
July 2020

Meeting the Needs of Linguistically Diverse Students in The Mainstream Classroom

Carrie Symons

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj>

Recommended Citation

Symons, Carrie (2020) "Meeting the Needs of Linguistically Diverse Students in The Mainstream Classroom," *Michigan Reading Journal*: Vol. 49 : Iss. 1 , Article 4.
Available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj/vol49/iss1/4>

This Bridging Research to Practice is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Reading Journal by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Meeting the Needs of Linguistically Diverse Students in The Mainstream Classroom

by Carrie Symons



Carrie Symons



It is probably fair to say that most teachers and researchers in the field of education know that emergent bilinguals—students who speak a language other than English at home—comprise nearly 10% of the students in U.S. classrooms today (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). As the mobility of people, commerce, and information accelerates around the globe, U.S. classrooms will continue to become increasingly diverse in terms of students’ cultures, languages, and experiences in and outside of school. Even now it is not uncommon to find multiple languages represented in one classroom in which a monolingual, English-speaking classroom teacher is responsible for the literacy and language development of all learners. While the linguistic diversity of U.S. classrooms increases, so do the demands for all students to meet high level standards (e.g., Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, College, Career, and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies) across grade levels and content areas. In order for mainstream and content area classroom teachers to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students, they must understand the role written and spoken language play in learning (Bunch, 2013; Fillmore & Snow, 2000). They need instructional tools and practices with which they can support emergent bilinguals’ reading comprehension and language learning. Rather than adding more to teachers’ plates, a focus on language can inform the instruction that teachers are already providing and support students in making connections across content areas.

Who are Emergent Bilinguals?

Prior to discussing the nuts and bolts of what instruction with a focus on language looks like, it

is important to clarify what I mean by the term “emergent bilingual” students. I use the terms “emergent bilinguals” and “linguistically diverse students” interchangeably to refer to P-12 students who speak at least one language other than English at home. Many of these students were born in the United States, but their parents were not (Goldenberg, 2008). Some emergent bilinguals may have recently emigrated from another country; some have extended families and communities already established in the United States. Some emergent bilinguals are adolescents who arrive in U.S. schools having had little to no formal schooling, which means they may not be able to read and write in their home language; some have had extensive schooling in their home language, are literate in their home language, and are becoming literate in a second language.

In the U.S., these students who are learning English as an additional language are referred to with a variety of labels (e.g., English language learners, second language learners, emergent bilinguals, students with limited English proficiency, L2 learners, bi-literate learners). A label is, by nature, limiting for a group of individuals who come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds and represent a vast range of identities, histories, races, languages, home countries, cultures, dialects,

religious affiliations, cognitive aptitudes, degrees of motivation, interests, genders, and ages. The terms “emergent bilinguals” and “linguistically diverse students” do not convey the diversity of this heterogeneous group of students, but I use these terms because they enable me to refer to a particular population of students without positioning them relative to their proficiency in English.

Recognizing the limits of labels is essential to understanding how to meet the learning needs of these students. As with any student, but even more so with emergent bilinguals, it is important to find out about their backgrounds, families, and communities. If emergent bilinguals have previously had formal schooling, it is important to learn about their prior performance in school across content areas, what they know and are able to do in their home languages, and their prior knowledge and experience with English.

All states in the US are required to have English Language Development (ELD) standards and provide an annual report of emergent bilinguals’ English proficiency as measured by an approved assessment that aligns with the ELD standards. Michigan is one of 38 states that has adopted the WIDA standards. WIDA is a set of K-12 English language development (ELD) standards for social, instructional, and academic language. These standards provide descriptors of English language performance in four domains (listening, reading, speaking, and writing). The range of performance is characterized by a 6-point scale from entering (Level 1) to reaching (Level 6). States who are members of the WIDA consortium use ACCESS—a standards-based, criterion-referenced English language proficiency (ELP) test—to determine emergent bilinguals’ social and academic English proficiency.

When a new emergent bilingual student enrolls in one of Michigan’s public schools, the school is required to either administer WIDA’s diagnostic tool, the W-APT, or use the student’s ACCESS

scores from the previous year to get a sense of the student’s English proficiency. However, such assessments do not provide insight on the student’s proficiency in other languages or other pieces of personal, historical information mentioned above, all of which will affect a student’s ability to engage with learning in school. Knowing which resources can provide support and information about an individual’s personal, linguistic, and educational history—and seeking out these resources—is vital to designing differentiated instruction.

Attention to Language Across Content Areas

Literacy and language scholars who are concerned about the academic welfare of emergent bilinguals have been calling for increased attention to the role language plays in students’ learning (Bunch, 2013; Fillmore & Snow, 2000; Han & Anderson, 2009; Schleppegrell, 2010; Turkan, de Oliveira, Lee, & Phelps, 2014). With the assumption that written texts play a central role in every content area, understanding emergent bilinguals’ strengths and challenges as readers—in general and for each individual student—is essential. Thoughtfully chosen texts can serve as anchors for students to engage with challenging content area concepts and learn the language associated with those concepts. Through discussing instructional texts together in class, supported by the teacher’s scaffolding and high-level questioning, students can have multiple opportunities to use language for communicative purposes in the context of co-constructing content knowledge (Larsen-Freeman, 2012). Below, I outline three fundamental points that can serve as a foundation for building a more inclusive pedagogy that moves toward meeting the literacy and language learning needs of all students—including emergent bilinguals—in the mainstream classroom.

1. *The reading skills students possess in their first language transfer when reading in their second*

language, but reading text that is written in a foreign language presents challenges.

As readers, emergent bilinguals are similar to monolingual English speakers in many respects. When reading, both emergent bilinguals and monolingual English speakers make use of the following types of knowledge: graphophonic (sound-symbol), lexical (vocabulary), semantic (meaning), syntactic (language structure), background and textual knowledge (schemata), and cognitive strategies (Garcia, 2003). However, emergent bilinguals must navigate obstacles specific to the process of comprehending texts written in a foreign language:

- Emergent bilinguals' prior knowledge is encoded in their home languages and cultures, which may make it difficult to leverage relevant background knowledge in service of making connections in and across texts written in English (Rueda, 2011). Therefore, providing the support of visual aids, multiple examples for unknown words, and cognates (words that have similar roots in both languages, if applicable) can cue students to draw upon their prior knowledge encoded in their home languages. Making explicit the connection between one text and another can also help students form the neural networks necessary for learning.
- Furthermore, when emergent bilinguals read texts written in English, they encounter more unfamiliar words and fewer familiar topics (Garcia, 2003), which places higher demand on working memory and increases the cognitive load (Rueda, 2011; Sweller, van Merriënboer, & Paas, 1998). To reduce the cognitive load, teachers can explicitly teach the vocabulary that is central to understanding the text and provide many opportunities for students to read, write, and use the new words.
- Emergent bilinguals may also have difficulty knowing when to infer and when to use the text to answer implicit questions (Garcia, 2003). In preparation for teaching, teachers can carefully analyze their instructional texts,

making note of the places in which students will need to infer in order to make meaning and the places in which the author explicitly tells the reader an important piece of information. This textual analysis allows teachers to then plan interactive read-alouds with marked stopping points for discussing the text and scaffolding students' meaning making (Kucan & Palincsar, 2013).

Aware of the strengths emergent bilinguals bring to reading and of why certain texts might be challenging, teachers are better equipped to provide targeted instruction when emergent bilinguals are working with texts across content areas.

2. *Emergent bilinguals need opportunities to participate in meaningful, grade-level discussions about literary and informational texts.*

Interactive, scaffolded instruction supports emergent bilinguals' language development and reading comprehension (Aukerman & Schuldt, 2016; Boyd, 2012; Saunders & Goldenberg, 1999, 2007). When students engage with text and exchange ideas through discussions, they create a collective process of meaning-making that involves actively interacting with texts through reading, listening, talking, and writing. When skillfully scaffolded, this social, discursive process is beneficial for all learners, particularly emergent bilinguals for whom oral language proficiency is positively correlated with English reading comprehension (Geva, 2006). Through whole-class, shared readings of a text, teachers can skillfully scaffold the meaning-making process for all students. To further support learning, teachers can be deliberate about text selection and limit the amount of text students read at one time, which can help students focus their attention on the important ideas or concepts (Van den Broek & Kremer, 2000). Furthermore, the interactive nature of teacher-led, text-based discussions increases the chances for meaning-making because students have access to the teacher's and other students' background,

linguistic, and strategic knowledge, which they can leverage to better understand the material.

3. *Learning how to address the language learning needs of students begins with understanding how each discipline uses language to build knowledge and communicate ideas.*

For years, we have known the importance of pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), but as the demographics of our students change, we must also attend explicitly to the language demands specific to each discipline; this is referred to as *disciplinary linguistic knowledge* (Turkan et al., 2014). Disciplinary linguistic knowledge goes beyond identifying the key vocabulary in each unit of study, which is important but not sufficient for supporting students' understanding of how the English language works. Disciplinary linguistic knowledge involves understanding how authors use language in specific, patterned ways within a discipline.

For example, in informational science and social studies texts, authors often use what is referred to as *nominalization*. With nominalization, an author turns what is typically a verb into a noun. Consider the following sentence: *The transformation the pupa undergoes to become a butterfly is a process that occurs in phases.* In this sentence, the verb transform has been turned into a noun—*transformation*—and the surrounding words are part of that noun because they specify what type of transformation. So readers need to recognize that the whole phrase, *The transformation the pupa undergoes to become a butterfly*, is the subject or participant in this sentence. In order to comprehend this sentence, readers need to cluster these words together as one whole meaningful chunk. If teachers draw students' awareness to the patterned ways in which content is presented and communicated within each discipline, they are equipping students with a tool called *metalinguistic awareness* that becomes part of a reader's strategic knowledge when reading challenging content area

texts (Jiménez et al., 2015; Schleppegrell, 2013). Metalinguistic knowledge benefits all students, but it is particularly beneficial for emergent bilinguals who are developing their English alongside their home language. Bunch (2013) has suggested that in order for disciplinary linguistic knowledge to inform pedagogy for mainstream and content area teachers, equal attention needs to be given to *pedagogical language knowledge*. Beyond knowing disciplinary patterns of language, teachers need to know how this knowledge can become a pedagogy and support content learning in their classrooms. In other words, knowledge of language must be applied and situated within teachers' specific classroom contexts.

Putting Theory into Action

Between 2011 and 2013, I worked with a team of researchers from the University of Michigan on a design-based project called Language and Meaning (Palincsar & Schleppegrell, 2014). In collaboration with classroom teachers and literacy coaches from five elementary schools in a public school district that serves a predominantly Arabic-speaking student population, we engaged in a process of iteratively designing language arts units with narrative fiction and informational science texts and studying how teachers enacted these units. Our curriculum design was informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL, Halliday, 1978), a theory of language development that grew out of Halliday's observations of parent-infant communication. From this theoretical perspective, language development is regarded as a social process that serves communicative, meaning-making purposes. SFL provides an accompanying metalanguage, a language for talking about language, and the Language and Meaning curriculum was designed to integrate teachers' use of specific metalinguistic terms for the purpose of generating discussions about the text, negotiating meaning, and learning content. We referred to this instructional approach as *functional grammar analysis*.

Below is an excerpt from a lesson in which Ms. Youssef, a fourth-grade teacher in the project, and her students (all of whom speak Arabic and are at various stages of learning English) were engaged in an interactive read-aloud with an informational science text about electricity. At the beginning of the lesson, Ms. Youssef shared the objectives and her rationale for the objectives with her students. She had a language objective (to read and focus on the meaningful chunks of words) and a content objective (to learn about who invented the battery and what is inside of it). In the excerpt below, Ms. Youssef used the metalanguage of *processes* (what's happening) and *participants* (who or what is doing/receiving the action) from the curriculum. With the text projected on the Promethean board, Ms. Youssef read aloud the following section while the students followed along:

Inventing the Battery

Count Alessandro Volta, who lived in Italy, invented the first battery in the 18th century. He called it a "voltaic pile." It consisted of a pile of zinc and silver or copper discs separated by pads in an acid solution. The acid allowed the electrons in the metals to travel even more freely, creating an **electric current**. An electric current is the flow of electricity through a conductor.

She paused after reading this paragraph and asked, "What do we recall about conductors?" (Students had learned about conductors in the previous lesson.) Hands went up immediately, but Ms. Youssef continued to reiterate and reframe her question. "What do we recall about conductors? How do I know metal is a good conductor?" More hands went up along with "ooing" and the waving of hands desperate to be called on, but she continued to reframe the question to get everyone in the room thinking. "What should happen in order for that metal to be a good conductor?" She reiterated the question four different ways, providing ample time for students to think about what she was asking. The reframing may also have allowed students at varying degrees of English proficiency

to grasp her question (Larsen-Freeman, 2012). The following discussion ensued:

Interactive read-aloud: *Inventing the Battery* (Source: Unit 3, Lesson 3, 24:35-34:46)

1. Ahmed: It would be a good conductor if, metal can (inaudible speech).
 2. Ms. Y: What would make that matter a good conductor?
 3. Kamil: The particles have to move freely.
 4. Ms. Y: What type of particles? Which part of the atom has to move freely?
 5. Kamil: Electrons.
 6. Ms. Y: Electrons have to move freely. What part of the atom will make it an insulator?
 7. Nadia: When the electrons are all stuck together and cannot move freely.
 8. Ms. Y: It is the same part...the electrons. However, they are stuck together; they stay together. So, right now, I would like you to read this paragraph silently on your own. Quickly.
- Above, Ms. Youssef embedded a quick review of previously learned vocabulary. Eliciting student ideas, she was able to assess their understanding and review the vocabulary at the same time. Linking previously learned material with new material supports students' reading comprehension.
9. Ss: (Rereading sub-vocally).
 10. Ms. Y: Children, let's look closely. "Count Alessandro Volta." That's a person...where did he come from?
 11. Ss: Italy.

12. Ms. Y: From Italy. Italy is in Europe. What did this person do?
13. Ss: Invented the first battery in the 18th century.
14. Ms. Y: So, he invented the first battery in the 18th century. He called it what?
15. Ss: Voltaic pile.
16. Ms. Y: When you are piling something, you are putting things on top of each other. (*Ms. Youssef demonstrates piling a stack of papers. She then stacks a pile of books, one on top of the other.*) So, let's start seeing the mental image in our heads. Together... (*reading*) "It consisted of a pile of zinc and silver or copper discs." Let me stop here and let me think about the process here and who is participating. (*rereading*) Voltaic pile. It consisted of a pile. Who¹ is "it" here? (*Repeats the question in Arabic and rereads the same portion of text in Arabic.*) So, my question is, who is "it"?
17. Isa: The voltaic pile.
18. Ms. Y: The voltaic pile, which is the battery. Do you agree (*addressing the class*)?
19. Ss: Yes!
20. Ms. Y: Yes! I agree. "It" is the battery. Wonderful.
21. Ms. Y: (*rereading*) "Consisted of a pile of these metals; zinc and silver or copper discs." Do you notice that these are all metals? "Separated by pads in an acid solution." What's a solution? What's a solution?
22. Isa: Something that solves the problem.
23. Ms. Y: Something that solves the problem. Yes! Because we have learned that, when we write, that at the end of the story, we need a solution or...
24. Ss: Conclusion.
25. Ms. Y: Or?
26. Mamun: Evaluation.
27. Ms. Y: Or? Outcome. However, solution here is a bit different. Solution is liquid that has some kind of chemicals in it. (*Ms. Youssef then makes a saltwater solution, by adding table salt to a container of water and mixing.*) This water became a—? Solution. Solution. So, solution has several meanings. In this selection, solution is the acid. It is a liquid that has chemicals in it and we call it...
28. Ss: Acid solution.
29. Ms. Y: Now. Read.
30. Ss: (*reading*) "The acid allowed the electrons in the metals to travel even more freely."

In the section above, the students read the text again on their own and then engaged in their third reading of the text through an interactive read aloud with Ms. Youssef. She used a visual demonstration of "piling" to reinforce new vocabulary, she used the metalanguage of process and participant to help students track the referent "it," and she translated the text and her question into Arabic.

In the section above, Ms. Youssef made new vocabulary concrete by affirming students' prior knowledge of the word from other contexts and clarifying the meaning in the present context using realia.

¹ Ms. Youssef consistently referred to the participants in this informational text as "who." In Arabic, these pronouns do not take different forms based on the human/non-human distinction.

31. Ms. Y: Who are the participants? Who is doing the work? Who is involved?
32. Amina: Acid.
33. Ms. Y: The acid is a participant. Who else?
34. Samir: The electrons.
35. Ms. Y: The electrons. Who else?
36. Mustafa: The metal?
37. Ms. Y: The metal. Anything else? Okay. What is the process here?
38. Ss: Allow
39. Ms. Y: Allow...so, let's read... The acid is doing what?
40. Ss: Allow.
41. Ms. Y: Allowing WHO?
42. Ss: Electrons! To travel even more freely.
- Ms. Youssef used the functional grammar metalanguage (*e.g., participants and processes*) to help students dissect the sentence to better understand what occurs inside the battery.
43. Ms. Y: Continue reading.
44. Ss: (*reading*) "creating an **electric current**"
45. Ms. Y: And what did we learn about informational text. You are reading and you find these bold, dark, big vocabulary words. Why?
46. Abdul: It's a new word.
47. Ms. Y: It's a new word. So, what do we need to pay attention to?
48. Abdul: What it means.
49. Ms. Y: Let's continue reading and see if the author provides that.
50. Ms. Y & Ss: (*reading*) "An electric current is the flow of electricity through a conductor."
51. Ms. Y: Did the author provide the definition of a current?
52. Ss: YES!
53. Ms. Y: Where is it? Say it out loud.
54. Ss: An electric current is the flow of electricity through a conductor.
55. Ms. Y: Are you ready to draw the battery?
56. Ss: Yes!

The above episode illustrates how Ms. Youssef used a whole-class participation structure to facilitate an interactive read-aloud with embedded opportunities for students to read the text independently and together. Throughout this section of the lesson, Ms. Youssef and her students read just this one paragraph three times and each sentence in the paragraph multiple times during moments of word- and sentence-level analysis. Iteration such as this promotes language development (Larsen-Freeman, 2012). Translating the text and her questions into Arabic at key points during the reading scaffolded the engagement of students who had recently immigrated to the United States. For new vocabulary, she provided redundancy through demonstrating the word visually in several ways, rereading the word in the clause multiple times, and eliciting other meanings of the words from other contexts (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2013). All of these instructional moves scaffolded her students' reading of the text and their construction of the content knowledge.

During the interactive read-aloud, Ms. Youssef employed functional grammar analysis as a tool for discussing what Count Volta *did* (eliciting the *process*) and helping students track the referent—a word or phrase that refers to a person, object, or event previously mentioned in the text—by asking who is “it” (eliciting the *participant*). A quick 13 turns at talk (lines 30-42) generated the identification of the *participants* and the *processes*, which reinforced the role the acid was playing in the battery. It is important to note that this was the third unit of study in which Ms. Youssef used functional grammar analysis with her students. In the first unit, she spent a substantial amount of time explicitly teaching the meanings of *participants* and *processes* within the context of reading a narrative fiction text and analyzing characters. At this point in the year, the functional grammar metalanguage had become a common classroom discourse used to discuss texts, the language in the text, and its meanings.

Linguistic Diversity is an Asset

Students’ languages are one of the greatest resources they bring to school. Classroom environments and learning opportunities in which students can use their home languages enable them to draw upon their full linguistic repertoires. Multilingual theories such as *translanguaging* (Garcia, 2009) emphasize the importance of providing many opportunities throughout the day for emergent bilinguals to use their first language and for teachers to leverage this linguistic asset in meaning-making contexts. Translanguaging also emphasizes that language learning, language awareness, and language appreciation is not a unidirectional process. Both monolingual English speakers and speakers of languages other than English benefit from classroom and school environments in which languages of all kinds are recognized as the very foundation for learning, communication, and transformation.

Despite the fact that linguistic diversity enriches our classrooms and communities, emergent

bilinguals are often viewed through a deficit lens, and this is not just the case in the United States (Cummins, 2015). Comments such as “they bring down a school’s test scores,” or “they require too much extra attention” are unfortunately far too common in public discourse. The problem is not the students. The problem is the historic marginalization of linguistically diverse students, which has contributed to the perpetuation of inequitable access to high-quality instruction. Rather than blaming the students, schools need to critically analyze the programs they have adopted with the intention of ameliorating the challenges of learning English in the mainstream classroom. The ways in which programs are implemented may further stigmatize linguistic diversity and/or may not provide appropriate instruction for emergent bilingual students (Dabach, 2014). Schools need to support mainstream and content area teachers in learning more about the role language plays in learning and developing pedagogies that position all students for success. In spaces that are committed to social justice on all levels, students have the chance to realize their differences as strengths and their multiple languages as assets.

The demographic realities of U.S. classrooms and the persistent opportunity gap between emergent bilinguals and their native English-speaking peers make it clear that every classroom needs to be a language learning space. Language is essential for communication, inquiry, investigation, and understanding, as well as for building relationships, solving problems, developing knowledge, and negotiating ideas. If mainstream and content area classroom teachers can begin to explore and recognize the language-intensive nature of learning, then developing students’ metalinguistic awareness will not feel like one more thing to do. By acknowledging the centrality of language in the meaning-making process and being explicit with students about how English functions to communicate meaning, teachers can help students build relationships, navigate grade-level texts, pursue lines of inquiry, and make connections across content areas.

Applications to the Classroom

- Think about the language diversity represented in your classroom. Ask yourself how well you know your students' linguistic histories and capacities. Make a commitment to learning about your students' languages, families, and communities, and use this knowledge to inform your instruction and build upon students' funds of knowledge.
- Create opportunities for students to use oral language, to hear language, to read language, and to write for authentic, academic purposes. This can occur in small groups, pairs, or whole-class participation structures. Iterative experiences with language allow students to reconstruct meaning across varied contexts and reinforce language-meaning connections, especially when the focus is on co-constructing knowledge with others (Larsen-Freeman, 2012).
- Analyze one of the texts you plan to use for instruction. While reading the text, make notes of words and concepts that may be new for students, especially students who speak a language other than English at home. Incorporate explicit teaching of vocabulary while reading this text. For more on vocabulary instruction, see the Cobb and Blachowicz (2014) reference below.
- Beyond vocabulary instruction, analyze an instructional text for the ways in which the authors use language that may hinder students' ability to keep track of the information. For example, are there instances in which the author uses nominalization (i.e., a noun phrase that represents a process)? Or does the author use referents that require students to connect the referent to the original concept, person, or word introduced previously in the text? Note the potential challenges and incorporate explicit instruction on how to navigate these kinds of features in the text.
- Take time to read texts with your class as interactive read-alouds or text-based discussions. When doing so, make sure all students have a copy of the text or, at the very least, can see the text. Emphasize the content learning goals and the language goals developed from your pre-analysis of the text. Make these explicit so that the purpose for reading is clear. Stop along the way to reinforce key ideas and core concepts. Elicit student thinking and encourage student-to-student dialogue. For more on text-based discussions with informational texts, see the Kucan and Palincsar (2013) reference below.
- Over time, keep track of your analyses of instructional texts within each content area to build your own knowledge of how authors in particular content areas organize and communicate information. Notice the patterns of how authors use language across texts and help students do the same.

References

- Aukerman, M., & Schuldt, L. C. (2016). Closely Reading "Reading Closely". *Language Arts*, 93(4), 286-299.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life, 2nd Edition*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Boyd, M. P. (2012). Planning and realigning a lesson in response to student contributions. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113(1), 25-51.
- Bunch, G. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 298-341.
- Cobb, C., & Blachowicz, C. (2014). *No more "look up the list" vocabulary instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cummins, J. (2015). Intercultural education and academic achievement: A framework for school-based policies in multilingual schools. *Intercultural Education*, 26(6), 455-468. doi: 10.1080/14675986.2015.1103539
- Dabach, D. B. (2014). "I am not a shelter!": Stigma and social boundaries in teachers' accounts of students' experience in separate "sheltered" English learner classrooms. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 19(2), 98-124. doi: 10.1080/10824669.2014.954044
- Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Garcia, G. E. (2003). The reading comprehension development and instruction of English-language learners. In A. P. Sweet & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Garcia, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnab-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140-158). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Geva, E. (2006). Second-language oral proficiency and second-language literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy*

