2/3), 28-33.
- Bunch, G. C., Lotan, R., Valdés, G., & Cohen, E. (2005). Keeping content at the heart of content-based instruction: Access and support for transitional English learners. In J. Crandall & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in primary and secondary school settings* (pp. 11-25). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2004). Multilingual writers and the struggle for voice in academic discourse. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 266-289). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 432-463). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- DeGuerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 51-68.
- Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169-192.

- Dutro, E., & Collins, K. (2011). Journey through nine decades of NCTE-published research in elementary literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 46(2), 141-161.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Enright, K. A. (2011). Language and literacy for a new mainstream. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(1), 80-118.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-11.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in L2 student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Flowerdew, J., Li, Y. (2007). Plagiarism and second language writing in an electronic age. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 161-183.
- Fu, D. (1995). *My trouble is my English: Asian students and the American dream*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fu, D. (2009). *Writing between languages: How English language learners make the transitions to fluency*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.
- Gebhard, M., Harman, R., & Seger, W. (2007). Reclaiming recess: Learning the language of persuasion. *Language Arts*, 84(5), 419-430.
- Gebhard, M. & Willett, J. (2008). Social to academic: University-school district partnership helps teachers broaden students' language skills. *Journal of Staff Development*, 29(1), 41-45.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging discourses in the ESL classroom*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Goh, C. (2005). Second language listening expertise. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 64-84). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goldenberg, C., & Coleman, R. (2010). *Promoting academic achievement among English learners: A guide to the research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Graff, G. (2003). *Clueless in academe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (1995). Unpackaging academic discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 19, 21-37.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Morales, P. Z., & Martinez, D. C. (2009). Re-mediating literacy: Culture, difference, and learning for students from nondominant communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 33, 212-245.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Orellana, M. F. (2006). The "problem" of English learners: Constructing genres of difference. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40, 502-507.

- Harklau, L. (1999). The ESL learning environment in secondary school. In C. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 42-60). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 329-350.
- Hartman, B., & Tarone, E. (1999). Preparation for college writing: Teachers talk about writing instruction for southeast Asian American students in secondary school. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 99-118). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hawkins, M. R. (2004). Researching English language and literacy development in schools. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 14-25.
- Henderson, E.H. (1981). *Learning to read and spell: The child's knowledge of words*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Hull, G. (2012, January). What is the development of literacy the development of? Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kelley, J. G., Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., & Faller, S. E. (2010). Effective academic vocabulary instruction in the urban middle school. *The Reading Teacher*, 64(1), 5-14.
- Kibler, A. (2010). Writing through two languages: First language expertise in a language minority classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 121-142.
- Langer, J. A. (1997). Literacy acquisition through literature. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40(8), 606-614.
- Lee, C. D., & Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenge of adolescent literacy*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Leki, I. (2003). Coda: Pushing L2 writing research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 103-5.
- Loban, W. (1976). *Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1990). Literacies programs: Debate and demands in cultural context. *Prospect*, 5(3), 7-16.
- MacSwan, J. (2000). The threshold hypothesis, semilingualism, and other contributions to a deficit view of linguistic minorities. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 22(1), 3-45.
- MacSwan, J., Rolstad, K., & Glass, G. V. (2002). Do some school-age children have no language? Some problems of construct validity in the Pre-LAS Español. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(2), 213-238.
- Manchón, R. (Ed.) (2011). *Learning to write and writing to learn in an additional language*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- McGinnis, T. A. (2007). Kmher rap boys, X-Men, Asia's fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating multilingual and multimodal classroom contexts. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(7), 570-579.
- McGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D. Holt (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: A response to linguistic and cultural diversity* (pp. 19-46). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- McGroarty, M., & Calderón, M. (2005). Cooperative learning for second language learners: Models, applications, and challenges. In P. A. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Academic success for English language learners* (pp. 174-194). White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2011). Resolution on the student's right to incorporate heritage and home languages in writing. Retrieved from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) website: <http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/homelanguages>.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- Orellana, M. F., & Gutiérrez, K. D. (2006). What's the problem? Constructing different genres for the study of English learners. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 41(1), 118-123.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317-345.
- Pennycook, A. (2000). The social politics and the cultural politics of language classrooms. In J. K. Hall & W. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Philips, S. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classrooms. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Postman, N. (1997). *The end of education*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Riches, C., & Genesee, F. (2006). Literacy: Crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. M. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 64-108). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening*. Harlow, England: Pearson
- Samway, K. D., & Taylor, D. (1993). Inviting children to make connections between reading and writing. *TESOL Journal*, 2(3), 7-11.
- Saunders, W. & Goldenberg, C. (2010). Research to guide English Language Development instruction. In *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 21-81). Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schleppegrell, M. J., & Colombi, M. C. (Eds.). (2002). *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schleppegrell, M. J., & O'Hallaron, C. L. (2011). Teaching academic language in L2 secondary settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 3-18.
- Scott, J. A., Skobel, B. J., & Wells, J. W. (2008). *The word-conscious classroom: Building the vocabulary readers and writers need*. New York: Scholastic.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40-59.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London, England: Oxford University Press.

- Smythe, S., & Neufeld, P. (2010). "Podcast time": Negotiating digital literacies and communities of learning in a middle years ELL classroom. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 53(6), 488-496.
- Souryasack, R., Lee, J. S. (2007). Drawing on students' experiences, cultures and languages to develop English language writing: Perspectives from three Lao heritage middle school students. *Heritage Language Journal*, 5(1), 79-97.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 251-274.
- Wineburg, S., Martin, D., & Monte-San, C. Reading like a historian: Teaching literacy in middle and high school history classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Trueba, H. T., Moll, L. C., Diaz, S., & Diaz, R. (1984). Final report: Improving the functional writing of bilingual secondary students. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED240862). Retrieved April 1, 2011, from EBSCOHost ERIC database.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Valdés, G. (2001). Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Valdés, G. (2004). Between support and marginalisation: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2&3), 102-132.
- Valdés, G., Bunch, G. C., Snow, C. E., & Lee, C. (2005). Enhancing the development of students' language(s). In L. Darling-Hammond, J. Bransford, P. LePage, K. Hammerness & H. Duffy (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 126-168). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Valdés, G., Capitelli, S., & Alvarez, L. (2011). *Latino children learning English: Steps in the journey*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Valdés, G., & Sanders, P. A. (2006). Latino ESL students and the development of writing abilities. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Evaluating writing: The role of teachers' knowledge about text, learning, and culture* (pp. 249-278). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- van Lier, L., & Walqui, A. (2012, January). How teachers and educators can most usefully and deliberately consider language. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA.
- Walqui, A. (2005). Who are our students? In P. A. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Academic success for English language learners* (pp. 7-21). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2), 159-180.
- Walqui, A., & Heritage, M. (2012, January). Instruction for diverse groups of English language learners. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA.
- Walqui, A., & Van Lier, L. (2010). Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Wagner, R., & Stanovich, K. (1996). Expertise in reading. In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *The road to excellence* (pp. 189-225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wells, G. (1999). Putting a tool to different uses: A reevaluation of the IRF sequence. In *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education* (pp. 167-208). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L., & Fillmore, C. (2012, January). What does text complexity mean for English learners and language minority students? Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA.

Williams, J. M., & McEnerney, L. (n.d.). Writing in college: A short guide to college writing. Retrieved from <http://writing-program.uchicago.edu/resources/collegewriting/index.htm>

Zwiers, J. (2008). Building academic language: Essential practices for content classrooms, Grades 5-12. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

The Understanding Language Initiative would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for making this work possible. For more information about this paper, please contact **UnderstandingLanguage@stanford.edu**

Understanding Language

Stanford University School of Education
485 Lasuen Mall
Stanford, CA 94305-3096
ell.stanford.edu