

Toward Linguistically Inclusive Teaching:  
a curriculum for teacher education and a case study of secondary teachers' learning

Emily Kathryn Jean Curtis

a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of Washington

2013

Reading Committee:

Manka Varghese, Chair

Kenneth Zeichner

Deborah McCutchen

Dafney Blanca Dabach

Program authorized to offer degree:

College of Education

© Copyright 2013

Emily Kathryn Jean Curtis

University of Washington

**Abstract**

Toward Linguistically Inclusive Teaching:  
a curriculum for teacher education and a case study of secondary teachers' learning

Emily Kathryn Jean Curtis

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Associate Professor Manka Varghese

College of Education

Addressing teachers' preparation for and cultivation of cultural and linguistic diversity, this study presents a linguistics curriculum designed for teacher education and a case study of teacher-candidates' learning. That teacher education must develop culturally and linguistically responsive teaching ideologies and practices, integrating explicit teaching of language norms and academic language and supporting first and heritage language maintenance, stems from a demographic imperative: a diversifying student body versus a nearly monolithic teaching force of white, middle-class, monolingual English speakers with minimal experiences with language learning to inform their work for equitable education for culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students. Over 20% of US schoolchildren are second language English speakers (cf. deficit-focused "English Language Learner"), speaking over 460 languages. CLD also includes speakers of heritage languages and non-dominant dialects. While "ELL methods" proliferate,

teacher education has but sparsely recommended, much less provided, a foundational knowledge base in language structure, variation, and acquisition that would enlighten and empower teachers for the CLD era. Case study results of teacher-candidates' (TCs') learning in this basic linguistics course demonstrated TCs' improved language awareness, empathy, and sense of empowerment, responsibility, and intentionality toward integrating language in their teaching and an inquiry stance toward SLES and language. All main topics contributed to learning, including critical realizations based on phonology, anthropological-linguistics, and pragmatics, and widespread connection with morphology, second language acquisition, and systemic functional linguistics analysis of disciplinary academic language. Some English Language Arts TCs found some material redundant, but others appreciated the course situated in their teacher education. Future development of linguistic inclusiveness as proposed here will include continued alignment with social justice and multicultural education, teacher and faculty professional development, learning communities, induction support, and curriculum development for all levels, informed by longitudinal case studies of teacher learning and practices of linguistically inclusive teaching.

## **Acknowledgements**

For all that you have taught me, modeled for me, accomplished before me, and inspired me to be a part of and contribute to, I am so grateful to my committee members.

Especially my adviser, Manka Varghese: thank you so much for your encouragement and your unfailing confidence in my abilities, ideas, and their products, for the invaluable opportunities you provided for me to further develop them, for the community of intentional scholarship you create, and for modeling the genuine but professional pursuit of one's mission and path.

I am also grateful to have worked with and come to know Ken Zeichner, and I thank you, Ken, for all you taught me, for encouraging and motivating comments on multiple papers throughout my EdD program, and most of all, for sharing your wealth of knowledge and inspiring passion for teacher education and social justice.

To Deborah McCutchen, I am so grateful for the work you do to demonstrate the value of language awareness and to mentor subsequent scholars, but more personally, for the opportunity to be part of that work and for the learning and inspiration it provided.

Dafney Blanca Dabach, I also thank you for agreeing to join my committee when I was in a pinch, but also for all the mentoring, community-building, and inspiration you created for and around my program.

To Julia Herschensohn, I cannot thank you enough for years of recognition and support of my endeavors, even into and to completion of a second doctoral program.

And to all committee members, for your kindness, intentionality, and collegueship.

Thanks also to many others in the College of Education for your shared enthusiasms, inspiring conversations, and warm camaraderie: there are too many to mention.

I also wish to thank Sharon Hargus, my first adviser, for building my foundation in Linguistics and providing me with opportunities to teach and to see the larger pictures of academe and linguistics in the world.

One must always thank her parents and elders for all their efforts to raise her up, and I thank especially my mother and sister for always being concerned for my well-being, happiness, education, and success, and for the support, interest, love, and respect they have unfailingly shown. I wouldn't be here without you!

Similarly, I would not be the person I am if not for my wonderful family and many friends, and I can only hope that you each know who you are and know that I am thankful you are in my world.

Finally, I am thankful for my spouse, Soohee Kim; for your simple existence, for exactly who you are, for choosing to be with me, and for supporting me in this great endeavor, with necessary household help, grounding and clarifying conversations, calming and refreshing breaks, collegial diligence and constancy, encouraging words and food, and support in uncountable ways, but most of all, patience and love.

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated  
to all who lost their first languages to a socially dominant one

and

to those who cherish and preserve them.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Dedication.....	v
Table of Contents.....	i
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
<i>Prologue</i> .....	1
Culturally and linguistically diverse students: terminology and acronyms.....	5
What teachers need to know.....	10
Linguistic inclusiveness.....	13
Outline of the dissertation.....	16
Chapter 2: Context and Rationale for the Study.....	20
Social context and diversity demographics.....	20
Socio-political context.....	27
Research Context: Approaches to teacher preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity.....	32
Attention to culture: Multicultural Education and Cultural Responsiveness.....	33
Attention to language: linguistically responsive teaching.....	39
Functional linguistics and academic language.....	48
Pedagogical and methodological approaches to integrating language and content..	50
Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA).....	51
Peregoy & Boyle.....	52
Freeman and Freeman.....	53
Gibbons.....	55
Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL).....	56
Sheltered immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP).....	57
Summary of methods-based approaches.....	59
Summary of approaches to CLD.....	62
The state of teacher preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity.....	63
Proposal for teacher education and its rationale.....	70
Chapter 3: Foundations in Theory and Research.....	75

Fundamental Frameworks.....	75
Social Justice Teacher Education.....	77
Multicultural Education .....	84
Multicultural education framework .....	86
Language in multicultural education .....	101
Summary .....	102
Culturally Responsive Teaching.....	103
Diversity knowledge and sociocultural consciousness .....	105
Including cultural diversity in the curriculum .....	109
Caring and affirming attitudes .....	110
Learning about students and culturally responsive practices.....	112
Responding to diversity and using culturally responsive practices .....	114
Constructivist views of learning and acting as change agents .....	116
Language in culturally responsive teaching.....	117
Linguistically responsive teaching and linguistic inclusiveness.....	119
Sociolinguistic consciousness.....	122
Value for linguistic diversity .....	123
Inclination to advocate for ELL students.....	124
Learning about ELL students’ language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies .....	124
Identifying the language demands of classroom tasks.....	125
Applying key principles of second language learning.....	126
Scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students’ learning .....	129
Summary of major frameworks .....	130
Theories of Learning.....	132
Cognitive constructivist view of learning .....	132
Sociocultural view of learning .....	135
Perspectives on Teacher Education, Learning and Professionalism.....	138
Perspectives on Language.....	145
Chapter 4: A Language Awareness Curriculum for Secondary Teachers .....	150
Recommendations from teacher education literature .....	151

Resources .....	154
Themes .....	155
Curriculum .....	155
Phonetics and Phonology .....	156
Orthography vs. Phonetics .....	157
Basics of articulation.....	160
Phonemes .....	161
Stress and Intonation.....	164
Discussion of phonetics and phonology concepts .....	165
Morphology.....	166
Inflection versus derivation (acquisition) .....	166
Beyond affixation in English .....	167
Beyond Greek, Latin and cognates .....	169
Typological Variation .....	170
Morphological awareness, vocabulary acquisition (and literacy skills) .....	171
Syntax .....	171
Simplifying principles.....	172
Complexity.....	174
Variation .....	175
Semantics .....	176
Complexity of word meaning – reference, sets, prototypes, connotation and polysemy.....	176
Lexicalization.....	177
Figurative Language: Idioms and Conceptual Metaphors .....	179
Discussion of semantics concepts .....	180
Pragmatics.....	180
Indirect speech acts and illocutionary meanings—register and cultural differences .....	181
Intonation .....	182
Conversational routines and gamuts .....	182
Sociolinguistics .....	183

Regional and social dialects.....	184
Language, power, prejudice and identity.....	185
Intraspeaker variation.....	186
Anthropological Linguistics.....	186
Participation structures.....	187
Cultural pragmatics of questions .....	187
Culture values in language.....	188
Acquisition & Bilingualism .....	189
Basics of first and second language acquisition and bilingualism.....	189
Theories of acquisition.....	193
Individual characteristics as factors in learning.....	194
Bilingualism, L1 and L2 .....	195
Academic Language and Functional Analysis.....	195
Academic language: basic characteristics.....	197
Disciplinary language variation .....	201
Uncovering layers of meaning through functional linguistic analysis.....	202
Discussion of the curriculum .....	204
Chapter 5: Case Study of Teacher-Candidate Learning in a Language Awareness Course.....	208
Framework and Methodological Considerations .....	209
Reliability, validity and generalizability.....	214
Subjectivity and positionality of the researcher .....	216
Procedures.....	219
The research setting .....	219
Recruitment and consent.....	221
Data collection .....	222
Data analysis .....	224
Findings.....	225
Classroom Discussions .....	225
Pre- and Post-tests.....	227
Linguistic Autobiographies.....	237
Prescriptive mindset or sense of aptitude.....	238

Standard English as social power .....	241
Equity and sociolinguistic awareness .....	243
Empathy .....	245
Linguistic Awareness .....	246
Summary of teacher-candidates' thinking at the beginning of the course .....	248
First Reflection Essay .....	250
Second Reflection Essay .....	254
Final Essays .....	258
Language sketch assignment .....	261
Disciplinary language and functional linguistic analysis .....	262
Pragmatics .....	263
Other topics: morphology, second language acquisition and prescriptive grammar .....	265
Socio-cultural sensitivity and linguistic empathy .....	269
Linguistic awareness, empowerment, and intentions for explicit instruction .....	270
Summary of final essays .....	273
Course evaluations .....	273
Discussion of findings .....	276
Case study: what was learned and gained .....	277
Variation .....	277
From prescription to access .....	278
From caring to empathy, culturally responsive to linguistically responsive .....	279
Empowerment and a framework for inquiry .....	280
Curriculum critique: what aspects contributed to learning .....	285
Depth, breadth and topics to include .....	286
Structure of the curriculum .....	292
Assignments .....	293
ELA versus other specialist learning needs .....	296
Contributions and limitations of the study .....	299
Other factors .....	299
Data trustworthiness .....	301

Intention versus action .....	301
Questions for future studies .....	302
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	304
Results of the case study and curriculum critique .....	304
Implementing linguistic inclusiveness teacher education.....	306
Linguistic inclusiveness foundations and methods.....	307
General teacher education, not endorsement .....	312
Elementary and Secondary Educators .....	312
ELA and other subject area teacher-candidates .....	313
Integration, program commitment, vision, and faculty development.....	314
Ensuring enactment of linguistically inclusive teaching .....	316
Longitudinal studies needed .....	316
Induction support and professional development for in-service teachers.....	318
Limitations of political contexts .....	320
Future directions .....	321
References.....	324

## Chapter 1: Introduction

I begin this dissertation with a prologue, before entering into the academic discussion.

### *Prologue*

Never has the United States been as culturally and linguistically diverse as today, except perhaps at the time of first colonization. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that we have never been as *conscious* of our cultural and linguistic diversity, but it should be clear that we are a far cry from accepting much less embracing of that diversity. This is especially true with respect to language. Sociologist Rubén Rumbaut (2009) describes the United States as a “language graveyard,” where they are buried by the hegemony of monolingual English. This may be true of other nations built on colonization, and part of the blame is on globalization and the need for communal languages. And perhaps the guilt is exaggerated by the relative youth of the nation and a sense that “we should have known better.” Given the recentness of our founding and modernity of our thinking, we should have had a more enlightened understanding of the value of indigenous languages, the benefits of bilingualism, and the importance of language awareness for individuals and for society.

Instead we continue to pursue paths of assimilation and oppression and ignorance. Of 175 Native American languages, 155 of them are on their way to extinction (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007 citing Krauss, 1998), and 80 percent of Americans speak only English (Field, 2011). There is no easy way to count the number of individuals who have been and continue to be unable to maintain their first languages.

But our diversity is not only in our immigrant languages, it is also in the influences they have had in their new home regions and the resultant flavoring of multiple American dialects, perhaps none so well-known, widespread, and ever-vibrant as African-American English.

While we have inevitably and enjoyably inherited from this linguistic diversity to continuously create expressive language forms, as a society, we have chosen to deride those “non-standard” varieties, and to worsen the blow, we have chosen to cease teaching about grammar norms and concepts and building language awareness and instead to foreclose access to the dialect assigned prestige for all those who are not raised steeped in it. We have chosen to deny the research, much less common sense, on the benefits of valuing students’ voices and maintaining one’s first language (even in pursuit of a second language) and allowed funding to be cut along with ideological support of the first languages of millions of Americans: pursuit of a singular ideal language form, forsaking our long history of diversity—*unum* forsaking our *pluribus*.

No doubt much of this assimilation and oppression has been maliciously or selfishly devised and based on racist foundations, but future decisions will be based on ignorance unless public education addresses the realities: the US *is* linguistically diverse, and public education must not only *cultivate* that diversity but provide a basic understanding of linguistic diversity and what language is.

The United States is more linguistically diverse now than ever in its history as a country, that is, since colonization (Ethnologue (online), 2013; Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010). In the year 2000-2001 there were over 460 languages spoken in the homes of our schoolchildren (Valdés & Castellon, 2011), and over 20% of today’s schoolchildren speak English as a second language (Villegas & Lucas, 2011).

At the same time, though a thorough discussion of public and policy viewpoints on grammar and language and awareness of language structure and variation is beyond the scope of

this study, it has been noted that the general US populace has maintained an rather subjective, xenophobic and prejudiced view of language for some time, privileging native, Standard English and discriminating against speakers of other varieties, being distrustful of bilingualism and prejudiced against bilinguals, and slashing support for bilingual education and the study of foreign languages (Hakuta, 2011; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). Mainstream<sup>1</sup> Americans are generally ignorant and subjective about the language and languages that surround us. Twenty-six states have enacted Official English laws, effectively terminating funding for bilingual education in the schools (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007), and while statistics are not forthcoming on teachers' language proficiencies, 83% of public schoolteachers are white (Grossman & Loeb, 2008) and about 80% of the US population speaks only English (2007 census data cited in Field, 2011). Only 9 percent of Americans speak a second language, compared to 53 percent of Europeans (Field, 2011). Since foreign language (or "world language") proficiency is thus lacking, and English grammar is rarely taught beyond elementary school since the 1960s (Fillmore & Snow, 2002), it can be assumed that the overwhelming majority of teachers has limited awareness of language, understanding of how it is structured, acquired and variable, or sensitivity to the processes and experiences of learning the societally-dominant language as a second language or dialect (Clayton, Barnhardt, & Brisk, 2008). Interestingly, Walsh (2004) cites studies from the 1970s and 1980s that found correlations between teachers' scores on standardized Verbal Ability tests and their teaching effectiveness, suggesting that some type of language skill, knowledge or experience may be involved in good teaching as Fillmore and Snow (2002), de Jong and Harper (2008) and others have asserted.<sup>2</sup> There is thus a *demographic*

---

<sup>1</sup> The use of the term "mainstream" is described in the next section.

<sup>2</sup> Detailed information on the teachers' individual linguistic backgrounds, such as bilingualism, foreign language studies or studies abroad, are missing from Walsh's "effectiveness" research. The studies that Walsh cites and Walsh's own assumption that verbal ability can be attributed to a liberal arts education merit further investigation.

*imperative* for teachers to know about language (Banks et al., 2005): while teachers remain culturally and linguistically monolithic, today's students are increasingly diverse and will live in an increasingly diverse and interconnected world.

The consequences of our society's and education system's failure to engage with linguistic diversity have been dire for linguistic minority groups, including speakers of "non-standard" dialects and second language speakers of English (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Nieto, 2005a; Valdés & Castellon, 2011 and many others). These groups are overrepresented in special education, underrepresented in advanced courses and higher education, and suffering tragic achievement gaps in elementary and secondary test scores and other measurements (Hawkins, 2011b; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Valdés & Castellon, 2011; Zeichner, 2012).

What better way to improve their education and opportunities and begin to change society's ignorance than to enable teachers through knowledge, skills and dispositions to truly include cultural and linguistic minority (CLM) students in classroom communities, thinking and learning by including the examination and interrogation of language forms and expectations; by making language part of explicit learning goals, fostering linguistically diverse understandings (or, understandings informed by multiple language-based perspectives), and engendering pride in one's language knowledge as well as interest in and appreciation of others'? What better way to than to educate, inspire, and empower teachers to be a part of the imminent generation of diversity? Since the relevant knowledge of grammar, other languages, and CLM students' experiences are generally lacking among teachers, it would seem to be the responsibility of teacher education programs to prepare teachers to equitably teach a linguistically diverse student body.

This dissertation seeks to address the linguistic diversity mismatches between teachers and students and their appalling consequences for linguistic minorities by offering a concept of *linguistically inclusive teaching*, discussing in detail a curriculum designed to build teachers' language awareness toward linguistically inclusive teaching and presenting a case study of secondary teachers' reactions to that learning in order to contribute to a growing body of research in teachers' attitudes, knowledge, education and learning for linguistic diversity.

In the rest of this chapter, I clarify who are the culturally and linguistically diverse students who stand to benefit, introduce concepts of what teachers need to know, present the main goals of linguistic inclusiveness, and explain the organization of the rest of the dissertation.

### **Culturally and linguistically diverse students: terminology and acronyms**

Before I can begin, an excursus on terminology— a focus on *language*, if you will—is surely in order, as sensitivities and awarenesses are rapidly advancing. It is necessary to clarify terminology and concepts of who are the students that stand to benefit from teachers who are linguistically aware and from linguistically inclusive teaching.

Education researchers and policy makers have recently given great attention to “English Language Learners” (ELLs). ELL is the official term in education policy for students acquiring English as a second language whose English proficiency is at a level that merits continued language supports for access to English-medium education. The term ELL replaced “Limited English Proficient” (LEP), and carries a somewhat less derogatory connotation. ELL is used herein when original sources use that term to refer to students who are officially designated ELL for educational services, but is otherwise avoided for two reasons. First, like “LEP,” ELL focuses on a perceived weakness in these students' English proficiency and gives no recognition of their first language capabilities and language-based knowledge. A better term used by some

education researchers to refer to these students is “emergent bilinguals,” to emphasize the emergent nature of their second language (here, English), while recognizing the first language and optimistically asserting their potential to become bilingual. A similar reference, used here is “second language English speaker” (SLES); it acknowledges a first language, while remaining focused on English as the second language context of their schooling (for the purposes of this study).

The second problem with the term “ELL” is that every US student is still learning English (Aitchison, 1996 cited in Valdés, Bunch, Snow & Lee, 2005). Throughout the school years, new and increasingly complex or specialized language structures and understandings are being learned, especially as introduced across content areas (Schleppegrell, 2004). “ELL” thus should not refer only to those learning English as a second language, but to all students, and as such is practically meaningless. For the purposes of this study, for linguistic inclusiveness, and for the curriculum proposed for teachers, this recognition is highly relevant. Teachers and teacher education should recognize that all students need to learn language and learn about language throughout high school; all of them are “ELLs,” and all teachers thus need language awareness. I will come back to this point and avoid using “ELL” except when following the primary reference.

Another term frequently heard in education discussions is “culturally and linguistically diverse” (CLD) students. Cultural and linguistic diversity generally refers to the diversity of a group or place in terms of ethnic, religious, socio-economic, gender and other minority constituents in addition to second language speakers of English/speakers of other languages. It has originally been used to emphasize the diversity itself, but has been used to refer to minority groups and even individual students themselves. Because “diverse” traditionally and in my mind

means “having varied parts or constituents,” it cannot refer to a single individual (e.g. “a CLD student”), as Vavrus (2012b) also points out, nor should it refer only to those outside the majority or mainstream (e.g. “CLD students” referring to ethnic, gender, religious, linguistic and other minorities) (Vavrus, 2002, 2012a). For this latter reference, I use “cultural and linguistic minority (CLM) student” with the intention of recognizing their historically *minoritized* or *marginalized* positionality and including all but white, monolingual-English-speaking students.<sup>3</sup> Nieto (2005b) uses a great term “new majority” for CLM students, which reflects the recent statistics that, *en masse*, people of color will outnumber Caucasians in the US by the year 2050 (United States Census 2010, 2013). I will use the terms CLM and LM (linguistic minority) as well as SLES and CLD, but make every effort to append “student” (e.g. “SLES student”) so as not to refer to people by acronyms alone.

Another group that stands to benefit from linguistically inclusive teaching and a focus on language is a group sometimes referred to (in world languages arenas) as “heritage language speakers.” Valdés (2001) defines a heritage speaker, in the US context, as someone “who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language” (p. 38). Polinsky and Kagan (2007) point out the notable case where the heritage language acquisition was first, but was interrupted by a shift to another dominant language (that is, by immigration or schooling). There is much controversy over the definition of *heritage language speaker*, the term “heritage,” and over generalizations about their knowledge and proficiency in their two

---

<sup>3</sup> I have not directly addressed another common attribute of the social “mainstream,” that of social class, where the mainstream and indeed most teachers are of the middle class. Class-based language variation is subsumed under discussions of “dialects other than the standard,” though its manifestations and implications are different in some cases from more “visible” minoritizing factors. There is no question that class-related issues other than language merit concerted attention and effort toward assistance and improved educational equity, but also that language plays a role in discrimination based on social class and that language can limit one’s social mobility. Addressing language explicitly is one means of addressing certain aspects of social class inequities.

languages and their learning goals in language classes (Carreira & Kagan, 2011; Kondo-Brown, 2005), but there is no doubt that students with these linguistic backgrounds, too, can benefit from added attention to language in school and the potential for improved metalinguistic awareness. These students have particular language experiences and also parents and communities that, by virtue of being speakers of languages other than English, provide school language support that differs from other groups such as SLES students who speak another language within the home and community and monolingual English students.

The term “mainstream” here generally refers to *classrooms* that are not focused on language learning, that is English-medium elementary classrooms and secondary classrooms other than ESL (English as a second language, or, ESOL English for speakers of other languages, or ELD, English (second) language development) or world languages classes (French, German, Spanish and so on taught as second and societally non-dominant languages). It will include English language arts (ELA) classrooms; though there is a focus on language in ELA, it also involves content learning and subject-area academic language usage that can pose challenges to CLM students similarly to academic language in other disciplines.<sup>4</sup> I will avoid privileging a “mainstream” culture or cultural identity, and instead refer to “white, middle class, monolingual speakers of the standard English dialect,” or relevant portions of that designation, where the “standard” dialect is idealized and localized, but socially real.

Finally, one last clarification of language used here concerns the common use of the phrase “meeting the needs of” usually followed by “ELLs” or “CLD students” (meaning CLM students, in my terms). This phrasing, like “ELL” and “LEP” focuses on CLM students’ deficits

---

<sup>4</sup> Clearly students are not intended to learn only language or even literacy in ELA classes at the secondary level. They are learning advanced language and literacy, certainly, but also a view of literature and its history as well as genres and advanced writing skills. This consideration raises concerns for what SLES students are missing when they are in ESL courses *instead of* Language Arts classes.

and frames them as “needy” or of requiring “extra” assistance or effort on the teacher’s part, having needs beyond white, middle class, monolingual students who speak the “standard” dialect. To avoid these connotations, I will tend to refer to “creating equitable learning opportunities and environments.”

Preparing white, monolingual teachers to provide equitable learning opportunities for growing numbers of SLES students in their mainstream classrooms is a dire and urgent need that, along with more explicitly teaching academic language, can be addressed in ways that benefit other linguistic minorities as well, such as speakers of dialects other than Standard English, speakers of languages other than English at home, and any who have less support for their Standard English or academic language learning outside of school. To begin to meet these needs and create more linguistically inclusive schools, this dissertation adopts a broad view of “English Language Learner” that includes multiple linguistic minority groups and, in fact, *most* middle and high school students, and proposes a curriculum for secondary teacher candidates that aims to improve their language awareness, dispositions toward linguistic diversity, and knowledge and skills in creating linguistically inclusive and equitable classrooms. Though the challenges and learning objectives of second language learners are not the same as, and are perhaps more numerous and intensive than, those of learners of standard English as a second dialect or of academic English (de Jong & Harper, 2005, 2008), teachers’ improved knowledge of language and more explicit focus on language in school curricula can’t help but be beneficial to all “English language learners” by creating a more linguistically rich and welcoming environment and by improving metalinguistic and linguo-cultural awareness in classrooms and eventually in society.

Linguistic inclusiveness is envisioned to address the *language* aspects of education for CLD students, especially cultural and linguistic minority students. In Chapter 2, I reflect on the social and research contexts for this study and how understandings of cultural and linguistic diversity (separately and together) have developed over time, toward this point where education as a field is coming to focus on language and its importance in the education of schoolchildren.

### **What teachers need to know**

In an age of global mobility and diversifying communities, repudiation of historical prejudices, and expanding efforts toward social justice and equity, education researchers have come to reconsider what teachers in the public schools need to know about language. Answering these questions has entailed assessment of the demographics of schoolchildren and their home languages, recognition of achievement gaps with linguistic minorities suffering inequities in educational access and success, and finally some recommendations about what teachers need to know, especially about cultural and sociolinguistic aspects of language use.

Teacher education researchers have recently focused their attention on language in the schools and a need for teacher candidates to know more about language toward two goals: one is for the equitable education of increasing numbers of especially immigrant SLES and the other is in the area of disciplinary academic language at the secondary level in support of college access for SLES. The central role of language has been recognized in teaching (Fillmore & Snow, 2002, cited in Lee, 2010) and in schooling (Schleppegrell, 2004), as has the corresponding need for teacher candidates to be more cognizant of language use in their classrooms, and more knowledgeable and skilled in basic linguistics (structure of English, language development, and second language acquisition, socio- and anthropological-linguistics and language use, language function and subject-area variation) in order to integrate explicit language learning objectives

with content teaching (e.g. Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Valdés et al., 2005 and see Bunch, 2010 for overview).

Immigration and the increasing number of SLES students in the schools, along with statistics about their achievement gaps, may have helped motivate this focus on language, but (leaving globalization and policymakers' economic motives aside) *most* schools of education have concerned themselves with social justice goals of meeting the needs of *all* students (Zeichner, 2006) and with cultural and linguistic diversity issues for some time, and the premise of this dissertation is that these efforts toward social and educational equity in our culturally and linguistically diverse society can be complemented by attention to teachers' *language* awareness.

Linguistic diversity is becoming more and more frequent in mainstream classes due to the demographics cited above and to policies surrounding the education of ELLs. As mentioned, over 20% of schoolchildren are second language speakers of English. Policies such as *No Child Left Behind* have led to cuts in funding for language-oriented educational supports for SLES students, forcing them into mainstream classes often before their proficiency allows for equitable access to the English-medium instruction, with dismal results (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007; Valdés & Castellon, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). Recognizing these pressing issues, education researchers are recognizing the importance of teachers' positive attitudes towards language differences as well as more developed knowledge of culturally-influenced language use (Gay, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a), second language acquisition, and sociolinguistics (e.g. Brisk, 2008a; Lucas, 2011b). Some are calling for more generalized knowledge of language structure (Bunch, 2010; Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Steiner & Rozen, 2004; Valdés et al., 2005), and some are explicating the language-based demands of school (Cummins, 1979a; Schleppegrell, 2004). Methods-based

approaches to “ELLs” have also proliferated (e.g. Chamot, O'Malley, & National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1986; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000), but aligning with a view of teachers as thinking professionals (Labaree, 2004; Zeichner, 2003, 2006) and with frameworks of social justice (e.g. Zeichner & Flessner, 2009) and multicultural education (e.g. J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1995), the concept of linguistic inclusiveness proposed here emphasizes the *knowledge of language* that teachers need to have in order to engage flexibly and convivially with linguistic diversity, and indeed in order to develop effective methods and strategies.

Discussions of specific linguistic concepts that teachers need to know or methods and materials for learning them, however, are lacking in the literature. At times general topics such as phonology and syntax are referenced (e.g. Valdés et al., 2005), and at other times specific facts about sociolinguistics (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005) or second language acquisition (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) are cited, but a teacher cannot simply be handed a list of facts and expected to develop dispositions and practices that reflect them. Targeted teacher education is needed with deeper, inductive, and experiential learning. In Chapter 3, I discuss the conceptual frameworks that support linguistic inclusiveness, including constructivist and sociocultural views of learning and teacher professional development, and in Chapter 4, I discuss at length specific linguistic concepts for inclusion in linguistic inclusiveness teacher education and potential learning results.

Finally, some education researchers (Athaneses & de Oliveira, 2011) have reported that teacher-candidates do want to learn about language and linguistics or value what they have learned about language in multicultural education or similar classes, but few, if any, have reported on what specifically teachers value in linguistics curricula when they are offered. And of course, we can't just ask teachers what they want to learn because one cannot specify a need

to learn what one does not know about.<sup>5</sup> If teachers are unaware of much of linguistics, they cannot tell us what aspects they will find valuable. Former teachers-turned researchers can contribute greatly in this area (Gordon, 2012; Silver & Lwin, 2013), and I contribute in this dissertation ideas based on a Linguistics perspective (my own and e.g. Denham & Lobeck, 2013) and reading of the teacher education literature.

The purpose of this dissertation is to study in greater detail teachers' crucial knowledge of language, proposing a language awareness curriculum as teacher preparation to support the equitable learning of culturally and linguistically diverse students in US public schools, and assessing teacher learning based on this curriculum in a case study reported in Chapter 5. The curriculum, discussed in Chapter 4, is part of a concept of *linguistically inclusive teaching*, which relates to culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000, 2010; Villegas, 1991; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a) and linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008), among other influential frameworks for teacher education.

### **Linguistic inclusiveness**

The overarching concept of linguistic inclusiveness is greatly informed by social justice teacher education and multicultural education, in addition to the teacher education concepts of culturally responsive teaching and linguistically responsive teaching. While details of the

---

<sup>5</sup> In two introductory linguistics classes I taught for elementary teachers, they were asked on a pre-test to identify and describe the five main "components" of language structure, or, kinds of knowledge, given "syntax" as an example, "pragmatics" as an example of one that is "not always included in the main five," and a description, "knowledge of the meanings of words and relationships among word meanings," that would correlate with the answer "semantics." Very few were able to provide even one or two parts of the intended answer: phonetics (how sounds are pronounced), phonology (how sounds can be put together; sound patterns), morphology (how words are structured with meaningful parts), syntax (how sentences are organized or structured), and semantics (as above). Some relevant awareness was evident in answers such as "phonemic awareness" and "vocabulary," but if teachers do not know that these topics (and other linguistics topics) exist, for example, they cannot tell us that they want to know about them.

frameworks and the model they set for linguistic inclusiveness are discussed at length in Chapter 3, all share the goal of equity in education and have made great strides toward improving education, including teacher education, to reflect and cultivate our society's cultural and linguistic diversity. Multicultural education is wide-reaching in its goals and "dimensions" (Banks, 1995, 2013), and having a relatively long history, is a valued forebear and conceptual mentor for linguistic inclusiveness. Similarly, social justice teacher education has made great research strides in how to educate teachers for reflective teaching and effectively caring dispositions (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009) that are also needed for linguistic inclusiveness.

In the area of teacher preparation for linguistically inclusive *teaching*, specifically, culturally responsive teaching has paved the way in conceptualizing and implementing teacher education toward understanding culture and its role in identities, communication, and schooling as well as developing culturally responsive dispositions and practices. And finally, more recently, a framework for linguistically responsive teaching has been explicated (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011) and research gathered on teacher attitudes, relevant policies, demographics, and teacher education faculty development and collaboration (Lucas, 2011b and chapters therein).

Linguistic inclusiveness is an extension of linguistically responsive teaching in two ways. First, linguistic inclusiveness aims to parallel the broader goals of multicultural education in a sense of *multilingual education*, where language groups and language itself are integrated into curriculum and equity pedagogy (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995), for example. Second, linguistically inclusive teaching differs from linguistically responsive teaching in the dual concept of *inclusion*: linguistically inclusive teaching *includes* linguistically diverse students as equal partners in classroom learning and knowledge construction through inclusive attitudes and practices, and linguistically inclusive teaching *includes* explicit attention to language as part of

everyday classroom teaching, by exploring meanings, examining structures, and making language usage explicit in ways that it has not been made explicit in the past decades.

Linguistically inclusive teaching is inclusive of language and linguistic minorities, and it serves the following goals.

- Building understanding, welcoming, and inclusive orientations among teachers *and* native standard English speaking students toward LM peers in the classroom. This comes from
  - curiosity and openness toward other languages, an understanding of the multilingualism of much of the rest of the world, recognition that English did not “win out” for any linguistic reasons, and that monolingual native English is not the ultimate asset
  - cultural responsiveness and awareness
  - knowing about other languages and perspectives as learning resources for all (including the teacher); multiple perspectives and ways of conceptualizing
- Encouraging bilingualism, maintenance of heritage languages, and world language studies by
  - working against the “graveyard of languages” and English-only hegemonic thinking
  - understanding that bilingualism is beneficial, is common (outside the US), is not a handicap, that first language proficiencies support second-language English acquisition and literacy, and that metalinguistic awareness should be supported for this to happen
  - valuing other languages and metalinguistic discussion as resources for critical thinking and deeper learning
- Making standard and academic language accessible to all students
  - as emphasized in the Common Core State Standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2012)
  - including teaching of “standard English” for speakers of marginalized dialects
  - knowing that disciplinary literacies differ
  - including teachers’ awareness of their own linguistic expectations (and prejudices) and areas of linguistic difference between languages and dialects (and cultures)
- Improving metalinguistic awareness toward educational improvement.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Research in educational psychology has provided evidence of the correlations between metalinguistic awareness and literacy skills (Carlisle, 2000; Green et al., 2003; Kirby et al., 2012; McCutchen, Green, & Abbott, 2008; McCutchen, Logan, & Biangardi-Orpe, 2009; Nagy, Berninger, Abbott, Vaughan, & Vermeulen, 2003; Nagy, Berninger, & Abbott, 2006) and of the potential of metalinguistic instructional interventions (Berninger, Abbott,

Linguistic inclusiveness, like linguistic responsiveness, is a response to the demographic reality of increasing linguistic diversity in the US and in the schools. Coupled with a historical assimilationist and monolingual societal prejudice and the lack of teacher capacity for working with linguistic diversity, the result has been marginalization of linguistic minorities and educational and societal inequities that are abhorrent. Adopting social justice goals and based on the foundations of multicultural education and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, linguistic inclusiveness seeks to improve education for *all* students by counteracting our historical ignorance, fear and assimilationist perspectives on language through educating teachers to hold positive dispositions and a strong knowledge base that prepares them to integrate language learning and exploration in the classroom. Linguistic inclusiveness means including linguistic minorities *and* including language in classroom learning. As a contribution toward linguistic inclusiveness, this dissertation presents this conceptualization, a curriculum in language awareness for teachers, and a case study of teacher learning using that curriculum, all in the belief that teachers and the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students are at the forefront of what shall be a sea-change toward a linguistically inclusive culture and society.

### **Outline of the dissertation**

To develop the concepts further, the dissertation proceeds through discussions of the social, political, research and teacher education contexts underlying the need for linguistic inclusiveness in Chapter 2, existing theoretical frameworks and a deeper conceptualization of linguistic inclusiveness in Chapter 3, discussion of a curriculum to build teachers' dispositions, knowledge and skills in linguistic inclusiveness in Chapter 4, and a case study of teacher-

---

Nagy, & Carlisle, 2010; Carlisle, 2010). Metalinguistic awareness is also *presumably* akin to metacognition and thus a basis for critical thinking and deeper learning. Further studies are needed to verify the role of metalinguistic awareness in learning.

candidate growth toward linguistic inclusiveness in a class based on that curriculum in Chapter 5, with general concluding discussion in Chapter 6.

Chapter 2 explores rationale for linguistic inclusiveness by looking at the social, political, research and teacher education contexts of the last decades. In this chapter we come to a better understanding of the monolingual socio-political context of today's demographic diversity and the context of prior research seeking to advance understandings and provide equitable education for culturally and linguistically diverse students. We also look briefly at the state of teacher education in this area.

In Chapter 3, I discuss in more detail the paradigms of social justice teacher education, multicultural education, culturally responsive and linguistically responsive teaching that provide the foundation for the conceptualization and ultimately the implementation of linguistically inclusive teaching. The concept of linguistically inclusive teaching is further developed in the process of examining these formative frameworks as well as through discussion of the requisite perspectives on learning, language, and teacher education, learning, and development.

Chapter 4 comprises the proposed curriculum, where topics and concepts within each topic are discussed in detail, with explanations of the concepts and of their intended learning impact on teachers, so that teacher educators might evaluate the relevance and appropriateness of the curriculum for implementation their teacher education programs.

The appropriateness and effectiveness of the proposed curriculum is also evaluated through a case study of one instantiation of the course in Chapter 5, which serves to advance the curriculum from an abstract ideal to a tested curriculum that can be discussed as a model for future courses of its kind. Through the exploration of teacher-candidates' learning in the course, it becomes a pilot study of teachers' knowledge of language and ideas about what linguistic

knowledge and skills might apply in their work. The study thus contributes to teacher education literature focusing on academic language (Schleppegrell 2004, Schleppegrell and Colombi 2002), the value of teaching about language (e.g. grammar, world languages, linguistics) (Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Valdés et al., 2005), and teacher knowledge and development (Alsup, 2006; Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Hawkins, 2011a; Lampert, 2000; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005).

In the final chapter, Chapter 6, I discuss the results of the case study in the larger context of linguistic inclusiveness goals and considerations for its implementation in teacher education programs; where we might go from here to implement linguistic inclusiveness teacher education, ensure teachers' enactment in their teaching sites, and further inform the conceptualization of linguistically inclusive teaching and teacher education and implementation efforts.

The goal of this dissertation is to advance and expand the linguistic responsiveness framework to a new paradigm of *linguistic inclusiveness* that will parallel and collude with multicultural education toward socially just educational outcomes for CLD students. In closing this chapter and entering into the larger study, I borrow a quotation from Geneva Gay's (2010) discussion of culturally responsive teaching that reflects characteristics of linguistic inclusiveness as envisioned here. It is a passage from a book detailing Black women's socially-imposed adaptations of identity (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003).<sup>7</sup> Those authors write,

Ideally, everyone, no matter what gender or race or background, will become multilingual, ...feeling free to switch between [languages] according to their own predilection rather than out of shame or obligation. ... When we hear differences in accent, ... dialect or slang, rather than automatically if subconsciously judging the

---

<sup>7</sup> That the quotation comes from a book on this topic is quite *a propos*. It highlights the importance of language in personal identity and in societal pressures and prejudices, including those concerning dialect and variation within English (or any language) in addition to those concerning different languages.

speaker, we can expand our personal styles instead, borrowing idioms, inflections, and expressions that suit the context we're in, our mood, our sense of self. There is a wonderful beauty to language, to regionalisms, vernaculars and patois, and embracing language in whatever form can enrich all of our lives (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003, p. 120).

This vision is not impossible to achieve, and there is evidence in our art, media, and pop culture that many perform this code-switching and linguistic exchange every day. But in our mundane institutions and explicit policies and the efforts we employ in our own education, we privilege a single prescriptive language norm, an idealized Standard English, and maintain an ignorance about language structure, usage, development, change, and the awesome diversity of human language. Which path shall we pave for our next generations? Or, how shall we prepare for the inevitable linguistic diversity of our society?

## **Chapter 2: Context and Rationale for the Study**

In proposing a curriculum for teachers to develop linguistic inclusiveness dispositions and practices, the questions should be asked and answered, *why is this course needed, at this time in history, and in this form?* Answering these fundamental questions involves several considerations. First, we will look briefly at the current social context and demographic situation, wherein the number of second language English speakers in the schools is growing, unmatched by diversity among teachers. Next we will look at the socio-political climate in which the US has espoused monolingual English privilege, disparaging bilingualism and shrinking world language and even English language studies. We will also look at the research context, including three approaches to cultural and linguistic diversity in teacher education, identifying what is missing and how to expand the existing research and teacher education paradigms. In this context I propose the new approach to linguistic diversity in the schools, referred to as *linguistic inclusiveness* to highlight its relationship to *linguistic responsiveness* (Lucas et al., 2008) and concept of *inclusive* pedagogy (c.f. Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). The proposal is aligned with recommendations from teacher education research concerning what teachers need to know about language (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005). Finally, based on these contexts, we will explore the rationale for linguistic inclusiveness and the teacher education curriculum that is proposed in Chapters 3 and 4, what is at stake and what is to be gained.

### **Social context and diversity demographics**

Linguistic diversity is a reality of great importance in US schools in a way it has never been before. Following recent waves of immigration, there are more foreign-born residents than before, from a larger variety of countries, so diversity among the student population is also

increasing. Teacher diversity has not kept pace, and with increasing policy and ensuing budgetary restrictions on education in languages other than English, SLES spend most of their time in mainstream classrooms (that is, not language development, ESL or SLES-only classes, but general education or content classes alongside non-SLES peers) where they have had limited access to rigorous academic content when language services are lacking. Finally, the wider sociopolitical context of monolingualism (as both a linguistic phenomenon and an ideology) also influences what students and teachers believe and know about language and what their education in the area of linguistic diversity should be.

The demographics of immigration and language diversity in the US establish linguistic diversity as a current event of importance. In 2006, for example, nearly 20% of the nation's schoolchildren were English language learners (Villegas & Lucas, 2011), and over 460 different languages were spoken in schoolchildren's homes nationwide (Valdés & Castellon, 2011). By 2030, 40% of the K-12 population will be children whose first language is not English (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). Though the US has never been culturally and linguistically homogenous, the increases in diversity in recent years are significant: the percentage of foreign-born persons in the US, for example, has ranged from a 14.8% (2.2 million) in 1890 to a low of 4.7% (9.6 million) in 1970 and back to 12.5% (37,547,789) in 2006 (Terrazas et al., 2007 cited in Valdés & Castellon, 2011). Approximately 25% of those foreign-born (of 2006) had arrived in the year 2000 or later, which, except for some coming from former British colonies, indicates a large number of second language speakers of English who either are of school-age themselves, or will raise schoolchildren who will have to learn in school in a language different from their parents' (and potentially their own) first language.

In 1960, eight of the top 10 countries of origin of the US foreign-born were in Europe, but in 2006, the top 10 source countries were in Asia and Latin America, (Migration Policy Institute, 2007, cited in Valdes & Castellon, 2011): 30.7% of immigrants were from Mexico, 4.4% from the Philippines, 4.1% from China (excluding Taiwan), and 4.0% from India. The next leading source countries were Vietnam, El Salvador, Korea, Cuba, Canada and the UK (to make up 58.4% of the total) (Terrazzas et al., 2007 cited in Valdes & Castellon, 2011). Goldenberg and Coleman (2010) also cite increased immigration from Africa. These new and varied countries of origin mean that the languages coming into the US are greatly varied as well, and extend beyond the more traditionally studied European languages to include some formerly unfamiliar to many Americans, even in name.

It is interesting to compare the top non-English languages spoken in the general population with those spoken by ELLs, as in Table 1, though these figures are from a few years ago now.<sup>8</sup>

*Table 1. Top US languages other than English: general population and ELL students*

Languages other than English spoken by general population (based on 2000 Census) (Valdés & Castellon, 2011)		Languages other than English spoken by ELLs (based on 2002 survey) (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010)		
Language	Number of speakers	Language	Estimated percentage of ELLs	Approximate number of ELL speakers
1. Spanish	28,101,052	1. Spanish	79.05	4,031,300
2. Chinese <sup>9</sup>	2,002,143	2. Vietnamese	1.95	99,600
3. French	1,643,838	3. Hmong	1.55	79,282
4. German	1,382,613	4. Cantonese	1.02	52,055

<sup>8</sup> According to the 2007 census data, the top languages are: 1. English only (80.27%), 2. Spanish (12.3%; compare at 34,547,077 speakers in 2007), 3. Chinese (not specified as Mandarin, Cantonese, or other Sinitic language; 0.88%), 4. Tagalog, 5. French, 6. Vietnamese, 7. German, 8. Korean, 9. Russian, 10. Italian, 11. Arabic, 12. Portuguese, 13. Polish, 14. French (Haitian) Creole, 15. Hindi, 16. Japanese, 17. Farsi, 18. Urdu, 19. Greek, 20. Gujarati (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010). Only 1.6% of the total US population is estimated to not speak English at all.

<sup>9</sup> This data is not differentiated for Mandarin, Cantonese or other Sinitic languages, but the number here is suspiciously high, suggesting that at least Mandarin and Cantonese are included, though they are considered different languages (mutually unintelligible) (see e.g. Ethnologue (online), 2013).

5. Tagalog	1,224,241	5. Korean	0.97	49,258
6. Vietnamese	1,009,627	6. Haitian Creole	0.93	47,316
7. Italian	1,008,370	7. Arabic	0.91	46,244
8. Korean	894,063	8. Russian	0.82	41,627
9. Russian	706,242	9. Tagalog	0.75	38,239
10. Polish	667,414	10. Navajo	0.59	30,280
11. Arabic	614,582	11. Khmer	0.59	30,041
		12. Mandarin	0.49	25,065
		13. Portuguese	0.46	23,287
		14. Urdu	0.41	20,892
		15. Serbo-Croatian	0.38	19,227

One interesting factor in linguistic diversity demonstrated by this data is that, while the general population includes speakers of several Indo-European languages among the top few, and the overwhelming majority of ELLs speak Spanish, the other top languages of ELLs are from many different language families. (Russian, Portuguese, Urdu and Serbo-Croatian are Indo-European, but the others are not.) It cannot of course be claimed that speakers of other Indo-European languages will necessarily have fewer difficulties in learning English than those of other language families, but speakers of Asian languages, for example, will have fewer cognates to facilitate communication,<sup>10</sup> generally different basic morpho-syntactic types, and oftentimes a different writing system (cf. Tagalog and Vietnamese which use the Roman alphabet). The same is true for Arabic.

Previous waves of immigrants were largely from Europe (Field, 2011; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007), but more recent groups are clearly from around the world and come speaking languages about which Americans typically know very little and that are among the “less commonly taught languages.” To illustrate the diversity even further, in school districts local to where this dissertation was written, the top languages include Somali, Amharic, Samoan,

---

<sup>10</sup> There will exist a number of English words that have been borrowed into these unrelated languages, such as words related to technology and pop culture, that constitute a limited number of “cognates.”

Tigrinya, Moldavian and Ukrainian – none of which are in the top fifteen cited above – in addition to Vietnamese, Tagalog, Korean, Mandarin, Arabic, and Spanish.

Furthermore, SLES schoolchildren are no longer found mainly in traditional immigration centers and states such as California and New York, but live in all states in increasing numbers. In 2004-2005, the growth in ELL student percentages was greatest in South Carolina, Kentucky, Indiana, North Carolina and Tennessee, and nearly half of the US states saw their ELL numbers double between the 1994-5 and 2004-5 school years (Valdés & Castellon, 2011). Among these were states that did not have a history of ELL and had fewer options for special ESL programs (Alabama, Nebraska, Virginia, Georgia and others) (Villegas & Lucas, 2011). The numbers also indicate that recent immigrants are more often people of color than in the last century (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007), and that there are differences in the ethnic make-up of different cities and regions in the US. This means that growing cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity is a reality everywhere.

Meanwhile, among the general population, 80.27% are monolingual English speakers (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010), and the teaching force remains overwhelming white (83%) (Grossman and Loeb (2008). National policies and think-tanks have been calling for the diversification of the teacher workforce (Villegas & Lucas, 2004). Recommendations of the influential Carnegie Foundation and (second) Holmes Reports (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy & Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; Holmes, 1995) instigated an upheaval in teacher education and led to the “mobiliz[ation of] the nation’s resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers” (Fraser, 2007, p. 224), but to little avail. So-called “alternative route” (non-university-based) teacher education programs also seek to recruit CLD teacher-candidates, as role-models and as culturally responsive to CLM students by virtue of

being CLM persons themselves (Grossman & Loeb, 2008).<sup>11</sup> In several alternative route programs, non-white teacher candidates are at higher percentages than in traditional university-based programs (Grossman & Loeb, 2008), but the majority of teachers are still educated in university-based programs, and overall, there remains a persistent paucity of minority teachers (Fraser, 2007; Villegas, 2009). Villegas (2009) points out that the education concerning CLD for the few minority teachers may suffer in any case because “most of the literature on the preparation of teachers to teach students of color focuses on the needs of the White teacher majority—often without making that focus explicit” (p. 555). The push to recruit under-represented groups into teaching is repeated in the Carnegie Foundation’s 2007 *Teachers for a New Era* (Carnegie Foundation, 2007), but Fraser (2007) laments that “of all the recommendations that received so much attention in the 1980s, this one had probably the least to show in terms of measurable outcomes some 20 years later” (p. 230). It remains the case that public school teachers are most often white, monolingual English speakers with few experiences comparable to those of CLD students that would offer them insights into working with CLD students (Clayton et al., 2008). This lack of experience among teachers (and lack of understanding more widely) is exacerbated by the decline in language education in recent decades as well. World language study requirements have been relaxed at both secondary and post-secondary levels (Baca & Escamilla, 2002), and the extended teaching of English grammar in grades 5-8 ceased in most schools in the 1960s (Fillmore & Snow, 2002). Further research into language awareness opportunities in public school curriculum is surely in order, but Lucas and Grinberg (2008) also suggest that “the teaching of grammar has come to be seen as a quaint

---

<sup>11</sup> Grossman and Loeb (2008) mention results from a 1985 Tennessee study showing that random assignment to a teacher of the same race improved the test scores of both Black and White students. That no other or more recent studies are mentioned may be significant, and results for neither language nor other racial minorities (nor grouping of minorities together) was reported.

practice of earlier generations, and no other study of language *as language* has replaced it in undergraduate education” (p. 616). Ironically, one of the main functions of the earliest American schools was to teach language (reading, writing, spelling, grammar, literature, oration, and then Greek and Latin in the grammar schools). Into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, teachers’ English language studies were also prevalent, if prescriptive, at least in part.<sup>12</sup> Now, however, language awareness is poorly supported in US schools, and the mainstream white populace, including the teacher force, has little occasion to learn about language, think critically about and through language and language differences, or develop positive views of other languages and their speakers.

Given the demographics of societal diversity and the lack of diversity and awareness in the teaching force, now more than ever, teachers must be educated to bridge cultural and linguistic differences in the classroom, and more than ever this includes language differences. For a more equitable school system, the mainstream teacher needs positive dispositions toward language and linguistic diversity and the knowledge and skills to scaffold the language development of CLD students, whether in the first or second language, and to make explicit the language expectations of schooling and the advanced disciplinary literacies which may not be (and likely never were) “common knowledge” among a diverse student body.

Given the centrality of language in schooling (Carnegie Foundation, 2007; Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005) and in teaching (D. Freeman, 2002), it almost goes without saying that teachers must be educated in basic linguistics and in the creating of optimal learning opportunities for CLD students that integrate a focus on and deeper understanding of language. “One of the major reasons that has been identified for the chronic underperformance of ELLs in schools has been the inadequate and

---

<sup>12</sup> Fraser (2007) cites a 1914 Wisconsin normal school curriculum as including specific courses in grammar, orthoepy, reading, composition, spelling, penmanship, and literature, among other fields, with advanced options in English composition and literature and German or Latin.

haphazard preparation of teachers” (Varghese & Stritikus, 2005, p. 84). This dissertation thus seeks to improve education for CLM students, and indeed for all students, through improved teacher education in language.

### **Socio-political context**

With a focus on linguistic diversity in the public schools and in teacher education, this discussion is not isolated from larger socio-political contexts, since public education is under the purview of the national government and the public at large. As Stritikus and Varghese (2007) point out, the education of linguistically diverse and immigrant students has never been a neutral process, but is situated in societal contexts of immigration, economics, and the empowerment of students. A thorough exploration of the intertwined histories of immigration, economics, politics and policies, and general attitudes toward racial, ethnic, and linguistic minorities and their education would be too extensive to provide here, as public education lies at the nexus of political and sociocultural spheres, where beliefs and attitudes, laws and policies, and budgetary decisions collide. I outline here the main policies effecting integration of CLD students in the schools and offer some considerations of where we stand, as a society, as concerns understandings and viewpoints on language, linguistic minorities, and bilingualism.

Out of the complex the political and policy history surrounding CLD education, four main policy moves played a central role in creating the current situation and climate. The first was the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954 that led to the racial integration of the schools, especially centered on ending the separate (but unequal) schooling of African-American students. Though this was clearly a step toward equitable education and pluralism, the decision came with and led to no specific plans to expand and adapt “mainstream” schools and schooling to integrate African-American and white (and other racial and ethnic groups) culturally and

socially or to provide pluralist and equitable education in integrated schools (Gay, 2004). Multicultural Education research, teacher education, activism, and the paradigm as a whole, discussed below, would inform and begin that planning and change, by first explaining and offering remedies for cultural and linguistic differences, only years later.

Another Supreme Court decision that is especially relevant was in the case of *Lau v. Nichols* in 1974. This case concerned a Chinese-American community whose children, it was declared, were denied access to education because their language differed from that of the schools. In the *Lau v. Nichols* decision, the Court basically declared that it is the responsibility of the schools to provide equitable education for linguistic minorities, including education to address language differences. The *Lau* remedies of 1975 required school districts to have a program in place for SLES students but did not mandate specific programs, and still today, there is great variation in how SLES students are provided access to content and language education (Crawford, 2004; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). *Castaneda v. Pickard* (1981) decision provided guidelines for whether ELL educational rights are met, and *Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor School District* (1979) mandated measures to teach Standard English to students who spoke African-American English, (while recognizing AAE as a “systematic, rule-governed language system” but also that schools must enable students to succeed in various ways including learning Standard English) (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007).

Two other policies of great relevance are the 1965 Bilingual Education Act (Title VII), which was the major funding source for bilingual education and the language education of SLES students, and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 2001 by the Bush administration which eliminated the Bilingual Education Act (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007; Varghese, 2004). The latter includes the infamous *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) legislation and

effectively terminated federal funding for bilingual education, even removing the word “bilingual” from all its documentation wording (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). While much attention was given and great progress made in bilingual education and second language acquisition research in the interim (and even since 2001), the end effects of NCLB are the increasing “inclusion” of SLES students in mainstream classes (and testing), even when their English proficiency and teachers’ mismatched preparation present overwhelming barriers to learning, and a contentious political and sociocultural atmosphere surrounding SLES and their education (among other issues in education and teaching, such as teacher accountability and standardized testing). In short, while the earlier decisions and federal policies, along with social movements such as Civil Rights and Multicultural Education research raised awareness and confirmed the rights of CLD students to equitable education, the 2002 legislation contradicted and counteracted that progress with federal hand-washing and an antagonistic political climate. Organizations such as “US English” have lobbied against bilingual education, which 17 states have abolished. These policies have forced the sink-or-swim immersion of ELL students into mainstream classrooms, under the guise of “inclusion,” often without ESL support (Lucas, 2011a, 2011b; Villegas & Lucas, 2011).<sup>13</sup>

As to language and bilingualism in the general sociocultural sphere, the climate is similarly unfriendly, if not always hostile. Only 9% of Americans speak their native language and an additional language, compared to 53% of Europeans (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010), for example. Ninety percent of those who study a second language in schools and universities choose the “traditional” European languages, Spanish, French, German, or Italian, and only 10%

---

<sup>13</sup> Even with ESL support in the form of an ESL classroom, overall, ELLs spend most of their school time in mainstream classrooms (Lucas, 2011a, 2011b; Villegas & Lucas, 2011).

study Mandarin, Hindi, Arabic, and Russian, for example, which have huge numbers of native speakers worldwide (Ethnologue (online), 2013), much less “Less Commonly Taught Languages” such as Cantonese, Vietnamese, Korean, Tagalog and Urdu from among the top languages of ELL students. Some studies find widespread support of the learning of world languages (Robinson, Rivers, & Brecht, 2006), but media reports tout the primary importance of science and math education, and even English language education, far above that of world languages in the public eye (Monmaney, 2013). Admittedly, this discussion concerns the learning of “enrichment” languages among first-language English speakers and does not reflect directly on education for those who speak a language other than English as a first language, but it might be safe to say that the limited interest (or success) in gaining proficiency in languages other than English does not bode well for an inclusive attitude toward linguistic diversity. If 91% of Americans have little to no experience in learning a second language, where will interest, understanding, and respect for other languages come from?

Dispositions are still widespread that center on a monolingual, monocultural, assimilationist understanding of school and society. Hakuta (2011) cites a cultural bias against bilingualism and Villegas (2009) refers to “a deep-seated fear that cultural and linguistic diversity threatens the unity of society,” which stems from the belief that the language and culture of the dominant group are “inherently superior to the languages and cultures of other groups, especially those of people of color” (p. 552). Another interpretation is that language is but a proxy for racial difference and ultimately for discrimination (Sekhon, 1999), but surely the two are likely linked, language plays a role in societal inequities and discrimination, and the hegemony of native standard English is persistent.

The sociopolitical context is now especially charged due to increases in immigration, greater diversity among immigrants, decreased funding and policy support and charged political discussions about bilingual education coupled with increased pressures of standardization and accountability, and very likely, the recent economic downturn (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). These forces combine so that we find more and more diverse students in the mainstream classrooms, subject to standardized testing, competing for attention and resources, and contributing to teachers' accountability judgments. It can safely be said that every mainstream teacher will have at least one SLES in her classroom at some time in her career (Valdés & Castellon, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2011) and, the onus is now on the mainstream teacher to provide equitable access to learning for SLES and all other students.

In this unfriendly political context, Hakuta (2011) finds some hope in the Common Core State Standards which came out in 2012, citing them among three areas currently in play that he believes will help shape our knowledge of CLD in the next few years. Among these are standards intended to encourage a) attention to language in the schools, b) critical thinking about the teaching of (academic) language, and c) consideration of how "Language" and English Language Arts standards apply in meeting the needs of ELL (and other CLD students) (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2012). Gollnick (2002) also professional organizations' standards that reference improved language awareness for teachers. Some attention is being drawn to language and to ELL learning through the standards and their implementation. Researchers at Stanford's College of Education are promulgating research into how the Common Core State Standards affect teaching and learning for SLES in the schools (Understanding Language Group, 2013), and many education researchers have focused attention on similar

questions. It is only in the footsteps of these researchers that I am able to propose linguistic inclusiveness and a corresponding curriculum for teachers.

### **Research Context: Approaches to teacher preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity**

Since desegregation and the civil rights movement in the 1960s, educators and education researchers have been concerned with the education rights and equitable educational opportunities of minority groups in the United States. Beginning with a focus on social and cultural differences between racial/ethnic groups, and a framework of Multicultural Education (Banks, 1988, 2001; J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1995; Gay, 2000; Grant & Ladson-Billings, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 2001, 2006), teacher education adopted the concept of *culturally responsive teaching* (Bartolomé, 1994; Gay, 2000, 2002; Villegas, 1991; Villegas & Lucas, 2002b). From this foundation, *linguistic responsiveness* developed, promoting teachers' sociolinguistic awareness and considerations of the importance of teaching a standard language used in school and society while valuing students' varying languages and language varieties (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008). Linguistically responsive teaching also entails teacher knowledge of second language acquisition and scaffolding of language for SLES.

Meanwhile methodological approaches were being developed that integrate language learning with content learning by laying out methods and strategies for teaching about the language essential to a lesson and adapting language-based learning to match the language proficiency levels of students, especially taking into account SLES. And recently, researchers have applied systemic functional linguistics (e.g. Halliday, 1994) to reveal the language patterns of different disciplines and created methods for teachers to discover those patterns and look critically at and teach critically the language use in their classrooms .

Methods of teaching and scaffolding language in the classroom and of analyzing patterns of language use have laid a foundation for what will be called *linguistic inclusiveness* in that they are ways of including language in teachers' thinking and in classroom teaching and learning. The focus on language that they design, however, is limited to a focus on learning the immediate English academic language of the classroom, however. While attention to language is a scaffold for SLES learning, it has not been combined in these methodological approaches with linguistically responsive teaching or linguistic awareness education in a way that builds a wider *linguistic inclusiveness* – one that could parallel multicultural education with respect to language or contribute to it knowledge of language and inclusive dispositions. Teacher education toward linguistic inclusiveness is the goal of this dissertation study, and it draws heavily from these preceding approaches and research in developing equitable educational opportunities for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Each of these approaches is discussed in suite in the sections that follow to provide a research context for the present study.

### **Attention to culture: Multicultural Education and Cultural Responsiveness**

The US has always been multi-ethnic and multi-lingual, but much of our history is marked by the segregation of various racial, ethnic and language groups into schools separate from the (White, monolingual English-speaking) majority or “mainstream”, schools that nonetheless aimed to assimilate minorities into (certain social positions in) the majority culture (Lomawaima, 1994; MacDonald, 2004; Villegas, 2009). Schools were officially integrated with the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision and physically integrated in the years following, but there was no cogent plan for culturally integrating or accommodating ethnic minorities into the existing school culture (Gay, 2004), and for the decades since integration, cultural and linguistic minorities have fallen prey to unequal education outcomes widely recognized since

Linden Johnson's War on Poverty (Banks, 2012). These unequal outcomes are referred to as "achievement gaps" or as an "education debt" that minorities are owed due to the failure of the schools to provide equitable education (Ladson-Billings, 2006). To explain the gaps, research has progressed from racist eugenics hypotheses of the early-mid- 20<sup>th</sup> century and studies in the 1960s asserting minorities' IQ deficits, to those claiming cultural deprivation in the homes of minorities. More reasoned and reasonable understandings have become more common since the 1980s of cultural *differences* between the home cultures of CLM students and that of the schools and of the dire consequences of the schools' and teachers' ignorance of those differences (Villegas, 1991).

The Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s instigated a cultural turn from assimilationist goals in US schools to a more pluralistic<sup>14</sup> *multicultural education* movement beginning in the 1970s (Villegas, 2009) calling on schools to recognize, validate and integrate different US cultures in the classroom. With a focus especially on racial/ethnic minority groups (e.g. African-American, Hispanic, and Native American cited in Villegas, 1991), multicultural education seeks to create equal educational opportunities for all students "by changing the total school environment so that it will reflect the diverse cultures and groups within a society and within the nation's classrooms" (Banks, 2013). A wide-reaching research and education framework, multicultural education researchers paved the way in laying bare the institutionalized discrimination that Villegas and Lucas (2002a) offer as the ultimate explanation for achievement gaps and devising pathways toward social justice for culturally and linguistically diverse students. The multicultural education research and social movement also contributes, for our purposes, an understanding of who marginalized populations are (racial, ethnic, religious/philosophical, socio-

---

<sup>14</sup> Brisk (2008a) cites *cultural pluralism* as a key assertion of the 1972 Commission on Multicultural Education sponsored by AACTE (the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education).

economic, gender/sexuality, diverse-ability and linguistic minorities), and what cultural backgrounds they bring to the schools. Multicultural education scholars continue to investigate, exemplify, and propagate information about progressive multicultural education practices. The 4-volume *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education* (Banks, 2012) has 695 entries with topics from “magnet schools and resegregation” to “teacher educator preparation for diversity.” Similarly, the *Handbook of Multicultural Education* (Banks & Banks, 2004), first published in 1995, contains 49 chapters, including an entry on “language issues in multicultural contexts”(Minami & Ovando, 2004).

Multicultural teacher education emphasizes developing teacher dispositions away from ignorance, fear and “deficit orientations” that blame achievement gaps on problems inherent in minority groups (such as IQ or cultural deprivation) and toward recognizing socially-constructed privilege and discrimination as the main factors, and respecting, valuing, and advocating for CLD students (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Also among multicultural teacher education emphases, enumerated in Abbate-Vaughn (2008) are: “de-othering” CLD students (p. 196); learning about students’ prior knowledge and making connections between it and curricula; fostering relationships between parents, community, service agencies, schools and pre-service teachers; and recognizing that “teachers are to be bastions of democracy and equal access” (p. 196) and brokers between schools and “diverse home cultures” (p. 180). Valdés and Castellon (2011) propose the examination of the power structures and social prejudices (and hostility) against various CLD groups, teacher research into immigrant groups’ and individual students’ cultural, former national, educational, and linguistic backgrounds, the celebration of diversity, and honest exploration about difference, diversity and changing society.

In a reflection of multicultural education principles, the Carnegie Foundation's *Teachers for a New Era* study (Carnegie Foundation, 2007) also recommends the following multicultural awareness practices:

- that schools and teachers work with families
- that teachers engage students and know how children develop--including children with different learning styles, abilities and cultures
- that teachers comprehend basic elements of the cultures in which the pupils live
- that teacher education programs should devote attention to considerations of national culture, representative cultures, and how sensitivity to culture works as an ally to effective teaching
- that “curriculum materials and teaching strategies aim at accuracy with respect to what accepted research findings have reported on differing cultural traditions and their effects upon learning” (p.16).

Related to multicultural education, but developed in their own right are, Critical Race Theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Hayes & Juarez, 2012), Social Justice Education (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Juarez, Smith, & Hayes, 2008; Zeichner, 2009; Zeichner & Flessner, 2009), and Critical Pedagogy (e.g Henri Giroux, bell hooks, Christine Sleeter, Jonathan Kozol (1991), Paulo Freire (2000)). Cross-reference is made between researchers in these mutually-reinforcing frameworks, such as Zeichner and Flessner (2009) citing “equity pedagogy,” a basic tenet of multicultural education (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995; Banks, 2004b), as also fundamental in social justice teacher education. All of these areas have as ultimate goal the equitable education of marginalized students with recognition of the relevance of students’ socio-cultural backgrounds and the socio-cultural presumptions and expectations of teachers (and others) at school.

Wide-reaching in its theoretical and empirical foundations, multicultural education encompasses five “dimensions” of research and continued reform: integration of multicultural content, knowledge co-construction in the diverse classroom, an empowering school culture for

CLD students, reduction of prejudice, and an equity pedagogy (Banks, 1995). These dimensions are each extensive in scope, affecting many areas of education. Much more will be said about multicultural education in Chapter 3, as it is a foundational framework for linguistic inclusiveness. Multicultural education is the first and foremost concerted effort to address educational equity for cultural and linguistic minorities. It lays a foundation for continued development and for the subsequent conceptualizations of *culturally responsive teaching* and *linguistically responsive teaching*, and for the linguistically inclusive teaching concept put forward in this dissertation. Multicultural education focuses on minority group rights and *cultural* recognition and integration, and linguistic inclusiveness will emphasize *language*.

Out of multicultural education and conceptualizations of equitable educational opportunities for CLD students came its teacher education corollary beginning in the 1980s, known variably (Ladson-Billings, 1995; J. S. Lee, 2010) as culturally appropriate, culturally compatible, culturally congruent, culturally relevant, culturally sensitive, or culturally responsive teaching (Au, 1980a; Boyer, 1993; Cazden & Leggett, 1981; Jacob & Jordan, 1987; Jordan, 1985). Villegas and Lucas (2002b) and Gay (2000) independently wrote book-length discussions on culturally responsive teaching.

Cited by Banks (2004b) as a significant contributor to the development of multicultural education, Geneva Gay developed a model of *culturally responsive teaching* (Gay, 2000) to “epitomize” multicultural education and its component parts or dimensions (Gay, 2004). Gay (2002) defines *cultural responsiveness* as “using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (p. 106). Villegas and Lucas (2002a, 2002b) also develop a framework for educating culturally responsive teachers with a similar emphasis on teachers examining their own attitudes and

prejudices, learning about students, using materials that reflect students' cultures, and adopting dispositions and pedagogies of *including* CLD students in co-creating of knowledge and a classroom culture. They propose six strands of learning for teacher education programs to develop a vision for culturally responsive teacher education and provide numerous examples of culturally responsive teaching practices and their positive results from the literature to support their claims. These approaches for teacher education and the development of dispositions and knowledge bases to support culturally responsive teaching are further discussed in Chapter 3 as essential for the development of linguistic inclusiveness as a conceptual framework and for its successful implementation as a complementary pedagogy.

Cultural responsiveness focuses on social and cultural inclusiveness principles such as developing teacher dispositions and skills in recognizing cultural differences, interrogating prejudices and oppression at institutional and personal levels, challenging power discourses that privilege mainstream culture (and language, as a lesser focus) and engaging diversity *as* (not just *in*) the classroom context and content. This is essential teacher knowledge and disposition if teachers are to create optimal learning opportunities and truly inclusive classrooms for CLD students. Similarly, multicultural education has mainly focused on bridging gaps between diverse students' and teachers' (or schools') *cultures* and integrating members of diverse, historically marginalized groups, their contributions to various fields, their cultures and their ways of thinking into school curricula and school cultures. While marginalized *linguistic* groups are among those lifted up by multicultural education work, language as such is more rarely addressed beyond discourse or cultural language-use issues that are raised especially for culturally responsive teaching. Nonetheless, multicultural education and cultural responsiveness lay a powerful foundation for both linguistic responsiveness *and* linguistic inclusiveness in the

shared aims of not only “working with” but including and even *encouraging* cultural and linguistic diversity in the schools and society.

### **Attention to language: linguistically responsive teaching**

While second language acquisition and bilingual education studies began in earnest especially in the 1960s following the *Lau v. Nichols* decision (Hakuta, 2011), it was only more recently (e.g. Brisk, 2008a; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Lucas et al., 2008; Valdés et al., 2005) that “mainstream” (general education or non-language) education research and teacher education came to focus on language as a “missing piece” of the diversity puzzle (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Prior to the NCLB legislation and its elimination of funding for bilingual education, the majority of SLES students were educated “separately” in various bilingual and transitional ESL programs (where they were taught English as a second language for some time and then transitioned into mainstream English-medium classes) (Crawford, 2004), bilingual education specialists researched how best to educate SLES and advocate for their rights (August & Hakuta, 1997), and mainstream public education went its merry way privileging standard English. Multicultural education research drew attention to cultural influences on language use and the struggles of speakers of minority varieties of English starting in the 1980s, and the burgeoning field of sociolinguistics and the sociocultural turn in the humanities at that time also began to influence understandings in the education arena of the effects on educational access and outcomes of differences in language and communication patterns (Minami & Ovando, 2004). Recent waves of immigration brought immigrant SLES students to classrooms across the US, speaking a variety of languages, while the majority of teachers are still and in increasing numbers white, monolingual English speakers (Crawford, 2004), creating a *demographic imperative* for teacher education to determine ways for teachers to better provide equitable

education to diverse students (Banks et al., 2005). Teacher education research is now recognizing the importance of *mainstream* teachers' knowledge of second language acquisition and *linguistically responsive teaching* (de Jong & Harper, 2005, 2008; Harklau, 1994; Lucas, 2011b; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Lucas et al., 2008).

We can recognize the attention that turned first to *cultural* aspects of language use and communication even in the cultural responsiveness literature (e.g. Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Groundbreaking studies such as Philips (1972)(1972), Heath (1982), and Au (1980b) drew attention to language use patterns that affect minority children's success in the schools, revealing that even native English speakers, in these cases CLM students who are speakers of marginalized English dialects, come to school with different patterns, assumptions and understandings of language use. These and other studies brought language into discussions of preparing teachers and schools for diversity by explicating differences in language use, asserting the cultural identities of language-based minority groups, and showing how institutionalized discrimination, in this case as linguistic presumptions, operated in the schools to the great disadvantage of CLM students (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Ignorance of language differences meant CLM students' access to equitable education was denied, with dire consequences.

More recently, discussions of what teachers need to know about language have added a focus on sociolinguistic understandings of the central importance of language in schooling and of socio-cultural background in language use (Brisk, 2008a; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Gibbons, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005). In their framework of culturally responsive teaching, Lucas and Villegas (2010) recommend that teacher-candidates take a sociolinguistics course. With its emphasis on the various cultures of historically marginalized groups, culturally responsive teaching gave much attention to the language use patterns of

African Americans and Native Americans (including Native Hawaiians), to African American English as a dialect, to the need to explicitly teach “literate discourse” and standard language forms (Delpit, 1995b), and thus to many basic sociolinguistic concepts, such as language variation, dialects, *register*, academic language, *prestige*, standard dialects, and language and identity.

National level studies in education and teacher education have taken up call for teachers to have sociolinguistic awareness, also focusing on speakers of marginalized dialects of English. In the chapter dedicated to language in a national study (sponsored by the National Academy of Education) examining the central pedagogies and foundational knowledge recommended for teacher education programs, Valdés et al. (2005) exemplify sociolinguistic “uses of language” (register, function, dialect, and identity) and assert that teachers “must understand enough about language itself so that they can recognize the ways in which their students are already extraordinarily healthy” (p. 146). Similarly, the “Five Big Ideas” of Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden’s (2005) National Academy of Education study (*A good teacher in every classroom*) demonstrate how teacher education must work to overturn common misconceptions and deficit views of CLM students, again focusing on sociolinguistic variation in English:

- 1) [*Dialects exist:*] Speakers of English, like speakers of every other language, use many different varieties or dialects, depending on their regional and class origins.
- 2) [*Dialects are structured:*] varieties of English vary in pronunciation, vocabulary, and even grammatical structures, are all complex and contain sophisticated rules, result from sophisticated implicit learning rather than the result of some failure to learn. Teachers should help students learn to speak and write standard English
- 3) [*Children learn the language/dialect of their environment/community:*] Most children come to school as competent speakers of the language spoken in their homes and communities even if that language is not a "standard" variant of English.

- 4) [*Register/Intra-speaker variation is normal.*:] speakers of any variant of English use many different registers and styles in their everyday lives; use language differently at home, in school, on the playground, and elsewhere. Teachers should help students expand their repertoire to include the styles of various academic conventions, without asking students to abandon styles appropriate for other contexts
- 5) [*School language may differ from home language (dialect, register and language use).*:] Only children whose families use language in ways that are very similar to the ways it is used in school will have acquired the rules for using school-like language. Children who have not been exposed to such language use may initially have difficulty with the many different meanings that questions and other communications have in school settings and will have to be taught these new forms, as well as new vocabulary. (p. 12-13, square-bracket parentheses added)

Cultural responsiveness thusly contributed to a focus on teacher knowledge of language, primarily emphasizing sociolinguistic awareness and affirming dispositions about difference.

The recent rise in immigration and its diversity have brought attention to second language learning and the needs of students who are second language English speakers. Harklau (1994) explained the different learning opportunities provided by ESL versus mainstream teachers, and how the latter group could better support SLES students' content and language learning. de Jong and Harper (2005, 2008) also outlined how even the best "mainstream" teaching practices do not provide equitable learning for SLES students, and that there are additional awarenesses and practices necessary. These considerations for what teachers need to know about language culminate in what Lucas et al. (2008) envision as *linguistic responsiveness* (also Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011). The term *linguistic responsiveness* seems to have been coined only in 2008 (Lucas et al., 2008), reflecting the recentness of the focus on language itself.

Fillmore and Snow (2002) were among the first to propose a more extensive view of what teachers need to know about language. They are much cited and very ambitious in their

recommendations about what *all* teachers need to know, not only ESL teachers and not only to benefit SLES. Their idea is that teachers should know about basic linguistic structure, first and second language acquisition of English language and literacy, and the sociolinguistic concepts of dialects and academic English. They also advise that teachers know how to judge correctness in students' writing, and what makes a sentence or a text easy or difficult to understand. To prepare teachers in these areas, they suggest *seven* university-level courses that would be relevant, including Language and Linguistics, the Language of Academic Discourse and Text Analysis, and Language Understanding in Educational Settings. Some of the suggested courses might be offered in other departments and taken as electives, but it is unlikely that teacher education programs could offer or require them all (Richardson, 2002). Wong Fillmore and Snow's conceptualization of cultural and linguistic diversity is an expanded one that includes second-language English speakers and teacher knowledge of second language acquisition in addition to sociolinguistics, perhaps due in part to the wave of immigration that began around 1985 (Abbate-Vaughn, 2008).<sup>15</sup> They also recommend teachers have a solid foundation in basic linguistics, but this call has been only rarely and vaguely reiterated in mainstream teacher education research (Steiner & Rozen, 2004; Valdés et al., 2005).

de Jong and Harper (2005) were among the first to focus on mainstream teachers' knowledge of second language acquisition and additional knowledge and practices, beyond "just good teaching," that they must have to provide appropriate learning environments and opportunities for SLES students. They discuss both cultural and linguistic misunderstandings about SLES classroom performance and second language acquisition, including reading and

---

<sup>15</sup> It should be noted, however, that Spanish-speaking Americans have been a part of CLD since the multiculturalism movement and of schooling since the early days of westward expansion (Kaestle, 1983; MacDonald, 2004); and concern for their (dual) language development (in Spanish and in English) has paved the way in bilingualism and CLD research, policy and teaching (August and Hakuta, 1997 for overview; also primary researchers too numerous to mention).

writing. They assert that ability to provide cultural scaffolding “requires teachers to have specific rather than generic understandings,” (p. 111) and while they fall short of overtly stating the same for *language* scaffolding, there are a number of things they show that a good teacher of SLES students needs to know and do, most fundamentally, “making English visible” (p. 103).

Some of the practices of good teachers of SLES they recommend are:

- keeping the cognitive demand challenging
- understanding the difference between academic and social language development and paying attention to SLES students’ levels in each
- providing structured opportunities that actively engage SLES in negotiating meaning through academic language
- considering the development of SLES students’ vocabulary, grammar and discourse competences and not overemphasizing pronunciation
- using students’ first languages as a resource to learning English and English literacies
- integrating language and content instruction, using graphic organizers to demonstrate language form and function, and modeling academic and subject-area language
- understanding differences in the structures of different languages and their discourse and written genres and how it might affect SLES students’ English language and writing, valuing their first language knowledge, and providing strategies for bridging the gaps between languages and patterns
- monitoring their own language use for language that may be confusing or difficult, such as idiomatic expressions, familiar vocabulary used differently in academic language, or vocabulary that SLES cannot be assumed to know (even if native speaker peers know it)

The last two of these practices require that teachers have quite developed knowledge and cognizance about language structure over and above responsive cultural understandings and teaching practices. To be reflective on one’s own language use requires an understanding of the structural options and the choices one is making of, for example, which words to use and how to phrase one’s meaning. These choices are generally unconscious, so being cognizant means becoming aware through explicit attention to or studies of language. Similarly, the recommended practices involve a fundamental knowledge of the natural processes and progression of second

language acquisition, and even of the structures and discourses of other languages. de Jong and Harper (2005) thus draw attention to SLES students' language-related educational needs and to linguistic knowledge required of teachers of SLES students.

Linguistically responsive teaching, as put forward by some of the main researchers in culturally responsive teaching (Lucas, 2011b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a), reflects the linguistic equivalent of certain requisite teacher dispositions and practices from that earlier paradigm. For example, *sociolinguistic consciousness*, a main orientation of linguistically responsive teaching<sup>16</sup> resembles the sociocultural awareness required for culturally responsive teaching (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a) in that both emphasize teachers' knowledge of the role of culture values and identity on language use patterns and the importance of sociopolitical grouping and power issues and of institutionalized discrimination. Culturally and linguistically responsive teachers must interrogate those the power structures and recognize how they themselves (as white English native speakers) have benefitted from being members of the privileged mainstream.

Linguistically responsive teachers are to be educated to value linguistic diversity and to advocate for SLES students, just as culturally responsive teachers are to develop affirming attitudes toward CLM students and to act as change agents (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). In addition, linguistically responsive teaching brings attention to SLES students in the call for culturally and linguistically responsive teachers' to learn about students' background experiences and abilities. Where linguistically responsive teaching adds a focus on *language* is in the knowledge and skills specified for linguistically responsive teachers: identifying the language demands of classroom discourse and tasks and what students are expected to be able to do using language, knowing and applying key principles of second language acquisition such as that conversational proficiency

---

<sup>16</sup> All references here to the framework of linguistically responsive teaching are equally from Lucas and Villegas (2010, 2011) and Lucas et al. (2008) as well as other sources specified.

normally precedes and does not entail academic literacy, and being able to scaffold instruction to promote SLES learning such as by providing visual aids, organizing collaborative learning activities, and providing multiple texts perhaps in students' languages.

These skills depend on teachers' basic knowledge of language structure, the functions of language, and second language acquisition, in addition to learning styles and scaffolding methods. Lucas and Villegas (2010, 2011), Lucas et al. (2008), and Lucas and Grinberg (2008) also discuss the programmatic means by which teachers might be educated in these areas, such as adding a special course, requiring a linguistics course (in another department) for program entry or as a program requirement, and integrating language-oriented content across the teacher education program. For the sake of SLES students who are placed to English-medium classes in larger and larger numbers, linguistically responsive teaching requires that teacher education be revamped to include language-oriented learning. The framework of linguistically responsive teaching thus asserts the importance of teachers' knowledge and positive dispositions toward language in ways not previously seen in discussions of CLD.

While more attention is given to language itself (and not only to the marginalization of linguistic minority groups) in this approach, Zeichner (2005, and personal communication, 2013) argues that the *cultural* focus of CLD—and even the cultural side of *linguistic* diversity (i.e. sociolinguistics)—has dominated teacher education in cultural and linguistic diversity and its research base. This reflects the shift toward sociocultural theory in education and many language studies beginning in the late 1970s and especially dominant in the 1980s and 1990s (Johnson, 2006; Minami & Ovando, 2004). This turn was in part a reaction to the nativist view of language development, attributed to Noam Chomsky's work in linguistics during the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Chomsky, 1982), and to Stephen Krashen's work in language acquisition (e.g.

Krashen, 1982) both of which overemphasized “innate” capacities to learn language based simply on ambient language input.<sup>17,18</sup> Accordingly, linguistic responsiveness in teacher education focuses on teachers’ declarative knowledge that, for example, academic language proficiency differs from conversational language (Cummins, 1979a, 1999), that development in the first language supports second language (English) acquisition (Cummins, 1979a), and that a “safe, welcoming classroom environment” that minimizes anxiety, as well as comprehensible input and social interactions with native speakers, are of central importance (Lucas et al., 2008).

Lucas et al. (2008) mention that “explicit attention to linguistic form and function is essential to second language learning,” but in their discussion of scaffolding for SLES do not elaborate on how to enact that attention, nor how teachers might learn about language forms that restrict access to the academic content for cultural and linguistic minorities. Even identifying the language demands of a lesson, such as “listening to a lecture,” (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) does not mean that a teacher knows how to scaffold that listening or knows what aspects of listening might be challenging for various CLM students. The linguistic responsiveness literature underemphasizes teachers’ *procedural knowledge* of how to make language explicit, *how* (and when) to focus on language forms, *how to* make oral language and instructions clear, and how to adapt or rewrite a text without dumbing it down (Lucas et al., 2008)—or how to assess a text or engage learners in analysis for understanding. Lucas and Villegas (2011) recommend that teachers have a course in sociolinguistics and apply their knowledge of language acquisition, presumably acquired in yet another course. Some have recommended that teachers have an

---

<sup>17</sup> Chomskyan linguistics makes this claim only for first language acquisition, however, and not for the learning of language beyond the “critical period” of pre-puberty.

<sup>18</sup> Other potential influences on this line of thinking in Education are Jerome Bruner’s (1983 ) social interactionist theory of language development and concept of “scaffolding” (as children building on what they know), and Lev Vygotsky’s sociocultural psychology, or social development theory, that, roughly, asserts the social context-dependent nature of development and the crucial link between language and thought (Minami & Ovando, 2004). These theories are cited in multiple methods-based approaches discussed below..

introductory linguistics course (Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Valdés et al., 2005), but they do not consider how teacher-candidates are to connect ideas learned in such courses, especially those offered in other departments, to their teaching practice and ideologies. Conversely, methodological approaches discussed in the next section have addressed strategies and applications in teaching language alongside content, if not always the knowledge and dispositions underlying them or allowing flexibility and teacher professional judgment.

More will be said about linguistically responsive teaching in Chapter 3, where it is discussed as a foundational framework for the conceptualization of linguistically inclusive teaching put forward in this dissertation. Suffice it to say here that there has been increasingly direct attention to language in considering the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Attention to CLD students' learning, in terms of language, has progressed from recognizing linguistic minority groups among other groups in being disadvantaged by a biased school system (in multicultural education), to recognizing cultural influences on English usage and sociolinguistic variation (to some extent) in culturally responsive teaching, to linguistically responsive teaching's recognition of the content and language learning needs of immigrant and other second language English speakers now educated largely in mainstream English-medium classes. Linguistically responsive teaching has advanced a focus on language and on the needs of SLES students in teaching and learning.

### ***Functional linguistics and academic language***

Recent work in systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and functional linguistic analysis of academic and content-area language and text (Fang, 2005; Fang, Schleppegrell, & Cox, 2006; Fang, Schleppegrell, & Lukin, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2004, 2007; Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003;

Schleppegrell, Achugar, & Oteiza, 2004) is included in some discussions of linguistic responsiveness (Lucas, 2011b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011), and is representative of putting a concerted focus on language into practice. SFL studies have demonstrated differences in language use and text organization patterns in the service of meaning-making in different disciplines, and Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) propose functional linguistic analysis (FLA) of academic text as a classroom method of providing students access to academic language by unveiling its meaning-making structures, patterns and usages (also Gebhard, Harman, & Seger, 2007; Gebhard, Willett, Jimenez, & Piedra, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2013). FLA can also serve as learning activity in teacher education for uncovering assumptions about and aspects taken for granted in teacher-candidates' disciplinary language. When teacher-candidates engage in functional linguistic analysis of texts, they are engaging in one type of metalinguistic analysis, and thus gain practice in thinking critically about their own language usage and assumptions.

This type of functional linguistic analysis can be undertaken with teachers as part of their teacher education (Achugar, Schleppegrell, & Oteiza, 2007) and then also by those teachers with their students, even at the elementary level (Gebhard et al., 2007; Schleppegrell, 2013). In speaking about K-12 students who engaged in functional analysis, Schleppegrell (2013) reports that the process helps learners begin to see the larger systems in language and the options they have for making choices from those systems in different contexts and helps them to engage with abstraction and categorization. This would seem to be true of any learner engaged in the process for the first time, including preservice teachers, making it a valuable contribution to linguistically inclusive teaching.

## **Pedagogical and methodological approaches to integrating language and content**

Methods-oriented teacher education has also been concerned with including SLES students in the mainstream classroom for decades. Discussion of group work in support of second-language development and SLES participation in content learning in the 1970s, developed into a more defined model of *cooperative learning* in the 1980s (McGroarty & Calderón, 2005). The CALLA (the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach) model originated in the 1980s as well (Chamot et al., 1986), as did the concept of *sheltered instruction* (Northcutt & Watson, 1986, Schifini, 1985, cited in Peregoy & Boyle, 2005), or SDAIE (specially designed academic instruction in English), which refers to adapting curricula and teaching in the English-medium classroom to students' language proficiencies so that content matter is accessible and second language development is supported (as described in Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008). More recently, Walqui and Van Lier (2010) propose the QTEL model (Quality Teaching for English Learners), and Echevarria, Vogt, and Short's SIOP model (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol; originally 2000) is widely known. Other teacher-educator-researchers have also contributed to the general goal of educating mainstream teachers to *integrate language learning with content learning* in mainstream and content-area classes in support of ELL students (Echevarria et al., 2000; Y. S. Freeman & Freeman, 2009; Gibbons, 1993, 2002, 2009; Peregoy & Boyle, 1993; Walqui & Van Lier, 2010), whether for second-language learners or toward the learning of academic and disciplinary language (or both), which is increasingly recognized as differentiated (e.g. Gibbons, 1993; Schleppegrell, 2004). These methods-based approaches draw from second-language acquisition research and sociocultural theoretic approaches to learning that emphasize affective factors and social interaction in

learning, as well as *scaffolding*<sup>19</sup> on the part of the teacher, which draws from Lev Vygotsky's concept of *zone of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1978, cited in Gibbons, 2002 and others) and Stephen Krashen's (1982) *comprehensible input* and *i+1* (cited in Gibbons, 2009 and others). Though the approaches are well-researched (both in theory and in application) and well-intentioned, claiming not to be one-size-fits-all teaching gimmicks, they are focused on classroom methods, and what is missing is foundational education for the language awareness and knowledge to support the methods they propose – to develop teachers' understanding of the rationale for the methods and when to use them as well as the knowledge of language that would empower them to engage in the methods flexibly and “on the spot” in their classrooms (Walqui & Van Lier, 2010, p. 97).

A brief look at some of the methods education texts reveals some of the strategies proposed to support SLES learning.

### ***Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)***

The CALLA instructional framework, the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, was originally developed for ESL students preparing to transition into mainstream classes (Chamot et al., 1986), and is now promoted for use by mainstream teachers across the curriculum. It has three components: 1) a standards-based curriculum, 2) academic language development focusing on literacy, and 3) instruction in learning strategies (McGroarty & Calderón, 2005). CALLA's academic language component stems from Cummins's (1982) distinction in how conversational and school-language/literacy are acquired and includes content vocabulary, discourse structures of the disciplines, and “above all, the ability to gain information

---

<sup>19</sup> Scaffolding is “the temporary assistance by which a teacher helps a learner know how to do something, so that the learner will later be able to complete a similar task alone” (Gibbons, 2002, p. 10, with reference to Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976, and Bruner, 1978). It is now a frequently used term in education, which Gibbons (1993) is careful to distinguish from overly broad understandings.

from text and to express in written form what has been learned” (p. 91). The framework offers a five-point lesson plan model, including preparation, presentation, practice, students’ self-evaluation and expansion, or application of learning to beyond-the-classroom. CALLA emphasizes explicitness, metacognition, and scaffolded support, and in sum, is an early model of integrating (academic) language learning with rigorous content learning that shares a theoretical foundation with much of the subsequent (and now simultaneous) methods developed. McGroarty and Calderón (2005) mention that teachers may not be immediately aware of what academic language is in their disciplines or cognizant of how they use academic language and conversational language, sometimes intermingled. Further research would be needed into teacher education or professional training in the model to determine how teachers come to have this awareness.

### ***Peregoy & Boyle***

Suzanne Peregoy and Owen Boyle (and colleagues) have written an extensive and thorough methods textbook for mainstream teachers working with ELL students, now in its 6<sup>th</sup> edition (Peregoy, Boyle, & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2013). (The first edition was published in 1993.) The text offers myriad learning activities and teaching strategies, practices, and methodological conceptualizations, supported here and there by language facts and second language acquisition findings. Phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics are discussed briefly “to give [readers] an idea of the complex nature of language proficiency” (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005, p. 37), followed by sociolinguistic concepts in the next four pages and first and second language acquisition theories on the next ten or twelve. Elsewhere there is discussion of dialect and Ebonics, phonemic awareness and invented spelling, differences in writing systems, often presented in direct support of methodological concepts which immediately follow, such that emphasis is not

on deep understanding or reflective thinking about language and one's beliefs, but on the methods, with some rationale provided. There is very little exemplification or engagement with the language concepts, and at times the tone is quite disparaging. In one instance, in imagining how an ESL student comes to an understanding of a sentence, the authors highlight some morphological and syntactic knowledge that the student would use, but then write "these elements of morphology and syntax can be a bit tedious to think about (and write about!)" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005, p. 384). Far from encouraging teachers' inquiry stance toward the languages of SLES students or cultivating teacher professionalism, this flippant tone toward the study of language undermines the supposed goal of the textbook, to integrate language teaching into classrooms and support second language English learning. It echoes a common fear and mistrust of language and of the field of linguistics<sup>20</sup> that the course I am proposing aspires to contribute to resolving. A thorough source of creative strategies and methodological thinking, the book does not, however, (aim to) provide a foundation in language awareness.

### ***Freeman and Freeman***

Y. S. Freeman and Freeman (2009) offer more engaging exemplification of sociocultural issues in adolescent second-language academic language acquisition by including anecdotes and scenarios from SLES lives and the classroom that can help to foster positive, dutiful and caring teacher dispositions toward SLES students. Their volume also includes background theoretical considerations and research findings concerning academic and disciplinary language and second-language learning. There are overviews of what Scarcella (2003) considers the five components of academic language, the phonological, lexical, grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse

---

<sup>20</sup> A secondary English Language Arts teacher-candidate in my spring 2013 class stated, as "one thing you'd like to about language or linguistics," that *linguistics* was a word that scared her, and that she'd like to overcome that fear. This fear is also at work in anti-immigrant and English-only movements throughout American history (Burkholder, 2010; Sekhon, 1999; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007), but in academia stems from differences and changes in theoretical perspectives (Gordon, 2012; O'Neil, 2010; Walqui & Van Lier, 2010).

components (emphasizing the last two, citing Gee, 2008), and of the features of academic language laid out by Halliday and Hassan (1989), such as nominalizations, lexical density, and paratactic (parallel independent) and hypotactic (subordinate) clauses. There is also discussion of academic vocabulary, citing research on the percentage of Latin and Greek roots among technical terms (Biber, 1986; Corson, 1997), and of the importance of first language literacy (e.g. August & Shanahan, 2006). The book is very thorough as well as engaging, and with its focus on academic language, it might be judged to meet the language awareness needs of secondary teachers, perhaps with supplemental learning activities and readings such as the primary sources on disciplinary language (in functional linguistics; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010, and others), and on other topics such as second language acquisition, dialect variation, and structural linguistics. What might be considered lacking, however, is language exploration sufficient to develop in teachers an inquiry and inclusion mindset with respect to language, and skills in determining language learning objectives, as they model, e.g. for a social studies lesson, “Students will use complex sentences with clauses that show cause and effect as they write and talk about westward migration” (p. 151).<sup>21</sup> That is, the methods are well-reasoned, and some discussion of language structure and usage is included, but teacher-candidates are not led to do that thinking on their own; their knowledge of language is not developed even in support of the methods proposed.

Freeman and Freeman have also written a methods- and philosophy-oriented volume for teachers concerning second language acquisition and socialization in schools (D. E. Freeman & Freeman, 2011), and notably, a linguistics coursebook for teachers, D. E. Freeman and Freeman (2004), focused on literacy and early acquisition.

---

<sup>21</sup> The expected level of sophistication for English Language Arts language objectives was notably higher in their examples, so perhaps the authors recognize varying degrees of language knowledge and awareness between content-area teachers.

## ***Gibbons***

Pauline Gibbons is another who has been contributing in the scholarship on SLES schooling. Her 2002 methods book, *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning* has been cited in other teacher education texts (Y. S. Freeman & Freeman, 2009; Walqui & Van Lier, 2010) and research (Lucas & Villegas, 2010 and 96 others in Social Sciences Citation Index), and she has published multiple books on the topic for teachers and teacher-candidates (Gibbons, 1993, 2002, 2006, 2009) in addition to research in scholarly journals. *Learning to Learn in a Second Language* (Gibbons, 1993) is also a groundbreaking book, geared toward the teaching of elementary SLES, that encourages integrating language and content learning, lists language demands, and emphasizes the use of first languages in the classroom, around the school, and by parents. Gibbons (2009) lays a central role to the teaching of language, suggesting students learn a metalanguage and that classrooms include language form-focused activities. She discusses the features of academic texts (with examples; including concepts such as nominalization, nominal groups (or, complex noun phrases), action verbs, simple present tense, and various functional terms), and lays out five language-focused steps for teachers to take in planning an integrated program: 1) take into account students language strengths (in first language and in English) and learning goals, 2) identify the target language in the lesson, 3) select the language to focus on, 4) design activities to use the focus language, and 5) evaluate the unit. Steps 1-4 involve a high degree of language reflection, and a central goal of Gibbons' approach is to encourage students' critical thinking about language in the context of engaging with the content. The three types of cues to reading comprehension are mentioned (graphophonemic cues to decoding, syntactic and semantic cues to word meaning),<sup>22</sup> but there is no discussion of phonology, syntax or semantics

---

<sup>22</sup> These cues are also cited in Peregoy et al. (2013); it is interesting that *morphological* cues to decoding and word meaning are not included in this "standard" list from Goodman (1967); (cf. Nagy et al., 2006).

as such, and Gibbons is clear in her message that language form should not be excised from its context and meaning. This privileges a meaning-oriented focus that might undermine teachers' wider understanding of language, which might better include knowledge of structural components and cross-linguistic and cross-variety similarities and differences, of acquisition processes, of disciplinary usage differences and of the structural bases for meaning.

### ***Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL)***

Walqui and Van Lier (2010) propose Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL) as a “pedagogy of promise,” that is, pedagogy where teaching and learning are aimed at what students can become. This entails maintaining high expectations and scaffolding in ways that amplify the language and curricular materials, not simplify. They outline five principles for ELL teaching practice: sustaining academic rigor, holding high expectations, engaging ELLs in quality teacher-students interactions, sustaining a language focus, and developing a quality curriculum. The language focus is to entail attention to vocabulary, grammatical structures and the features of academic genres in a way that “academic and linguistic work should flow seamlessly together” (p. 99). Teachers are to be able to think on the spot about language issues that arise: “The key is not to add short grammar lessons or vocabulary quizzes (although they may have some role to play in a well-balanced unit of study), but to engage learners in challenging and meaningful activities and projects and find ways of dealing effectively with the language problems that inevitably come up...” (p. 98). This volume provides a great deal of theoretical background and methodological thinking that could serve as a rationale for most of the other methodological approaches reviewed here, with references to cognitive and social theories of learning and second language, recognition of academic versus conversational language forms and skills and of the importance of identity and welcome for SLES students

balanced with scaffolded access to rigorous academic content. While there is a great deal of rationale and teaching philosophical discussion, there is less in the volume in the way of specific strategies or methods *or* support for learning about the language structures and usages themselves.

### ***Sheltered immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP)***

Perhaps the most widespread and well-known approach to integrating language and content teaching is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol, or SIOP®, model developed through the Center for Applied Linguistics with support from the Department of Education. SIOP is a methodology for integrating language and content, for drawing teachers' and students' attention to language in the classroom to support language acquisition and development. It is a self-defined "instructional approach" to working with ELLs, or a "framework for well-prepared and well-delivered sheltered lessons" (Echevarria et al., 2008), where "sheltered" refers to scaffolding lessons to meet diverse learners' needs.

SIOP includes 30 focal points for teaching, or "features," in what was originally a protocol for observing teaching but has developed into a methodology for lesson planning and delivery, along with a training program and a series of training manuals. One of the language-related features of the lesson planning module in SIOP is to define, display and review with students the *language objectives* of each lesson. Determining language objectives is described as "a challenging proposition for many content teachers," that "requires a new way of thinking about their subject, specifically, both the written and spoken discourse" (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 28). In discussing how to go about determining language objectives, the authors refer to lexical and grammatical forms that construe meaning in written and spoken school discourse that have been discovered by Schleppegrell (2004) and Schleppegrell et al. (2004), but they neither

explain nor list any of these forms, and it is unclear in the SIOP® manual how teachers are to become familiar with them in order to refer to them in their language objectives.

According to the SIOP manual, language learning objectives are to be laid out in lesson planning alongside context objectives, academic language is to be introduced as part of building background to a lesson, maintaining comprehensible input is to involve assessing students' proficiency levels, oral language is to be developed during planned classroom interactions, and pacing and grouping configurations are also to be carefully planned to support language development (Echevarria et al., 2008). Each of these expectations in SIOP relies on knowledge of language – what is academic language? What is comprehensible input and what kind of abilities do students' proficiency levels entail? How is oral language developed differently from written? And how do we expect particular group configurations to support language development taking into account participant students' cultures, linguistic identities, learning styles and proficiency levels?

The authors suggest that teachers training in the SIOP method might be apprehensive that they have to become “grammar experts” in order to work with language in the expected ways. They reassure the reader that this is not necessary, but there clearly *is* foundational knowledge needed to support the language focus of the SIOP model. Examples given of language structures that might be included in language-learning objectives are questioning patterns, past or future tense verbs, pronoun usage and sentence formation – relying on teachers' ability to reflect on pragmatics, morphology, semantics and syntax, respectively. Whether this knowledge is assumed by SIOP, provided during SIOP training, or simply recommended research, it is not provided in the SIOP manual, raising concern that depth of language awareness is not developed through SIOP.

The SIOP model also recommends basing language objectives on state English language development or proficiency standards, Common Core State Standards for English language arts, the WIDA consortium standards, or the local curriculum, but also recognizes that these standards are too generic or too broad to be used as language objectives. Clearly there is linguistic thinking and knowledge involved in creating language objective statements and apparently *assumed* on the part of the teacher attempting to use the SIOP model.<sup>23</sup> The success that the SIOP model has purportedly enjoyed may stem from teachers' ability to "pick up" enough of this basic knowledge along the way or from past experiences and learning, but if SIOP is a new standard teaching model, then Teacher Education would do well to ensure that teacher-candidates have the basic linguistic knowledge it –and any similar methodology –relies on. Echevarria et al. (2008) mention that they assume "basic linguistic understandings that all teachers should have," and they cite Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2002), who, in fact, recommended an introductory linguistics course and six other courses on language and linguistics.

One additional method recently developed to address access to academic language is *functional linguistic analysis* (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003), as mentioned above and suggested by Lucas and Villegas (2011) as a method of linguistic responsiveness education. More will be said about this methodology in sections that follow.

### ***Summary of methods-based approaches***

The idea of linguistic inclusiveness is not lost on these methods-oriented pedagogies. Clearly their goal is to *include* language teaching, attention to language, and some degree of language awareness in the classroom (e.g. school and disciplinary registers, vocabulary, Latin

---

<sup>23</sup> They also recommend pairing up with ESL or bilingual colleagues to "tap his or her expertise for language topics" (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 27).

and Greek words and roots, word families and common affixes) and among teachers (e.g. knowing the functional language demands of lessons and specialized subject-area language, limiting figurative language, enunciating and allowing wait time, varying activities and allowing for progressive participation for SLES). Gibbons (2002) states “it is important to recognize the benefits to all students of a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom, and a culturally inclusive and language-aware curriculum” (p. 120), and Jim Cummins’ foreword extolls the book’s ability to reaffirm teachers’ commitment to nurturing the cultural and linguistic resources of students (p. viii). What these teacher education texts are generally lacking, however, is language-related content learning sufficient to engender teacher dispositions of inquiry about language (and especially the languages of SLES students and their own usages) and depth sufficient to build the language awareness I believe supports linguistic inclusiveness by empowering teachers with a sense of capability and a framework for thinking about language and questioning all its uses, forms and functions in the classroom. Hammerness et al. (2005) warns that when teachers learn only routines and not the theories and reasoning behind them, they do not develop the diagnostic and instructional skills – and adaptability—that may be necessary for enabling success among diverse students. Not all these methodological frameworks consist of simple routines, and indeed routines may have their role in both teacher learning and in allowing attention to new and other details. But a foundation in factual and theoretical knowledge is important for developing *adaptive expertise* that can help teachers with diverse and changing classrooms (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Hammerness et al., 2005). Additionally, actions that are supported by understanding are more often effective than those without understanding (Hammerness et al., 2005). Given the lack of experience most teachers have with other languages and with interrogating the structure, functions and pragmatics of English, many

of the methodological approaches would seem to necessitate a deeper language awareness in order to be better learned and ultimately more effective.

Despite an avowed sociocultural lens, the focus of these methodologies is on teaching *English* (especially academic language) alongside content and rarely on exploring how languages vary (and the consequences that has for understanding) or developing a true interest in students' first languages and understandings. Activating students' prior learning generally refers in these writings to their *English* levels and their *cultural* and educational background, and at most, their *literacy* levels in their first languages, but rarely to the cultural or grammatical knowledge of their *languages* themselves. Including a language focus in the classroom is a first step to responsiveness even if it is limited to English, but it falls short of linguistic inclusiveness as envisioned here to involve inclusion of students' language-based understandings and even aspects of their languages in learning activities.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, there is scarcely enough information about language structure in these methodological texts, and no inductive learning activities, to support the methods they propose, such as teachers determining the grammar, vocabulary and language functions of their lessons, or even designing sentence stems (or frames) to be used in particular discussion activities. Much less is there discussion of other languages to begin to predict areas of difference that might pose challenges *or allow contributions* to classroom content learning, to promote understanding, interest and appreciation for the languages of SLES students and colleagues.

The goal here is not to critique these efforts to integrate a language focus with content-teaching, of course. These volumes stem from extensive research and teacher education

---

<sup>24</sup> Some suggestion is made of including visuals of students' other languages in the classroom and in the school, but this tends to focus on the elementary level and is limited in scope.

experience and are aimed at providing concrete pedagogical steps, practices, methods and strategies for use in the classroom and in lesson planning. The goal of this critical look at the various approaches to teacher education for (and about) cultural and linguistic diversity is to learn from this extensive work in the area and to see what might be the next step to take in building more equitable learning for CLD students. Goldenberg and Coleman (2010) question whether the research is truly definitive on whether beliefs and attitudes must precede practice or can be gained from practices supporting language development, but the approach proposed in this dissertation espouses the former perspective, especially as pertains to *knowledge* (as opposed to dispositions). That is, knowledge of language is essential to developing practices and dispositions to provide equitable learning opportunities for CLD students. This knowledge base has been largely ignored and unspecified in the literature or not inclusive of language. This dissertation therefore provides a detailed discussion of what that knowledge base and a broader concept of linguistically inclusive teaching should include.

### **Summary of approaches to CLD**

Attention to education for our culturally and linguistically diverse student population began with attention to the marginalization of especially racial/ethnic groups and with the development of the Multicultural Education framework (Banks, 1988, 2001; J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1995; Gay, 2000; Grant & Ladson-Billings, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 2001, 2006) which came to recognize the similar marginalization of linguistic minority groups including speakers of non-standard English varieties. Teacher education adopted the concept of *culturally responsive teaching* (Bartolomé, 1994; Gay, 2000, 2002; Villegas, 1991; Villegas & Lucas, 2002b) which integrated understandings of culturally-influenced language use and discourse patterns differing across English language varieties and minority groups' linguistic cultures as

well as across languages. From this foundation, *linguistic responsiveness* developed (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008), promoting teachers' sociolinguistic awareness and considerations of the importance of teaching a standard language used in school and society while valuing students' varying languages and language varieties and adding knowledge of second language acquisition to teachers' requisite knowledge for providing equitable education for CLD students. Methodological approaches were simultaneously developed that integrate language learning with content learning. And recently, researchers have promoted systemic functional linguistics (e.g. Halliday, 1994) as a method of examining the language patterns of school texts and simultaneously accessing the language and the content and empowering students with awareness of language.

Methods of integrating language and content and of analyzing patterns of language use have laid a foundation for linguistic inclusiveness in that they are ways of *including* language in classroom teaching and learning. Linguistically inclusive teaching, however, will combine methodological approaches with the knowledge, skills and dispositions of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, emphasizing teachers' linguistic awareness. Teacher education toward linguistic inclusiveness is the goal of this dissertation study, and it draws heavily from these preceding approaches and research in developing equitable educational opportunities for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Before expanding on the proposed approach to CLD education, a brief look at the status of implementation of approaches is illuminating.

### **The state of teacher preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity**

An understanding the context for the proposed curriculum should be completed with consideration of the status of teacher education in this area. Multicultural education and

culturally responsive teaching, linguistically responsive teaching and a variety of methods of integrating language with content learning have been theorized and designed, but to what extent have these approaches been incorporated into teacher education? This question is a topic for a whole other research agenda, especially due to the difficulty in measuring implementation and measuring teacher uptake or changes in knowledge skills and dispositions across stages of their career when the learning occurred. With that caveat, I present some basic information about the state of teacher education in this area.

Among the methodological approaches, only SIOP (which has been copyrighted), reports on its usage. As of 2008, SIOP had been adopted as professional development for teachers by school districts in at least 26 states (Echevarria et al., 2008). SIOP is a methodological approach that school districts may adopt, calling in trainers to lead professional development sessions. To what extent university-based teacher education programs use this method or borrow from the basic methodology is a subject for further research, but some studies report the method's success in raising achievement among SLES students (Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Canges, & Francis, 2011; Short, Fidelman, & Louguit, 2012).

The other methods-based texts examined here have either “English Learners” or “ESL” in the titles, and as such may be limited in their adoption to programs for teachers seeking ELL or ESL endorsement as opposed to being part of the general teacher certification program for elementary or secondary teacher-candidates. A wider review of teacher education programs and their syllabi would shed light on the question, but it is expected to vary according to different state certification rules and the priorities of teacher education programs.

Linguistically responsive teaching is a relatively new concept, with the term being introduced in 2008 (Lucas et al., 2008), though work in the area is clearly underway (Lucas &

Villegas, 2011). The sociolinguistic awareness aspect of linguistic responsiveness had been in general education literature even earlier (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Delpit, 1992, 1995a; Valdés et al., 2005), and second language acquisition studies that contributed to Lucas et al.'s (2011) framework also were earlier (Cummins, 1979b; Krashen, 1982; Swain, 1995). Both areas of research must have influenced teacher education in some ways, given the widespread reference to the latter, especially, in the methods-based texts reviewed here.

The question is to what extent teacher education programs have *instituted* linguistic responsiveness education (and it would seem to be a rather involved procedure to measure it, unless there were simply dedicated courses). Students achievement research, however, shows that teacher education programs have not adequately integrated teacher preparation for CLD students, especially SLES (Valdés & Castellon, 2011). Despite the developing understanding of the need for teacher preparation for CLD, very little has changed in teacher education programs with regard to teacher education curricula and preparedness (Ardila-Rey, 2008).

In terms of official backing of multicultural and linguistic responsiveness education for teachers, one can look to state requirements. In such a study, Stevens (2008) reports that only four states had linguistic diversity requirements for all teachers (Arizona, California, Minnesota, New York), and only seven states required courses in multicultural or diversity education (Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, Wisconsin, Wyoming). Other findings reveal a similarly limited acknowledgement of the importance of teacher preparation for both linguistic and cultural diversity:

- only six states have requirements addressing linguistic preparation of teachers:
  - California requires a course in reading instruction involving phoneme awareness, “language” and comprehension (but not second language or educational linguistics)
- five states require a linguistics course for particular certifications:
  - Louisiana, Vermont and Pennsylvania only for ELL specialization

- Mississippi only for English teachers
- Missouri only for secondary English teachers
- 31 states require a course in content area literacy.<sup>25</sup>
  - 12 require them only for secondary education majors
  - 15, for all teacher candidates
  - only, for elementary teachers
- all states require courses in linguistic diversity or bilingualism *for ELL specialization*

Overall, the study shows quite a feeble directive for teacher education in CLD, especially as pertains to knowledge and skill in teaching linguistic structure and academic use and especially as pertains to mainstream teachers. Furthermore, as Stevens points out, even when states have requirements and teacher education programs have courses, it is difficult to know the orientations that they espouse and instill, much less the knowledge and linguistic awareness that are at issue for this study.

As evidence for teachers' lack of preparation for CLD, we could consider the persistent achievement gaps suffered by CLD students, such as that 46% of fourth-grader ELLs scored "below basic" in math and 73% "below basic" in reading nationwide in 2005 (compared to 11% and 25% respectively for White students)<sup>26</sup> (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). It can be asserted that some fault for the wider educational inequities listed by Zeichner (2012), such as inequalities in high school graduation rates, unequal access to college-prep courses, "unequal access to a broad and rich curriculum that educates students to understand and to think critically and in the disproportionate assignment of students of color and English learners to special education classes with limited educational opportunities" (Hawkins, 2011a, p. 6), are also attributable at least in part to inequities in education that marginalize culturally and linguistically diverse students,

---

<sup>25</sup> Stevens points out, too, that content area literacy courses do not necessarily promote practices that benefit ELL students, and more likely focus on "macro features" of creating an inclusive classroom, tapping students' funds of knowledge, and awareness of other areas that may be 'out of reach' for immigrant ELLs. They may provide needed scaffolding for other CLD students who are learning advanced literacies, however.

<sup>26</sup> This is the term used in the original source to refer to those not belonging to cultural or linguistic minority groups.

some of which in turn stem from inadequate teacher preparation in this area. The point is not to point the finger of blame at teachers, as is too often done, but if CLD students are marginalized socially and academically, part of the problem is surely teacher knowledge and beliefs, and part of the solution is surely teacher education.

Evidence of teachers' knowledge and attitudes can be found in a national study of university-based teacher preparation programs (Levine & Education Schools, 2006). In this study, principals, deans, teacher education faculty and teachers themselves were asked to rate teachers' preparation in 11 categories. By far the lowest ranking among them (across all respondent groups) was teachers' abilities to address the needs of linguistically diverse learners. Notably, only 27% of teachers themselves rated their abilities in this area at "moderately well" or "very well." Another survey of 5000 teachers in California (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005), where bilingual and ESL teacher education has arguably led the field, similarly found that teachers feel woefully unprepared to provide optimal learning opportunities for SLES students.

*Cultural* responsiveness seems to be faring better in teacher education and in the research literature. Fifty-two percent of the teachers in Levine's study rated their "abilities to address the needs of culturally diverse students" at "moderately well" or "very well." The Carnegie Corporation *Teacher's for a New Era* initiative prospectus (2007) mentions only cultural sensitivity and *neither linguistic sensitivity nor ELL* in its recommendations for teacher education research and improvement. There is an strong emphasis on culture in the teacher education literature on cultural and linguistic diversity that reflects a general trend of equating language with culture or recognizing only the cultural aspects of language (Villegas, 2009; Zeichner, 2005). As Lucas and Grinberg (2008) state: "the existing literature tends to treat linguistic and cultural diversity as one largely undifferentiated set of factors and to treat language as one of

many aspects of culture...” (p. 606). Similarly, in a survey of 180 pre-service elementary teachers, de Jong and Harper (2011) asked what teachers need to know to meet ELL students’ needs and found that the two major themes in the teachers’ responses were teaching as the application of strategies and an emphasis on culture, dwarfing any reference to language challenges and needs.

Ultimately, however, culture and language are “inextricably linked,” and both have an impact on children’s school achievement (Ardila-Rey, 2008), so the linguistic understandings of cultural and linguistic diversity and teacher education about language and linguistic diversity demand attention and development. While culturally responsive dispositions and practices are fundamental, they do not go far enough in understanding and supporting SLES students’ learning of both content and language (de Jong & Harper, 2008). The trend to focus on cultural awareness raises important questions that call for continued research and consideration: What is the knowledge base about language as opposed to culture in teacher education? Are teachers more confident about culture because they know more about it than they do about language? Is this misplaced confidence, or is culture truly more widely understood? How is cultural knowledge acquired and how is linguistic knowledge acquired among those to have or feel they have it? How can we provide teacher-candidates with the necessary knowledge of language to create equitable learning environments for all CLD students?

Despite the contributions of the linguistic responsiveness framework and research, it seems that there is still much more work to be done to prepare teachers for linguistic diversity. Though it comes from several years ago now, Valdés et al.’s (2005) summary of the obliviousness that language falls prey to in the classroom rings true:

“For many teachers, language only becomes a subject of discussion when it is suspected to be the underlying cause of students' problems. They are thus unable to analyze what is

typical at different stages of language development and what is characteristic of all children or only a few. They may, in fact, “misdiagnose” children's conditions and provide treatment for non-existing ‘illnesses’” (p. 127).

In sum, it seems that to the extent that multicultural education has brought us to examine assumptions and challenge prejudices about various ‘categories’ of CLD students (including speakers of various languages), the same has not been accomplished, through linguistic responsiveness or methodological approaches, in terms of raising awareness and challenging assumptions about *language itself*. Through detailed discussion of a possible curriculum and a case study of a language awareness class offered for secondary teachers, this study contributes toward an understanding of what teachers need to know and feel about language and linguistic diversity and how they might develop characteristics of linguistic inclusiveness from that knowledge.

In the language awareness curriculum proposed here, teachers will gain knowledge and skills that will allow them to include a language focus in the classroom, engaging in discussion of content vocabulary, concepts and textual meanings, soliciting student voices and languages as part of the sense-making that is central to learning (Bransford et al., 2000; Piaget, 1980), not only for wider access to content, but for all students’ development of critical thinking and linguistic global-mindedness and for truly inclusive classrooms. Teachers are empowered with basic knowledge of linguistic structure, variation and development and learn to take an inquiry stance to the languages of their classrooms, students and curricular materials. This inquiry stance also entails inclusion of the multiple and varied languages and linguistic understandings of all students. The teacher knowledge and learning involved in this approach is further elaborated in the chapters that follow along with discussion of the theoretical frameworks that support it, but in

sum, the intended inclusiveness is dual: inclusion of a language focus in classroom teaching and learning, and inclusion of students' multiple languages and language understandings in classroom communities and conversations. To enable this inclusion in K-12 classrooms, a strong foundation of language awareness and inquiry must be included in teacher education.

### **Proposal for teacher education and its rationale**

As has been mentioned throughout this chapter, this dissertation study has as its ultimate goal to promote an approach to cultural and linguistic diversity, referred to here as *linguistic inclusiveness*, that revolves around *including* a language focus, attention to language, language awareness, and students' language knowledge in the classroom and thereby creating a classroom atmosphere wherein linguistically diverse students and their linguistic insights are included and valued. Linguistic inclusiveness *cultivates* linguistic diversity by encouraging an interest in language and in languages and by *including* bilingual/bi-dialectal speakers' languages and understandings in the learning, thereby supporting their learning, their linguistic identities and pride, and the development of both (or all) of their languages.

A major part of linguistic inclusiveness inevitably resides in the attitudes and practices of teachers. As such, linguistic inclusiveness requires a language focus in teacher education as well; a foundational learning that builds language knowledge and awareness and encourages teachers'—and ultimately students'—reflection and inquiry stance<sup>27</sup> about language, and thereby, empowers them to include a language focus in their classrooms. This inquiry-oriented language focus, it is believed, will develop teachers' and students' critical thinking as well as a

---

<sup>27</sup> “*Inquiry as stance* is distinct from the more common notion of inquiry as time-bounded project or discrete activity within a teacher education course or professional development workshop. Teachers and student teachers who take an inquiry stance work within inquiry communities to generate local knowledge, envision and theorize their practice, and interpret and interrogate the theory and research of others. Fundamental to this notion is the idea that the work of inquiry communities is both social and political; that is, it involves making problematic the current arrangements of schooling; the ways knowledge is constructed, evaluated, and used; and teachers' individual and collective roles in bringing about change” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, p. 298). Here the term refers to teachers' (resulting) disposition and actions of reflection and interest in learning, along with students, about language.

multicultural open-mindedness that values language minority groups and language itself as well as multilingualism. This orientation depends on a basic knowledge base about language, its complex and fascinating structure, its multi-layered variation across languages and social groups, and factors and theories of how first and second languages are acquired and how they can be taught or supported.

The immediate goal of this dissertation is to propose and study a teacher education curriculum, designed to develop language awareness. This curriculum is at the root of the larger conceptualization of linguistic inclusiveness.

The linguistic inclusiveness approach to CLD that is proposed in this dissertation expands on the recommended knowledge and dispositions of the linguistic responsiveness framework and the various methodological approaches to the intentional and consistent integration of a language focus in the classroom discussed above. The specific teacher education curriculum aims to develop teachers' language awareness and knowledge as a foundation to support the methods-based integration of language and content learning and the building of dispositions and skills necessary for practices of cultural and linguistic responsiveness. The curriculum also incorporates recent work in educational linguistics that promotes functional linguistic analysis as a tool for accessing academic language (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010).

The linguistic inclusiveness approach to equity for CLD very much adopts and serves the goals of linguistic responsiveness as laid out in Lucas and Villegas's (2011) framework, but builds on them as well. Sociolinguistic consciousness of the sociopolitical dimensions and the role of identity in language as Lucas and Villegas mention, echoing the recognition of dialects and languages other than Standard English as funds of knowledge emphasized by Valdés et al.

(2005) and Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2005), is fundamental to genuine inclusion of CLD students' languages and linguistic knowledge. So is the value for linguistic diversity they cite. These dispositions toward language are an essential part of linguistic inclusiveness and a central goal of the language awareness curriculum.

The knowledge and skills that Lucas and Villegas list also mirror the methodological approaches discussed above, such as identifying the language demands of classroom tasks, scaffolding instruction, learning about ELL students' language backgrounds, and applying principles of second language acquisition. Where the preceding frameworks are less evident, however, is about how teachers should come about the knowledge and thinking that support these practices, or, how teacher education should develop it. The language awareness curriculum proposed here seeks to provide the requisite knowledge and a framework for continued learning about language and LM students by exposing teacher-candidates to the basic wisdom on language structure, variation and acquisition.

Specifics of the intended language awareness framework and how it can be achieved are discussed in Chapter 4, clarifying the vision of linguistic inclusiveness and allowing teacher educators to consider what is appropriate for their contexts and how their programs might implement language awareness education for teachers. In Chapter 3, I discuss how linguistic inclusiveness is built upon the foundations of multicultural education, linguistic responsiveness and other conceptual frameworks.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, what we stand to gain from linguistically inclusive teaching is something nearing equitable education for CLD students. As a first step, teachers' attitudes toward CLD students, which are central in all their interactions, stand to be improved through better understanding how and why language varies, examining what is involved in language

acquisition, and interrogating their own assumptions and prejudices about language, usage, and linguistic minority groups. Teachers can overturn their own deficit thinking about CLD students and even gain tools to challenge deficit thinking in their institutions. Attitudes about language itself and about practices surrounding language use and development can also be informed by a foundational knowledge of language and experience in thinking about language. As Campano and Ghiso (2011) write, concerning integrating LM student voices in literature studies, “educators are uniquely positioned to recognize their students’ expertise by honoring the value of being multiliterate [or multilingual] and providing opportunities for students to engage with and create texts that cross linguistic boundaries” (p. 173). The same is true of facilitating LM students’ creation of enlightening, boundary-crossing learning experiences for all students through integrating their voices in every classroom. Teachers are at the center of this linguistic inclusiveness if they can overcome apprehension about incorporating ideas that are beyond their cultural and linguistic ken and adopt a learner’s stance as Campano and Ghiso (2011) suggest, and if they can be empowered with basic linguistic knowledge that allows them to accept the limits of their knowledge and frame continued inquiry for their own and their students’ learning. Providing this knowledge base toward empowering teachers for linguistic inclusiveness is the goal of the curriculum proposed in Chapter 4.

Linguistically inclusive teaching is a means of integrating diverse voices in the classroom and thereby creating richer learning for all students as well as a welcoming environment for CLM students. Schools are often inhospitable to CLM students’ linguistic resources, holding Standard English as the only acceptable language and in the process compromising native language facilities and hampering English acquisition (Campano & Ghiso, 2011) and interpersonal relationships. On the other hand, when multiple languages and understandings are

honestly explored and valued, CLM students themselves can appreciate their first language and cultural knowledge, develop pride, self-assurance and motivation, and perhaps even set goals for continued development of their first languages, which in turn supports their English language development (Cummins, 1979b). In this way, linguistically inclusive teaching can improve educational outcomes for CLM students and play a role in fostering multilingualism.

Finally, including language exploration in the classroom not only provides opportunities to make expectations (such as standard and academic English usages) explicit, opening awareness and access to this linguistic knowledge for LM students, but also encourages critical thinking and develops metalinguistic awareness for all students toward deeper engagement with the curriculum and deeper learning.

### **Chapter 3: Foundations in Theory and Research**

In this chapter, I present theoretical frameworks and perspectives that inform the various areas that this dissertation touches on. Social justice teacher education and multicultural education share the main goal of equitable education with linguistic inclusiveness, which draws heavily from multicultural education as a framework and also from the concepts of culturally responsive teaching and linguistically responsive teaching. Theories of learning and perspectives on teacher learning and on language also shape the linguistic inclusiveness approach and the curriculum proposed in Chapter 4. I adopt constructivist and sociocultural views of learning for both the K-12 students ultimately affected and the teachers targeted for the teacher education curriculum, who are viewed as professionals and as agents for social justice. Finally, the content of the curriculum is influenced by generative and functional linguistics. In discussing each of these supporting perspectives in this chapter, I further develop the conceptualization of linguistically inclusive teaching that is put forward as a new goal for teacher education and intended in the curriculum outlined in Chapter 4.

#### **Fundamental Frameworks**

While the immediate approach taken in this dissertation is one of educating teachers toward awareness of language in the classroom, the ultimate goal is to support linguistic diversity and build dispositions of linguistic inclusiveness and equity in society. It is high time that the US cultivate a society welcoming of and knowledgeable about language and multilingualism, not oppressive of those who speak differently from the mythic and monolingual standard. Given that the so-called standard language is that of the powered elite, any study of language in education must take into account power dynamics, and in interrogating those and attempting to subvert them and create a more equitable education system, such a study locates

itself in social justice-oriented thinking. This study is thus informed by the framework of Social Justice Teacher Education (e.g. Zeichner, 2009; Zeichner & Flessner, 2009).

More directly, this study in linguistic diversity looks to research in cultural diversity, namely, the framework of Multicultural Education and its scion, Culturally Responsive Teaching, discussed in Chapter 2. Multicultural Education has included linguistic minorities in its conceptualization of historically marginalized groups whose cultures have not been incorporated in the school discursive norms, but has not addressed language itself as directly as is the goal here. In conceptualizing linguistic inclusiveness as a means to address language and linguistic issues, the framework of multicultural education provides a blueprint from which much can be directly translated to address language in education. There are five dimensions of multicultural education (discussed below), for example, each of which has a parallel in linguistic inclusiveness. Similarly, the culturally responsive teaching framework reflects similar goals and design of linguistically inclusive teaching as envisioned here to be an extension of Lucas & Villegas's (2011) linguistically responsive teaching. Just as multicultural education is an overarching equity framework for culturally responsive teaching, similarly linguistic inclusiveness should be developed as an overarching framework for linguistically inclusive teaching. The goal of this dissertation is to provide a curriculum for teacher education for linguistically inclusive teaching, but in this section, I discuss how the overarching framework draws its inspiration and foundation from social justice teacher education, multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> It might also be said that linguistically inclusive teaching complements work in the previous areas and can be integrated into multicultural education.

## **Social Justice Teacher Education**

The ultimate goal of teacher education for linguistic diversity is the equitable education, in terms of quality, access, and outcomes, of linguistic minority students. As Stritikus and Varghese (2007) assert, “the education of linguistically diverse students is situated in larger issues about immigration, distribution of wealth and power, and the *empowerment of students*” (p. 302, emphasis added), and this is indeed the ultimate goal of these efforts to educate teachers. Also, since most teacher education programs profess a dedication to social justice goals (Zeichner, 2006), it seems only natural that educators aim to reach all students equally and provide equitable education in the hopes of eradicating achievement gaps or repaying the education debt to CLD students who have been underserved by our public schools (Ladson-Billings, 2006). This dissertation attempts to provide a curriculum that will educate teachers toward social justice-oriented linguistic knowledge, dispositions, and skills that they can apply in classrooms to equalize opportunities for linguistic minorities by providing equitable language education and access to rigorous academic content which is so heavily dependent on language and literacy. Since a main goal of this dissertation is to instill in teachers dispositions of linguistic equity and understandings of language variation and its power in society and in education, much insight has been gained from research in Social Justice Teacher Education (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Hawkins, 2011a; Theoharis & O’Toole, 2011; Zeichner & Flessner, 2009).

In looking at Zeichner and Flessner’s (2009) critical discussion of what social justice teacher education (SJTE) is and should be, goals and structures that this project has in common with their conceptualization of SJTE are immediately apparent. They mention educating working class students in their collective self-interest, which suggests a parallel here in educating

linguistic minorities in their – and our (i.e., society’s)—collective self-interest; that is, educating all CLD and academic-language learners for their own success, pride, and self-knowledge as well as in the interest of enriching society, classroom learning, and the collective knowledge of language and communicative or verbal abilities. Confronting passive racism, as they cite, parallels confronting linguistic ignorance, xenophobia, and oppression through knowledge of sociolinguistics, an understanding of the basic structural and functional equality of all languages and dialects, and also through recognition that the basis of first language acquisition (why we talk the way we do) is exposure to an ambient language form (and not race, intelligence, or other innate characteristics). That is, speakers of dialects other than the standard have not failed to completely learn the standard, but have succeeded in learning the language they were exposed to, as we all naturally do. Also important is an understanding of the complexity of each language or variety and of the monumental task of learning a second language. Becoming linguistically aware on these basic points can unseat linguistic prejudice that stems from ignorance or from “never having thought about it.”

Zeichner and Flessner (2009) cite *cultural responsiveness* as a key element in teaching for social justice, and refer to Critical Race Theory and Critical Multiculturalism as “conceptual anchors for social justice work in teacher education” (p. 25). These frameworks “explicitly address the issues of oppression and injustice that are linked to social class, race, gender, and other markers of difference that are embedded institutions and structures in a society, as well as in the minds of individuals” (p. 27). *Language* differences accompany race, social class, gender and other ways that differences are marked as a source of oppression (e.g. English-only movements and attitudes, anti-bilingual initiatives) and injustice (achievement gaps and inequitable schooling as deemed in *Lau v. Nichols*) (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). Thus, the

overarching social justice framework and the thinking it promotes are as supportive of linguistic inclusiveness and of linguistic minorities' education rights as they are of racial, ethnic, religious and other social groups'. Thus, social justice provides a fundamental rationale for this study.

Another important link between this study and social justice teacher education is that SJTE also includes *equity pedagogy*,<sup>29</sup> “the development of teaching practices that promote equitable educational outcomes” (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). Clearly, the central intention of the curriculum proposed here is to promote equitable education opportunities and outcomes for linguistically diverse students. The approach developed here toward these ends is to prepare teachers to address language use expectations explicitly in the classroom and to include linguistic minority students' perspectives; that is, to prepare linguistically aware, knowledgeable, and curious teachers who take responsibility for the inclusion, learning, and educational outcomes of LM students.

Also mentioned as tenets of SJTE are the “examination of one's beliefs, perspectives and assumptions about others,” and reflection on one's identity and how “experiences, beliefs, and worldviews shape [us] as individuals” (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009, p. 34). A basic premise of sociolinguistics, is that many beliefs, prejudices, and assumptions about others stem from language variation and unconscious socio-emotional reactions to language differences, both of which stem from individuals' experiences and positions in society. In order to develop social justice attitudes about language variation, it is necessary for teachers to examine their beliefs about language. This examination is best pursued with a foundation in metalinguistic thinking and concepts such as that provided in a basic language awareness class like the one proposed here. Having metalanguage is essential to exploring and talking about language differences,

---

<sup>29</sup> Equity pedagogy is also a main dimension of multicultural education (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995; Banks, 1995), discussed below. This overlap between the conceptual frameworks illuminates their shared goal of equity, and demonstrates why both frameworks inform this study as well.

one's experience and attitudes toward them. The proposed course provides a basic metalanguage to talk about language structure (sounds, words, grammatical structures) and language variation (dialect, sociolect, etc.) on the various structural levels in precise and objective ways that can help to reveal prejudices and their unfoundedness. When language is examined objectively as in a structural approach, it becomes clear that different language varieties are functionally equal, that language variety is mainly a matter of environment, exposure, and access, not one of choice, that second language or second dialect acquisition can be a complex and taxing process, and most importantly, that aesthetic and social judgments are purely subjective. Studies in sociolinguistics as proposed in the curriculum for teachers also build on the foundation in structural linguistics to further this kind of equity-oriented realizations about language, and the course and reflection exercises provide a context for teachers to examine their own and others' sociolinguistic positionality and attitudes.

As a last case in point linking this dissertation study to SJTE, Zeichner and Flessner (2009) cite as signs of a SJTE approach the reading of the works of several authors whose ideas are aligned with linguistic equity. They mention Sonia Nieto, who has underscored the numerous benefits of bilingual education for LM students and quotes John Dewey's (1916) call that "it is the aim of progressive education to take part in correcting unfair privilege and unfair deprivation" (pp. 119-120). Language awareness in teachers, as envisioned here, supports their dispositions and skills in correcting linguistic privileging of English over other languages and of "Standard" English over other dialects, and correcting the unfair deprivation of cultural and linguistic minority students' access to academic content due to linguistic differences.

Zeicher and Flessner (2009) also recommend the ideas of Marilyn Cochran-Smith, who bemoans "differences in the biographies of most White teachers from middle class backgrounds

who speak only English, on the one hand, and the experiences of many pupils of color, those who live in poverty, and those whose first language is not English” as well as “disparities in educational outcomes and conditions for pupils with and without the advantages conferred by race, culture, language, and socioeconomic status” (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 42).

Precisely because the majority of teachers do not share the linguistic experiences of linguistic minorities and bilingual students, I propose a curriculum that not only exposes them to languages of their multilingual students and society (through a language sketch project), but engages them in exploration of concepts and readings that highlight the experiences of LM students and bilinguals (e.g. Almond, 2013; Delpit, 1995b; Ibrahim, 1999; Norton & Toohey, 2001; Pullum, 2013).

Zeichner and Flessner (2009) also suggest the work of Lisa Delpit, who argues that a key piece in improving education for CLD students is the explicit teaching of academic discourse (Delpit, 1995c), which includes language form and usage. For teachers to make language use explicit, they must have basic knowledge, awareness, and an inquiry disposition about their own language and the language expectations of their classrooms. The course proposed in Chapter 4 seeks to instill precisely this knowledge, awareness and inquiry disposition about language toward SJTE goals of providing equal (and equalizing) access to the content *and language* of the dominant academic discourse.

In an ironic twist on pinpointing SJTE as a main framework for the current work, Zeichner and Flessner (2009) bemoan the widespread lack of attention to *linguistic* diversity in SJTE and the need to integrate into SJTE the education needed for teachers to better meet the needs of SLES students. Non-ironically, on the other hand, this means that they and others espousing SJTE would recognize the value and the connection to SJTE in the current pursuit,

especially with the broad view of academic-English learners and linguistic minorities espoused here. They would also recognize the value of educating teachers for cultural and linguistic inclusiveness and preparing them to provide equitable access to the language of schooling, grade-level material, academic language, and disciplinary literacies as equitable preparation for higher education and economic and social opportunity. While social justice addresses a broader range of inequities, language plays a role in many groups' minoritization and inequitable access to educational content – not limited to SLES students.

Finally, evidence of tragically unequal outcomes in the education of cultural and linguistic minorities makes teacher education in this area a social justice issue. “The failure to prepare all teachers to provide the support needed by ELLs has had negative repercussions for generations of young people who have entered regular classrooms” (Lucas and Grinberg 2008, p. 606). These negative repercussions are evidenced in sizeable ELL achievement gaps, such as the shocking 2005 statistic that 46% of fourth-grader ELLs scored “below basic” in math and 73% “below basic” in reading nationwide (compared to 11% and 25% respectively for white students), and the gaps between ELLs and their native English-speaking peers are greater in the higher grades (Valdés & Castellon, 2011). Failure to address ELL needs also surely plays a role in societal inequities listed by Zeichner (2012) such as inequalities in high school graduation rates, unequal access to college-prep courses, “unequal access to a broad and rich curriculum that educates students to understand and to think critically, and in the disproportionate assignment of students of color and English learners to special education classes with limited educational opportunities” (p. 6, citing Hawkins, 2011). Zeichner and Flessner (2009) list “including issues of language diversity and the preparation of teachers to teach English learners” as among steps to be taken in developing strong social justice teacher education (p. 40). That CLD students have

continued to receive inequitable education and achieve unequally makes teacher education in this area a social justice cause.

A brief examination of SJTE reveals shared goals that also inspire and underlie this project. Building teachers' linguistic awareness and knowledge of language structure, development, and variation is not a goal in and of itself, but serves the larger goals of developing their social justice attitudes about language and about linguistic minorities (and recognition of the role of language in social justice work) and their *abilities* to provide equitable educational opportunities for speakers of diverse languages and varieties. Developing strong social justice dispositions and capabilities in teacher-candidates has proven to be more involved than providing a class on the subject, however expertly and intentionally designed and implemented (Hawkins, 2011a), so it would be naïve to think that a single, isolated course in language awareness could successfully instill similar dispositions in the area of linguistic inclusiveness for all teacher-candidates. Most likely, the course should be embedded in a teacher education program (Bunch, 2010) that builds a *community of practice* in the area (Lave & Wenger, 1991), builds language awareness, examines linguistic attitudes, and cultivates teachers' social justice and multicultural orientations and capacities both as a foundation for linguistic inclusiveness and as ultimate goals in themselves. With much in common, teacher education for linguistic inclusiveness should be informed by research in teacher education for social justice. Studies such as that of Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) set a model for how to study as well as how to facilitate teachers' development of linguistically inclusive ideologies and practices, and suggest that it will require continuing and concerted reflection, intention, and challenging of assumptions on the part of teachers.

## **Multicultural Education**

As observed by C. A. M. Banks and J. A. Banks (1995), teaching is unavoidably a multicultural encounter in that teachers and students invariably bring differences of age, social class, gender, race, and ethnicity to the classroom, and often, differences of national-origin, religion, sexuality, and ability as well, with concomitant differences in culture. Language also varies by each of those factors, making multicultural education a foundation for linguistic inclusiveness and making linguistic inclusiveness an extension, if not an integral part, of multicultural education. As described in Chapter 2, multicultural education is “committed to developing techniques for achieving educational equality, particularly for students from ethnic groups who historically have been marginalized, dispossessed, oppressed, miseducated, and undereducated in school” (Gay, 2004, p. 204). (It has extended to include groups other than ethnicity-based, such as women and girls, those of diverse gender identities and sexual orientations, religious and other cultural groups, language groups, exceptional learners, the differently-abled and the Deaf (Banks, 2004a; Gay, 2004). Multicultural education is a paradigm for educational equality and excellence, grounded in pluralism and understandings of cultural differences and similarities between groups and setting new standards for how teachers should best interact with diverse students by recognizing, taking into account, and integrating into classrooms and curricula their diverse cultural backgrounds and perspectives (Gay, 2004). Key concepts in multicultural education’s work toward equity in education are culture, immigration, racism, sexism, cultural assimilation, structural assimilation, ethnic groups, stereotypes, prejudice, and institutional racism (Banks, 1991). Like multicultural education, linguistic inclusiveness seeks to cultivate cultural and linguistic diversity as a central tenet of education and American thought. Focusing on language, the goals are to stimulate deeper understanding

and appreciation of students' diverse linguistic backgrounds and to have teachers integrate these diverse perspectives and knowledge in the classroom; into discussions, curriculum, learning, knowledge creation, and community.

Early multicultural education researchers uncovered the “troubling pedagogical assumption” that the White ways of schooling in the US were normative and that following *Brown vs. Board of Education* and integration, African Americans would receive equal education if treated the same way in the same schools; “no deliberate structural or pedagogical changes were made to accommodate their arrival” (Gay, 2004, p. 196), p. 196). We are in a position now, with rapid increases in diversity and the number of SLES in the schools (not to mention a solid understanding of dialectal and language use variation in the US), either to replicate this insensitivity to cultural and linguistic differences and propagate inequity or to learn from decades of multicultural education and make changes in teacher knowledge, teaching, and school curricula to adapt to the new social realities and potentialities of cultural and linguistic diversity. Multicultural education seeks to recognize and provide for, for cultural and linguistic minority students, the right to be educated within their own cultural contexts and to have access to cultural capital (Gay, 2004). Paralleling multicultural education research, education research must continue to study the role of language and language differences in learning and in schools as multicultural education has been doing for the cultural. We must borrow from linguistics research (structural, functional, socio-, psycho- and anthropological-linguistics, cognitive science, acquisition and literacy studies) to build understanding of *language* on a parallel with continually-developing understandings of *culture* and its role in education and to integrate this knowledge into teacher education and K-12 curricula. Multicultural education provides a framework to do this.

Multicultural education is an idea, a process, and a reform movement that is “trying to change the schools and other educational institutions so that students from all social-class, gender, racial, language, and cultural groups will have an equal opportunity to learn” (Banks, 2004a, p. 3). Similarly, the goal of this study, that of educating teachers about language acquisition, development and variation and having them include language discussions in their classrooms, is to improve opportunities for CLD students to learn; for teachers to create classrooms where they will be recognized, welcomed and empowered to learn, be it learning language, learning *about* language, or learning content in order to be successful in their chosen endeavors. To integrate a focus on language and students’ understandings of and through language in the classroom is to recognize diverse language experiences and their value. This recognition is one important manifestation of social equality (Banks, 2004a, citing Gutmann, 2004). With social equality as a shared goal, multicultural education and social justice teacher education are the main frameworks for this study.

### ***Multicultural education framework***

Multicultural education research has laid out a framework of thinking about diversity and equity that can be borrowed and extended in developing curricula for teacher-candidates and K-12 students that will embody linguistic inclusiveness. Most fundamentally, Banks (1995, 2004b) defined five dimensions of the multicultural education model which delineate areas for work toward linguistic inclusiveness as well: they are content integration, the knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, an equity pedagogy, and an empowering school culture and social structure. In each dimension, there are corresponding goals for multicultural education and for linguistic inclusiveness.

### *Content integration*

Content integration in multicultural education refers to infusing the content of school subject areas, not only history or social studies and literature, with examples, data, and information from a variety of groups to illustrate key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories (Banks, 1995, 2004b). Of course, teaching about the contributions from diverse *language*-group members should also be part and parcel of multicultural education, even when language seems irrelevant to the concepts or contributions being learned about. Linguistic inclusiveness will extend this dimension of content integration to the infusion of *language* and *language information* across content areas, such as discussing words borrowed from other languages along with the new concepts contributed. Examples are the word *algebra* (an Arabic word); or the fact that Native Americans spoke hundreds of different languages from dozens of (unrelated) language families before European contact, reinforcing the conceptualization of *First Nations* with independent cultures and languages and that they were *not* necessarily able to communicate with other groups when forced onto reservations or into residential schools. The same is true of slaves brought from Africa. They also spoke a variety of languages (from different language families) which may have contributed features to the African American English varieties that still exist today. Pragmatic or cultural language uses can also be included in curricula, especially when they enter into the meaning, theme, or relevance of the content, as in historical and literary works.

Banks (2004b) describes a progression of four approaches to content integration: contributions, additive, transformation, and social action. The first two focus on specific multicultural contributions (heroes, holidays, etc.) and adding multicultural themes and materials to the general curriculum without changing its basic structure. The transformation approach

more closely resembles linguistic inclusiveness in its goal of helping students learn how knowledge is constructed, and students are enabled to view concepts, issues, events, and themes from the perspectives of various ethnic and cultural groups. In linguistic inclusiveness, this approach corresponds with a focus on language in understanding texts and ideas from diverse sources, voices, and positionalities, which is supported by functional linguistic analysis strategies and more generally, by interrogating meanings and including multiple interpretations in the classroom. This approach also motivates Banks' social action approach that empowers students to act to change the social *status quo*. Applied to language, interrogating meanings and voices in texts and alongside peers allows students to challenge linguistic single-mindedness and prejudice, and to consider and integrate multiple interpretations, perspectives, and language forms in a broader shared language.

Research among early multiculturalism efforts showed that children internalize adult attitudes that are institutionalized in societal structures and institutions *and* that implementation of sustained, democratic multicultural lessons, activities, and teaching materials helped students to develop democratic attitudes and values (Banks, 2004b). This latter finding bodes well for the potentialities of implementing sustained, equity- and inquiry-oriented lessons, activities and materials concerning *languages* and multilingualism and the corollary possibilities of countering the widespread and long-lived monolingual prejudices of the U.S. (Hakuta, 2011; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). That is, if studies show that multicultural content integration can “work” in developing positive and democratic attitudes toward racial and ethnic difference, then so might linguistic inclusiveness work in building positive attitudes about language difference and encourage a multilingual society by respecting students' first and heritage languages and sparking interest in the study of world languages. While a complete overview of linguistically

inclusive and enlightening learning materials for K-12 students is beyond the scope of this study (see e.g. Denham & Lobeck, 2010a), such materials are within the larger framework of linguistic inclusiveness to be developed on a parallel with multicultural education.

The other finding, that children internalize adult and institutionalized attitudes, underscores the importance of examining and democratizing teachers' attitudes toward linguistic diversity and their abilities to interrogate institutionalized linguistic prejudice. While teacher education *per se* is not one of the components of multicultural education, the teacher education curriculum proposed here is intended to support multicultural and multilingual content integration as well as other pillars of multicultural education, such as knowledge construction, to which we now turn.

#### *Knowledge construction*

Another dimension of multicultural education is the interrogation and integration of knowledge construction in the schools. Knowledge construction refers to “the procedures by which social, behavioral, and natural scientists create knowledge, and the manner in which the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, perspectives, and biases within a discipline influence how knowledge is constructed within it. When the knowledge construction process is implemented in the classroom, teachers help students to understand how knowledge is created and how it is influenced by the racial, ethnic, and social-class positions of individuals and groups” (Banks, 2004b, p. 5). Knowledge construction thus refers to valued kinds of thinking, “facts,” and ideas in each discipline and in the schools in general, recognizing that this knowledge is selected differently in different cultures and subcultures. Multicultural education requires that teachers and students interrogate the value systems behind valued knowledge together by recognizing socio-cultural influences.

As concerns language, looking at textual organization and meaning-making is one way of examining the knowledge construction of a field or context. Research in systemic functional linguistics has revealed ways in which meaning is organized and presented in various disciplines and in school in general as opposed to other situations (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Fang et al., 2008; Schleppegrell, 2004). In addition to the explanations of general meaning organization patterns in different text-types and disciplines, researchers also outline methods by which teachers and students can themselves engage in the analysis of texts (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Gebhard et al., 2007; Schleppegrell, 2013). By examining the structure of sentences and texts in different fields, students become aware of how information is presented and of the positioning of various participants (including the author and reader) in a text. For example, texts that use many questions seek to draw the reader into a more personal interaction with the text and its content, whereas a text that makes commands or uses many declaratives without adverbs and modals to “soften” the message communicate that the author is an objective and knowledgeable authority. These styles of writing serve different purposes and include or exclude readers in the knowledge construction process in different conventionalized ways. Each discipline has its norms, and all students stand to benefit from explicit attention to norms, while teachers may also be unaware of their own fluency in these subject-area language norms and thus benefit from engaging in analysis and comparison.

Even more fundamentally, however, students should be led in exploring how meaning is made in English in general and how that might differ from knowledge construction—or valuation—in other languages and varieties. Only by thinking critically about language in all its levels, complexity, variability, change, and social dimensions can students and teachers become aware of the social and cultural significance of language usage that is taken for granted to the

detriment of those whose cultural and linguistic patterns differ or who struggle to access hidden and cultural meanings when language is unexamined.

Finally, when it is understood that language experiences influence expression and understandings—that is, when CLD students and their language knowledge are recognized,—then students’ language knowledge can be truly integrated into classroom learning, and the different perspectives will contribute to a richer learning environment for all. In linguistically inclusive classrooms, students and teachers explore how meaning is made across language backgrounds and how knowledge can be constructed in an through language in a variety of ways. Through inclusive discussions of language and knowledge, CLD students *contribute* to knowledge construction in the classroom, and are not only expected to study and learn a normative Standard English-based knowledge construction. Ideally, then, critically examining language, meaning-making, and knowledge construction is a means of *including* diverse students in knowledge construction itself.

#### *Empowering school culture and social structure*

Another dimension of multicultural education is creating an empowering school culture and social structure for cultural and linguistic minority students. Banks (2004b) describes this as “restructuring the culture and organization of the school so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, language, and social class groups will experience educational equality and cultural empowerment” (p. 6). This includes examining grouping and labeling practices, the school’s social climate, and teachers’ expectations for different groups’ achievement. With a lens on language, grouping and labeling can refer to speakers of particular languages or more generally to “ESL” students.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Groupings by dialect more often refer to racial/ethnic groupings. For example, African Americans are more likely to be labeled by their race/ethnicity than as those who speak African American English (AAE) excluding African

Due to changes in policy and funding for bilingual education, SLES are more and more often “integrated” in to mainstream classrooms (Valdés & Castellon, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). In some ways, this is an improvement in the school culture over isolating SLES into segregated ESL programs often in distant regions of the school. That SLES are a growing presence in the larger school culture is progress toward a more inclusive culture in that they cannot help but be recognized, but their labeling, inclusion, and access to learning should all be examined toward this dimension of both multicultural education and linguistic inclusiveness. In building an empowering school social structure, teachers can play a central role by positioning CLM students as capable contributors and peers.

For the linguistic inclusiveness dimension, teachers should first examine their own attitudes toward language and toward speakers of languages and dialects other than their own. Many teachers are monolingual English speakers with little experience in learning another language or dialect that might help them to understand and empathize with CLM students, much less value their different linguistic abilities (Clayton et al., 2008). Ignorance of other languages and a lack of metalinguistic understandings of the structure and peculiarities of English that studying another language often provides can also lead to fear and resistance in terms of including language exploration and approaching SLES in the classroom. One cannot teach (or model) what one doesn’t know about. The curriculum proposed here begins with teacher-candidates examining their experiences and attitudes about language to identify experiences that they might share with SLES, any peeves, biases, and prejudices they may have about language, or ways in which they may have been privileged due to their language or perceived language skills. Though additional insights in this area should be gained all throughout the course and

---

Americans who do not speak AAE or do not speak it at school. A similar case holds for Chicano English. Groups of speakers of regional non-ethnic varieties are rarely found *–in groups–* outside their regions, where their variety is the local standard, so they *less commonly* encounter prejudice, though it does occur.

enduring into their teaching careers as well, this early exercise sets the stage for continued reflection about language, unconscious attitudes, and privilege.

As linguistic inclusiveness education proceeds, teacher-candidates should learn about various aspects of language so that they might feel less ignorant and fearful about language differences and more empowered to address language issues, integrate attention to language in the classroom, and engender a welcoming attitude toward SLES, other varieties of English, and student understandings. While the school social structure is best addressed once on-site, and of course requires intentional leadership and a common goal (Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011), teachers who are able to reflect on their own attitudes and, with some basic linguistic knowledge gained, have an inquiry stance toward language are better prepared to work toward respect and inclusion in their classrooms and thus help to build an inclusive and empowering school culture. This dimension of multicultural education is also taken into consideration in designing linguistic inclusiveness education and the teacher course in linguistically inclusive teaching.

#### *Prejudice reduction*

Prejudice reduction is another dimension of multicultural education that is fundamental to linguistic inclusiveness. Linguistic prejudice is rampant in the US as evidenced in English-only movements and initiatives, de-funding of bilingual education, the debate over “Ebonics,” and in ubiquitous discussions about “proper” grammar (Minami & Ovando, 2004). Many believe the language of the social and economic elite to be superior to other English varieties, that speakers of African American English (AAE) do so by choice and in defiance, and that many SLES “refuse” to learn English. These beliefs lead to negative attitudes about other languages and other dialects, and thus a linguistically *exclusive* culture.

Attitudes toward languages and varieties reflect and reinforce attitudes toward *speakers* of those languages and varieties (Gay, 2000; Hakuta, 2011; Sekhon, 1999; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007). This rings true for regional dialects other than one's own and of languages with enough speakers in one's experience to constitute a group—that is, with groups of people one has had experience with in order to stereotype and discriminate. This grouping and stereotyping is exactly the prejudice that multicultural education targets. That it occurs with language or dialect as its source means that linguistic inclusiveness must address it as well. Similar to my interpretation of building an empowering school culture, prejudice reduction in multicultural education is concerned with examining attitudes about groups different from their own and developing strategies to help students and teachers develop positive, democratic attitudes about inclusion and the equality of language varieties (Banks, 1995, 2004b). For linguistic inclusiveness, the examination of teachers' attitudes includes those toward English language usage and dialects as well as other languages, as discussed in the preceding section, but should also include building an objective understanding of language, dialect, and acquisition so that miscommunication and differences can be interrogated objectively and subjective reactions can be checked.

One way in which linguistic inclusiveness education addresses language prejudice is by establishing that no language or language variety is better than another in any objective or logical measure. The knowledge base of linguistic inclusiveness offers a deep understanding that every language has complexity at every level of structure (phonology, morphology, syntax, etc.) and socio-cultural dimension (pragmatics, dialect, register, identity, etc.). Once it is understood that languages and dialects are functionally equal, prejudice can only be traced to social groupings and then can be interrogated on that (more familiar) level. In addition to questioning one's

assumptions and examining one's attitudes, then, a basic knowledge of how language is structured can serve to help reduce prejudice in teachers and to empower them to address prejudices and subjective beliefs and reactions they witness in others.

Another common attitude is that people living in the US must speak English, and therefore immigrants must learn it quickly and US-born SLES should have been speaking it all along. Privileging English over immigrant heritage languages and indigenous languages reflects an ignorance of the linguistic history of the nation, but this attitude is also based on an ignorance of the complexity of language and the effortfulness and time-course of second language acquisition. Through a basic understanding of how language works, however, teachers can come to feel more comfortable with language diversity, and through an understanding of second language acquisition and language identity issues, more empathetic and trusting of SLES. Instead of focusing on the deficits in SLES students' *English* ability, they can come to appreciate the linguistic resources that SLES possess (knowledge of another complex and interesting language) and can contribute to the classroom. Campano and Ghiso (2011) write, "for students from immigrant experiences, ... cosmopolitanism is not just an imagined possibility, but often a perceptual and lived reality as well. By virtue of their diverse vantage points and transnational negotiations, they are uniquely positioned to educate their peers and teachers about the world" (p. 166). Teachers who come to respect the knowledge and experiences of all of their diverse students in this way can model not only patience and empathy for the second language learning process and challenges, but more importantly, inquiry and inclusion of SLES and their viewpoints in the classroom, helping to reduce students' prejudice as well.

It is also commonly believed that dialects such as African American English are spoken by choice and in defiance. Logically, however, no one can choose to speak a language or dialect

without having been adequately exposed to and “brought up in” that dialect. I can no more *decide* to speak (standard) British or Indian English than could an AAE speaker necessarily choose to speak standard Canadian or Australian or South African or so-called Standard American English; we simply don’t know the grammar (including the phonology or pronunciation, as well as the morphology, lexicon, syntax and pragmatics) of varieties we did not grow up in or study.<sup>31</sup> This is another point, basic to sociolinguistics, that can be made toward unseating linguistic prejudices and building linguistically inclusive dispositions.

Finally, as concerns attitudes about “proper” English, it should be made clear that the perceived superiority (or power) of any language or variety is socially constructed and reflective of the status of its speakers. There is no objective, logical or natural superiority of one language variety over another, but self-appointed authorities have written down some number of usage rules, often based on Latin grammar and reflective of the (often historical) usage of the social group in power. It can be demonstrated that these rules are often broken even by their staunch proponents (Pullum, 1991), and that there are cases where they cannot be followed. For example, the sentence, *Where are you from?*, involves a “dangling preposition,” which is against one of these prescriptive rules but is perfectly common, and it would be awkward to rephrase it to avoid the final preposition (*From where do you hail?*). Linguistic inclusiveness education shall involve examining teachers’ attitudes about these rules as well as strategies for developing positive attitudes about languages and varieties other than one’s own, such as pointing out words and phrases from marginalized varieties that have come into common usage (*awesome* from 1980s slang) or historically “proper” forms that have fallen out of use (e.g. *different from* (now commonly *different than*)), words borrowed into English from other languages (*pajama*, *raccoon*,

---

<sup>31</sup> Once marginalized, however, linguistic minorities may come to identify with their marginalized language varieties and disassociate themselves from standard varieties (e.g. Ibrahim, 1999). It is not entirely clear that this should be judged a “choice,” however, as issues of language identity and social marginalization are complex.

*tsunami*), or discussing language forms (words and sentence structures, writing systems, politeness formulae, and so on) in the first languages of SLES students in the classroom. These are strategies for creating a welcoming environment for multiple languages and varieties and their speakers. Linguistically inclusive teaching should also instill teachers' understanding of second language acquisition and its variable outcomes for different speakers, and an appreciation of the complexity of the task and of SLES efforts and successes, instead of a focus on perceived shortcomings.

Understanding one's own – and others' – prejudices about language varieties (such as dialects) is one step toward prejudice reduction; another is understanding that each variety is a fully-formed language with equally complex structure and usage rules, and that *prestige* assigned to dialects is socially constructed and reflective of social (power) structures. Yet another approach is to begin to understand structural differences and explore methods of making language use expectations of the classroom or subject-area explicit, so that all students have access to the “language of power” and social capital (Delpit, 1995b). These approaches to the reduction of linguistic prejudice and building of a linguistically inclusive classroom culture are supported by teachers examining their attitudes and learning about language structure, acquisition, and basic sociolinguistics.

### *Equity pedagogy*

Among all dimensions of multicultural education, the last dimension, *equity pedagogy*, is especially foundational for the development of strategies for linguistic inclusiveness. Equity pedagogy is defined as “teaching strategies and classroom environments that help students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups attain the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to function effectively within, and help create and perpetuate, a just, humane, and democratic

society” (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995, p. 152). For the purposes of linguistic inclusiveness, the concept of diversity must be extended to include language groups, and the tone should shift from “helping” CLM students to *including* them and fostering diversity itself as a means of creating a humane and democratic society. Equity pedagogy has a broad scope, however, and linguistic inclusiveness will rely on its foundation both theoretically and in teacher education. The equity pedagogy dimension of multicultural education concerns the classroom environment, teacher-student and -curriculum relations, and foundations of teacher education. It is intertwined, as C. A. M. Banks and J. A. Banks (1995) assert, with the other dimensions of multicultural education. The classroom environment is improved toward equity with content integration, co-construction of knowledge and an empowering school culture, for example. Teaching strategies and the teacher’s role in the classroom environment are central in this dimension of multicultural education and in linguistic inclusiveness.

Teacher interactions with students are an essential ingredient in the classroom environment, and are guided by teacher’s attitudes toward students, teaching, and diversity, including language. Teachers’ attitudes toward students significantly shape their expectations of what students can learn, how they treat students, and what students ultimately learn (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b). How they treat students surely affects students’ self-concept, and the academic self-concept of students has been linked to their general self-concept and their abilities function in academic and social settings (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995). It is essential to cultural and linguistic responsiveness that teachers believe that *all* students can learn (Gay, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a) and can contribute to the classroom, regardless of language differences. They must become comfortable with, and make students comfortable with, language differences and second language disfluencies in order that all students can comfortably contribute their ideas

and understandings and participate fully in instructional interactions (see also Gay, 2004 concerning ethnic and cultural groups).

Equity pedagogy also requires that teachers challenge the hierarchical power relationships between teacher and student, such as ideas that the teacher holds the knowledge and students are passive recipients (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995). Similarly, equity-oriented teachers must challenge hierarchical and competitive relationships between language varieties and between students, especially native/standard speaker and linguistic minority students, by giving all students equal responsibility and opportunity to participate. “Teachers who are skilled in equity pedagogy are able to use diversity to enrich instruction instead of fearing or ignoring it” (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995, p. 157).

Furthermore, to understand the meaning of diversity in both their own and their students' lives, “teachers must be able to analyze, clarify, and state their personal values related to diversity” (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995, p. 157). This analysis of beliefs about *language* diversity may be new to many teacher-candidates who have never learned about the history, structural complexity, social identification, and validity of dialects or had encounters with other dialects and languages. Some may have been praised and come to identify as “good at” grammar, literacy skills, or “language.” Some may feel that English holds some superiority due to its prevalence in international communications. And most will take for granted the ease with which they acquired it, as a native language, and may fail to understand second language learners' challenges and non-native-like performance. All of these linguistic attitudes enter into teachers' interactions with students, and must be interrogated by teachers themselves so that they may develop positive (patient, respectful and interested) dispositions toward linguistically diverse students.

Equity pedagogy requires that teachers have a strong knowledge base in multicultural education including understandings of culture, immigration, racism, sexism, cultural assimilation, structural assimilation, ethnic groups, stereotypes, prejudice, institutional racism, and theories of diversity, and the histories, modal characteristics and intragroup differences of racial and ethnic groups (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995). While linguistic groups overlap with ethnic groups and can be included in multicultural education, linguistic inclusiveness relies on a similar knowledge base in the area of language itself. This knowledge base serves to help teachers develop dispositions of professional capability toward teaching diverse students, and should include facts about languages, concepts of language structure, use and acquisition, sociolinguistic understandings of dialects and their histories, power dynamics and other factors in variation, and exposure to diverse languages and their speakers and cultures. For equity pedagogy to include or be developed for linguistic inclusiveness, teachers need both positive dispositions toward students and knowledge that supports positive dispositions toward teaching and their own competencies to engage with diversity.

Similar to equity pedagogy, there are no specific strategies of linguistic inclusiveness to list and have teachers memorize. Banks and Banks' (1995) more general characterization of equity pedagogy is equally applicable to the vision of linguistic inclusiveness: "equity pedagogy is not embodied in specific strategies. It is a process that locates the student at the center of schooling. When effectively implemented, equity pedagogy enriches the lives of both teachers and students and enables them to envision and to help create a more humane and caring society" (p. 157). The central tenet of the two paradigms is one of centering education on students' background experiences, cultures, identities, and knowledge, their developing understandings of the world and the content, and their contributions to knowledge construction in the classroom.

To do this, teachers must engage with students, cede some control over classroom knowledge and social structure, learn about students, and as C. A. M. Banks and J. A. Banks (1995) point out, question hegemonies and educate students to become reflective and active citizens. For linguistic inclusiveness as equity pedagogy, all of this applies to language as well, where the hegemony of native, standard English should be challenged in linguistically inclusive classrooms by recognition of the contributions of diverse languages to the global, *non-monolithic* English just as multicultural education recognizes contributions of diverse individuals to knowledge and society. Educating students to be reflective means involving them in knowledge construction by encouraging them to make connections to their autobiographical experiences and to build and communicate their interpretations of reality (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995). Linguistic inclusiveness adds to equity pedagogy a space to examine the *language* used to express and understand experiences and interpret reality, to question the meanings of individual words as well as the meanings behind (or missing from) complex texts. Linguistic inclusiveness allows teachers and students to engage with individuals' language-based understandings.

### ***Language in multicultural education***

For the most part, discussions of language in multicultural education research have focused on the sociocultural aspects and sociopolitical aspects. Language in multicultural education research is treated as a grouping factor where language minority groups' rights are asserted alongside ethnic, religious, gender, and other minority groups' or where language is listed among historically marginalizing attributes of minority groups. Language is recognized, thus, as one factor that has been used, intentionally or otherwise in othering and marginalizing speakers of languages and dialects other than the local standard. Where language has been addressed more directly, the treatment reflects the sociocultural turn in language studies,

especially in educational linguistics, that began in the late 1970s and became especially dominant in the 1980s and 1990s. This perspective emphasizes the pragmatic and social aspects of language (pragmatics, sociolinguistics and anthropological or cultural linguistics) and critiques the overemphasis on structure and on universal and theoretically innate aspects of language that characterized the earlier generative approach (e.g. Noam Chomsky's work) (Minami & Ovando, 1995). In sociocultural and multicultural education perspectives, importance is placed on language use as patterns of social interaction that affect the education of minorities due to mismatched patterns and expectations between minority children and the majority teachers and school systems. Numerous anthropological linguistics studies demonstrated how *cultures* shape patterns of social interaction (see citations in Minami & Ovando, 1995) which, in turn, characterize language practices, values, and knowledge. In this sociocultural perspective, language acquisition and socialization are seen as "two sides of the same coin" (Minami & Ovando, 1995, p. 432), but language is largely treated as an aspect of culture (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Villegas, 2009; Zeichner, 2005), or the cultural aspects of language are emphasized.<sup>32</sup> Linguistic inclusiveness will need to encompass these valuable understandings in the development of inclusive dispositions toward linguistic minorities and language variation but do so without subjugating language to culture or limiting understandings of language to cultural influences on usage.

### ***Summary***

Despite decades of research, education, and social movements in multicultural education, collaborations and mutually-reinforcing research with paradigms such as critical race theory and social justice education, and the myriad concepts and themes included in the multicultural

---

<sup>32</sup> Minami and Ovando (1995) note that researchers in this sociocultural perspective do admit that Chomsky's notion of a highly abstract core of structures is applicable to any language but put their emphasis on environmental and social factors.

education research, handbooks, and diversity encyclopedias, I am sure scholars steeped in the research would be the first to suggest that there is much more to do and a long way to go toward equity and a truly culturally and linguistically pluralistic culture in the schools and at large. Linguistic inclusiveness and the efforts of this dissertation are in a composite relationship with multicultural education, simultaneously adopting much of its conceptual framework and research support and relying on the foundation it continues to lay in teacher education, while endeavoring to expand it to more fully reflect issues of language diversity and to develop that knowledge base. The teacher education curriculum proposed here stems from the primary goals of a multicultural and socially just education for all students, aligned with social justice teacher education and drawing on the framework of multicultural education. It seeks to contribute toward these goals teacher education in language awareness to parallel the multicultural awarenesses that multicultural education has built and continues to build. While teacher education, *per se*, is not among the dimensions of multicultural education, the concept of *culturally responsive teaching* is recognized as its teacher education incarnation. Culturally responsive teaching and linguistically responsive teaching are discussed in the following sections as additional frameworks from which linguistic inclusiveness is conceptualized.

### **Culturally Responsive Teaching**

The teacher education dimension, as it were, of the larger multicultural education framework and research that had been developing over many years culminates in the concept of *culturally responsive teaching* (especially developed by Gay, 2000, 2002, 2010; Villegas, 1991; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b, 2007). As mentioned in Chapter 2, this basic concept has also been called culturally appropriate, culturally compatible, culturally congruent, culturally relevant, and culturally sensitive teaching (J. S. Lee, 2010), with these terms appearing in the research as

early as 1980 (Au, 1980a). Note that the book-length treatments are much more recent (Gay, 2000, 2010; Villegas and Lucas, 2002), and that some of the same researchers are now developing the framework of linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas, 2011b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

Generally speaking, culturally responsive teaching involves teachers' positive dispositions and knowledge about socio-cultural differences and how they can affect classroom interaction and understandings, their dispositions of caring and engaging with cultural variation and students whose cultures are different from their own, and their skills in adapting their instruction to be inclusive and responsive to cultural variation. These basic goals of culturally responsive teaching are a foundational rationale, with multicultural education as an overarching framework, for linguistically inclusive teaching as well, where each of the culture-oriented tenets has a parallel in language. The similarities are discussed here with reference to principles laid out by Gay (2000, 2002), Villegas (1991) and Villegas and Lucas (2002a, 2002b).

Gay (2002) summarizes five basic practices of culturally responsive teaching, while Villegas and Lucas (2002b) refer to six strands needed, intertwined and mutually supporting, in a teacher education curriculum for culturally responsive teaching. Gay's practices and Villegas and Lucas's strands are arranged in Table 2 to show thematic similarities and are further discussed in the paragraphs that follow. Taken together, the two approaches lay out the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that culturally responsive teachers should have along with some ideas for how they can be gained in teacher education. Parallels for both the kinds of knowledge, skill or disposition and the approaches to teacher education for culturally responsive teaching can be envisioned for linguistically inclusive teaching based on these frameworks.

*Table 2. Two views of Culturally Responsive Teaching*

Gay's (2002) culturally responsive teaching practices	Villegas and Lucas's (2002b) strands of teacher education for culturally responsive teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• developing a knowledge base about cultural diversity</li> <li>• demonstrating caring and building learning communities</li> <li>• communicating with ethnically diverse students</li> <li>• responding to ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction</li> <li>• including ethnic and cultural diversity in the curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sociocultural consciousness</li> <li>• an affirming attitude toward culturally and linguistically diverse students;</li> <li>• commitment and skills to act as agents of change</li> <li>• learning about students and culturally responsive teaching practices</li> <li>• culturally responsive teaching practices</li> <li>• constructivist views of learning</li> </ul>

***Diversity knowledge and sociocultural consciousness***

Echoing Banks (1995), Gay (2002) asserts that teachers need a knowledge base about cultural diversity, including knowledge of contributions to a wide variety of disciplines from members of different minority groups and of generalized cultural characteristics of those groups, such as learning and communication styles. The comparable knowledge base in Villegas and Lucas's work is the first strand of teacher education for culturally responsive teaching, *sociocultural consciousness*, "an understanding that people's ways of thinking, behaving, and being are deeply influenced by such factors as race/ethnicity, social class, and language" (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b, p. 22, citing Banks, 1996). The tone of these approaches differs, however, in that Villegas and Lucas (2002b) emphasize teachers' awareness of power relations between cultural groups, the role of schools in perpetuating unequal status, and the fallacy of meritocracy in an education system created by (and thereby, *for*, or at least *biased for*) those already within the powered sociocultural group. A fundamental understanding of culturally

responsive teachers is that one's world view is shaped by many factors, such as ethnicity, gender, and social class, that it is not necessarily shared by others, and that the corollary access to social power is also differential (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). They argue that teachers must come to understand the façade of meritocracy in the schools and the structural discrimination that is responsible for achievement gaps and marginalization of CLM students. This understanding entails coming to terms with their own privilege and how the socio-culturally biased school system contributed to their success. Villegas and Lucas (2002a) explain that these are not easy realizations to make, but are necessary for building deep understanding and truly caring dispositions.

Gay's (2002) knowledge base is somewhat more factual, resembling the inclusion of multicultural content in the curriculum called for by Gay herself (as another practice of culturally responsive teaching) and by Banks (1995 and ff.) as a dimension of multicultural education, while her (2010) discussion reflects a similar emphasis on understanding cultural differences and their potentially deleterious consequences for minority students. What the two approaches share for our purposes is an emphasis on *teacher knowledge* of social and cultural concepts that enter into classroom teaching and interactions with CLD students. Villegas and Lucas (2002) reference multiple cases where the culture of particular minority groups differed from classroom expectations in ways that sidelined the students from full participation in the classroom learning. Villegas and Lucas (2002a) and Gay (2010) also refer to cases of culturally responsive teaching where the communicative and participation styles of CLM students were integrated into the classroom discourse, such as having students study an analysis of *signifying*, an African-American verbal art of insult involving humor, insinuation and exaggeration, as an entrée into textual analysis and literary interpretation (Gay, 2002 citing Lee, 1993), or comparing familiar

examples from hip hop music to other authors' use of rhythm in poetry (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a).

Linguistically inclusive teaching shares the goals of interrogating power structures (those based on language) and combatting prejudice through knowledge of sociolinguistic facts and concepts, of the general characteristics and equal richness of languages, and of the contributions of diverse groups and languages to English and to the larger culture. The corollary knowledge base for linguistically inclusive teaching should thus include facts about English (structure, history of language contacts and borrowing, dialects) and the contributions of and similarities with other languages. A basic knowledge of language structure, as a foundational objective understanding of language, can help teachers to navigate past subjective views of language in order to interrogate sociolinguistic power issues and discrimination. Knowing that African American English (AAE) systematically employs *be* to indicate the habitual aspect, while lack of copula indicates the present progressive, for example, undermines a prejudiced view that AAE speakers “don't know how to use *is*” or that AAE is an incomplete, faulty, or uneducated version of standard English. Knowledge of the history of English and its contact with other languages supports an understanding of how linguistic power structures came to be (however unfounded they may be, objectively-speaking). A more objective understanding of linguistic variation and change can help in the interrogation of linguistic prejudices and the building of positive attitudes toward CLM students and their language abilities.

Through social justice and multicultural education courses, teacher-candidates may be able to develop sociolinguistic understandings that there are different ways of speaking appropriate for different cultural contexts and that power relations exist between language groups and language forms. Most, however, will not have a sound understanding of what the formal,

standard and powered ways of speaking actually consist of or how they are structured and where those forms, rules, and social judgments came from. A knowledge base in what language is, structurally and objectively, provides a principled understanding of the equal complexity (and thus value) of all languages and language varieties despite sociocultural politics that prepares teachers to think critically about how the formal, standard, and powered varieties of language are structured. Such a strong knowledge base also supports teachers' abilities to teach students to "perform" those forms of language when necessary and also to interrogate their sociolinguistic power.

The necessary knowledge base of linguistically inclusive teachers includes all of the socio-cultural and sociolinguistic awareness that culturally responsive teaching and linguistically responsive teaching (discussed below) recommend, but also includes a deeper understanding of what underlies those sociolinguistic differences and inequalities. Culturally responsive teaching refers to teachers knowing *that* language conventions reflect and reinforce social power structures and marginalization. Linguistically inclusive teaching involves knowing *how* language is used in different forms for different purposes (Schleppegrell, 2004), so that these forms can be explicitly taught and explained, giving all students access to sociolinguistic capital (Delpit, 1995c). In this way, linguistically inclusive teaching can be emancipating in a way that culturally responsive teaching also seeks to be (Gay, 2010). The culturally responsive teaching framework thus offers a rationale for the inclusion of sociolinguistic awareness in linguistically inclusive teaching, corresponding to sociocultural awareness in culturally responsive teaching. It also provides a stimulus for deeply considering the requisite knowledge base to support that awareness in teachers and their proactive challenging of the sociolinguistic *status quo*.

### ***Including cultural diversity in the curriculum***

A strong knowledge base is also necessary for teachers to include diversity in the curriculum, as Gay (2002) recommends for culturally responsive teaching. Knowing about diverse cultures supports teachers' abilities to select diverse curriculum materials, include discussions of controversial and difficult topics, and challenge the media's portrayals of culturally and linguistically diverse people (Gay, 2002). Similarly, knowing about (and being curious about) other languages and varieties can empower teachers to find *or solicit from students* materials, language art-forms and ideas (such as poems, idioms, metaphors, and stories) from diverse languages and dialects and devise ways of incorporating them into truly linguistically inclusive curricula. Additionally, knowing how languages differ and what all languages have in common, being knowledgeable and inquisitive about language, supports teachers' integration of language discussions and explorations into classroom learning, such as soliciting translations, cognates, and other usages or understandings of content vocabulary or phrasing. While the bulk of the curricular materials themselves may be beyond the powers of teachers to choose, teachers can still integrate learning, inquiry and dispositions of multiculturalism and multilingualism in their teaching and in some areas of the curriculum if they have the knowledge base and dispositions to do so. Doing so is an integral part of linguistically inclusive teaching, as the cultural aspect is for culturally responsive teaching.

Knowledge of generalized cultural characteristics of diverse groups, while general and admittedly not always representative of each child, is recommended as a means of integrating diverse and culturally relevant learning styles in classroom instruction (Gay, 2002). Students from various cultural backgrounds bring with them different expectations for teacher talk, student participation in front of the whole class and in small groups, and teacher-student

interactions, as well as a wealth of other behaviors and language use (e.g. Heath, 1982; Philips, 2012; Sohn, 1983). These expectations for student talk and behavior form their learning and interacting styles and may not match the teachers' expectations if s/he is not culturally aware. If the teacher is unaware of differences in behavioral expectations, s/he may misinterpret the student's behavior in negative ways. The same is true for language use expectations, and especially important given the central role of language in the classroom. Similar to expectations for culturally responsive teaching (especially those concerning language laid out more fully by Gay, 2010), the linguistically inclusive teacher should understand variations in discourse and pragmatics across languages and employ a variety of participation structures in classroom learning activities. This variation benefits not only CLM students, but all students now living in a diverse society and thinking in more varied ways. From facts and examples of other languages and language varieties to participation structures and discourse styles, there are a number of ways that language and its variation can be integrated into the classroom learning if teachers build a knowledge base about language and a repertoire of inclusive strategies.

### *Caring and affirming attitudes*

Villegas and Lucas (2002) are quick to note that a traditional concept of knowledge base (i.e., factual information and declarative knowledge) serves little without culturally responsive attitudes. Culturally responsive teaching requires dispositions of caring (Gay, 2002) and an affirming attitude (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b) toward CLD students, of acknowledging the existence and validity of diverse ways of thinking, behaving and learning. Teachers are to respect students' cultural ways and aim to add to and not replace them, to care about students, to develop meaningful relationships with them, to hold high expectations for their learning, and to understand the consequences of their (teachers' own) attitudes toward CLM students. Villegas

and Lucas (2002b) also emphasize developing in teachers recognition of oppression and a sense of their own agency –and its importance—in emancipating students and working toward social justice goals. Fundamentally, teachers must shift from the traditional thinking where students whose ways of speaking, thinking and acting differ from those traditionally expected in the schools are seen as “deficient and in need of fixing” to “a recognition that educators have a responsibility to adjust their practices in order to build on the diverse backgrounds of the students” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, p. 76). That is, teachers must have attitudes of affirming students’ cultures and recognizing their and the schools’ need to adapt to diversity. They cite multiple studies confirming the impact of teachers’ attitudes on their teaching and on students’ learning. The importance of teachers’ attitudes toward language, linguistic minority students and language variation and change should also not be underestimated.

All these shades of the disposition of caring about students from diverse cultural backgrounds bolster *and* translate into caring about those with different *language* backgrounds for linguistically inclusive teaching. Where cultural differences may be understood and labeled more clearly (e.g. by ethnicity, religion, and so on), differences based on language are not always so well understood or identified, especially as pertains to dialects of US English or the language backgrounds of US-born SLES and *why* they do not speak standard or fluent English. Structural and pragmatic differences between languages and varieties may also be less familiar. To help develop caring and affirming attitudes about US-born SLES, teacher-candidates should learn about the language history of the US, for example, such as areas where Native American languages and Spanish have been spoken for centuries and how some language groups are able to maintain language communities despite the encroachment and sociopolitical dominance of English. Other background for understanding and caring about linguistic minority students will

come from considering the role of language in identity, especially for minority groups, and from knowledge of language acquisition and the challenges that LM students face in learning (standard) English. Finally, to build teachers' respect and value for the first languages of CLM students, linguistic inclusiveness teacher education should instill a sense of wonder and inquiry about language and an appreciation for languages other than English. Teacher attitudes toward CLD students have major consequences for CLD students' learning and for the creation of welcoming and integrative communities of learning (Gay, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b). "The way in which teachers talk with and about students grows out of how they construct their students as learners and see their own identities as educators" (Gibbons, 2009, p. 2, paraphrasing Cummins, 2000). Linguistically responsive teaching must follow the lead of culturally responsive teaching and integrate a strand of teacher learning that will develop positive attitudes toward language, language learning, language differences and linguistic minority students.

### ***Learning about students and culturally responsive practices***

With positive attitudes and an interest in language, communicating with CLD students (Gay, 2002) and learning about their lives, backgrounds, cultures, and learning goals (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b) will be natural and attainable objectives for linguistically inclusive teachers. Indeed, having an individualized knowledge of students is both essential to and a continuing result of including students, their language understandings and cultures in learning activities and in materials, as mentioned above. The concept of CLD students' special "funds of (cultural) knowledge" (Moll & et al., 1992) is now widely known in culturally responsive teacher education; linguistic inclusiveness must now extend the concept to *linguistic* knowledge, including both understandings of the kinds of knowledge involved in structural characteristics

such as gender or noun class distinctions in European and East Asian languages, respectively, and also socio-cultural linguistic knowledge such as formality-based registers, gender- or age-based language differences, poetic forms and language games (such as limericks, puns, Ubbly-Dubby-type games), *et cetera*. Learning that this kind of language knowledge exists in diverse languages not only builds teachers' respect for the potentially overlooked knowledge of their CLD students, but can motivate them to learn about this type of knowledge in their students and have them share it in the classroom. Knowing about funds of linguistic knowledge can help teachers motivate students to learn by embedding learning activities in contexts that are familiar to CLD students (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b), that is, by using language patterns, games and ideas that are familiar to CLD students and enriching to the whole class. Gay (2002) also recommends that teacher-candidates learn about the communication styles, linguistic structures and discourse characteristics of CLM students' languages and cultures so that they can facilitate cross-cultural communication and be understanding of differences. Teacher-candidates may be wary of overgeneralizing and stereotyping CLD students, and for good reason, as Gay (2002) asserts, as individual variations inevitably exist and stereotyping is a grouping and potentially marginalizing process. Understanding general patterns of various groups, and understanding the potential for cultural differences in many areas, however, sets a foundation for cultural responsiveness.

Similarly for linguistically inclusive teaching, it will be important that teachers learn about the existence of different kinds of language (and language-based) knowledge, but they should not feel they have to memorize "facts" or overgeneralizations about CLD groups' funds of knowledge. Rather, they should have basic awareness of variation coupled with dispositions of inquiry toward linguistic funds of knowledge that will motivate and support continued

learning about individual students' linguistic knowledge and its integration in the classroom. As culturally responsive teachers seek to learn about their students and their cultural ways of thinking, communicating, learning, and being, linguistically inclusive teachers must seek to learn about their students' language backgrounds and abilities, and about the languages themselves so that the students and their language knowledge can be included in the classroom. When teachers have positive and inclusive attitudes toward CLM students and their languages, awareness and knowledge about language and its roles in communication and identity, they are better prepared to make their classrooms into welcoming *learning communities* as Gay (2000) recommends.

### ***Responding to diversity and using culturally responsive practices***

Culturally responsive instructional practices include involving all students in the construction of knowledge, building on their strengths, helping them to examine the curriculum from multiple perspectives, using varied assessment practices, making the classroom inclusive of all students and materials relevant to their lives, and engaging in candid discussions of topics that while important to students, are often excluded from the classroom (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b). Gay (2002) adds using cultural characteristics as criteria in modifying instructional strategies for CLD students, such as including more movement or dramatic elements congruent with African American cultural styles. She also discusses general cultural learning styles and the importance of culturally relevant examples, scenarios and vignettes as *pedagogical bridges* between students' prior knowledge and new knowledge. These culturally responsive teaching practices are not meant as simplistic strategies or moves, nor as a way of using cultural stereotypes and building new sets of expectations for CLM students. They are meant to be well-reasoned instructional practices, developed out of teachers' culturally responsive knowledge and dispositions and

bolstered by mentor relationships and observations of experienced culturally responsive teachers (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b).

No bullet-point list of teacher moves is envisioned for linguistically inclusive teaching, either. Linguistic inclusiveness instructional strategies are similarly based on knowledge of language variation, structure, use and acquisition, and dispositions of embracing language and sociolinguistic differences and of continued learning about students' languages and thinking. Some strategies of linguistically inclusive teaching modeled on culturally responsive teaching are engaging in discussions about language and linguistic biases that are sometimes avoided, using language forms relevant to students' lives, such as poetry from hip-hop or from other languages (Japanese *haiku*, Korean *chil-o-jo*), and including students' diverse perspectives on the language used, meaning of words, ways of communicating ideas, and construction of knowledge through language (e.g. *why would one use a passive sentence in this case?* or, *would you find it natural to call this older person by their first name?*). When language itself can be explored and critiqued, and students come to understand multiple ways of expressing ideas (Schleppegrell, 2013)—and of choosing what ideas to express in the first place—they can also come to understand that they have their own experiences, thought processes, and voices, all of which very much influenced by the language and words they have learned to use thus far. Including attention to language in the classroom in a linguistically inclusive approach thus supports the inclusion of student voices and continued development of students' language repertoires (Delpit, 1995a; J. Gee, 2002; Scarcella, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2004) in ways similar to the goals of culturally responsive teaching. Directly teaching about the language of school and of the curriculum is also a means of granting access to the rigorous content and the socially valued ways of using language to students with less familiarity with those patterns. The main

instructional practice for linguistically inclusive teaching is for teachers to make use of their knowledge and inquiry dispositions toward language to incorporate attention to language in the classroom whenever it may arise to benefit student learning and classroom culture and to include and inspire students' attention to, interest and pride in, knowledge of, and critical thinking about language.

***Constructivist views of learning and acting as change agents***

Two more basic principles of culturally responsive teaching enter into the framework for linguistically inclusive teaching as well: teachers' commitment to act as agents of social change and constructivist views of learning (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b). The latter constructivist view of learning is discussed below as a framework for linguistic inclusiveness, similar to its importance in culturally responsive teaching, in that it calls for teachers to know and engage with students' background knowledge in order to build the connections between prior and new knowledge that are central to learning in that view. The same connections to linguistic and language-based knowledge are necessary for learning as well, and indeed, central to learning not only about language, but to learning in general, given the central role of language in school learning activities (listening, reading, writing, discussion), in labeling and understanding new concepts, and in organizing and expressing one's understandings. Thus constructivist understandings of learning are fundamental to the vision of linguistic inclusiveness.

The commitment and skills to act as agents of change that Villegas and Lucas (2002b) propose as a strand of teacher education for culturally responsive teaching must be built from teachers' dispositions toward CLD students and their interrogation of their own prejudices and assumptions and of the various explanations of minority students' lagging academic outcomes. Attitudes are central in teachers' cultural responsiveness, and teachers have a "moral imperative"

to engage in culturally responsive teaching and change agency (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, p. 53). This tenet of culturally responsive pedagogy ties it to teaching for social justice, but also depends on their general development of professional identities and sense of agency. Teacher education and professional development is discussed in a later section, where it is made clear that linguistic inclusiveness holds as a central premise that teachers are not simply technicians, at the low end of the continuum of cultural responsiveness for this strand in Villegas and Lucas's framework, but that they hold fundamental agency in establishing linguistically inclusive classrooms. Education for linguistic inclusiveness is meant to empower teacher-candidates to enact this agency and social change through their knowledge, dispositions and actions toward and with diverse students and languages. Linguistically inclusive teachers are indeed envisioned to be agents of social change in developing students' knowledge, respect, interest and pride in our diverse languages and in changing historical oppressive attitudes of monolingualism, English only society, and the superiority of certain varieties of English.

### ***Language in culturally responsive teaching***

Language has been far from absent in discussions of cultural responsiveness. Many of the studies of cultural mismatches between teachers (or schools) and students and of culturally responsive teaching practices, in fact, concern communicative or discourse styles and expectations. Villegas and Lucas (2002a) refer to decades-old but foundational research into "subtle differences in language use and interaction patterns...and the failures of communication resulting from these differences" (p. 42). One early example is the influential study of the Kamehameha Early Elementary Program (KEEP) (Au, 1980b) that integrated the topic-associative (as opposed to topic-centered) narrative style of Native Hawaiian children and found resultant improvements in reading readiness measures. Another example is Heath's (1982)

similarly influential study that demonstrated differential kinds and usages of questions between middle class white teachers and their working class white and African American students in the Appalachian area in the 1970s. In both cases, cultural influences on language use were mismatched between teachers and young minority students, such that the students' participation in classroom activities was unexpected and their "achievement" judged inferior. Both Villegas and Lucas (2002a) and Gay (2010) reference these and other similar language use examples in their frameworks of culturally responsive teaching. Villegas and Lucas (2002a) even include "the ways that community members use language" and "take turns at talk" in their conceptualization of culture (p. 35), and finding out about the languages spoken at home and by family members is included as part of finding out about students and their backgrounds. For the second edition of her book on culturally responsive teaching, Gay (2010) greatly expanded the section on communication in the classroom to reflect the changing demographics of linguistic diversity and address language-related issues. Villegas and Lucas (2002b) also refer to carefully assessing students who speak English as a second language, using cooperative group work to encourage participation by SLES, and making explicit grammar corrections to signal the importance of mastering standard English while integrating community language patterns (citing Hollins, 1982).

For the most part, the literature on culturally responsive teaching has addressed the cultural aspects of language use and communicative interactions, discourse, language use and pragmatics, so-to-speak, but the historical, structural and "factual" bases are largely missing. Linguistically responsive teaching, discussed below, strives to address that missing focus on language itself. Both frameworks are fundamental to the conception of linguistically inclusive teaching.

With multiple parallels and shared goals as well as a longer history and documented successes, cultural responsiveness is an important construct in developing linguistic inclusiveness in teacher education, building on the multicultural education framework. Culturally responsive teaching sets a foundation, both conceptually and practically, for similar efforts to reflect and cultivate language diversity in education.

Alongside the research foundation, exemplification and explanation of culturally responsive teaching itself, Villegas and Lucas (2002b) propose a vision of culturally responsive teacher education and argue that the development of a vision is indeed the first step in any teacher education program's implementation of cultural responsiveness education. Teacher educators, that is, must develop a vision of cultural responsiveness in order to plan how it might be built into their own teaching and the teacher education program. This study aims to lay out considerations that teacher educators can engage with toward the development of a vision of linguistic inclusiveness and its implementation in their immediate programs and contexts. In doing so, many conceptualizations and fundamental principles are drawn from multicultural education and cultural responsiveness frameworks and from linguistically responsive teaching which also draws on this foundation.

### **Linguistically responsive teaching and linguistic inclusiveness**

The framework for linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008) is also a main conceptual framework and source of research and reasoning for linguistic inclusiveness as proposed here. Indeed, linguistically inclusive teaching is envisioned as an extension of linguistically responsive teaching, and can only be built on the research and progress in teacher education in that area, including a recent collection of studies on the model,

teacher attitudes, and approaches to faculty education and program development initiatives (Lucas, 2011b). Where linguistically responsive teaching emphasizes the teacher knowledge needed for creating equitable learning opportunities for SLES and other CLM students, an ultimate goal of linguistic *inclusiveness* is to prepare teachers to *cultivate* linguistic diversity through language-inclusive teaching and dispositions and practices that encourage heritage language maintenance and a multilingual society, a globalized conception of English, and the study of world languages, for example. Linguistic inclusiveness seeks to expand the framework to include a broader view of language education (for teachers and for diverse K-12 students) and wider-reaching initiatives like those in the multicultural education framework, such as multi-linguistic content integration and knowledge construction and the development of an empowering school culture and equity pedagogy as discussed above. It is for these reasons that the term *linguistic inclusiveness* was chosen to this new conceptualization. Linguistic inclusive seeks to include language in teacher education and knowledge, include language in broader K-12 learning and cultures, and include the languages and language knowledge of all of our culturally and linguistically diverse students. Linguistic responsiveness is the first thorough treatment of what teachers need to know about language and is already advancing to implementation, and provides a research base and basic framework for the conceptualization of linguistic inclusiveness. It is examined at greater length here along with other major frameworks.

As discussed in Chapter 2, linguistically responsive teaching is a response to the sudden and rapid inclusion of SLES students in mainstream classrooms across the United States due to the recent waves of immigration, the diversity of new immigrants and their unfamiliar or less-commonly studied languages, schools' and teachers' lack of preparation for CLD in general and especially in regions and states where they newly came to live, and to NCLB's termination of

supports for ESL and bilingual education. Lucas et al. (2008) and Lucas and Villegas (2010) assert that all teachers must be prepared to work with and for CLM students, and since most teachers have no linguistic experiences that that would provide (some) necessary insights, they argue that teacher education must be re-envisioned to include linguistic responsiveness. In addition to explicating the demographic imperative (Banks et al., 2005), Lucas and Villegas (2010, 2011) lay out a framework of what linguistic responsiveness should include, along with programmatic considerations as to how teacher education for linguistic responsiveness might be implemented. The dispositions (here called, orientations), knowledge and skills comprising linguistic responsiveness are summarized in Table 3 and discussed below in some detail.

Table 3. Linguistically responsive teaching characteristics

Orientations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sociolinguistic consciousness:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ understanding of the connection between language, culture and identity</li> <li>○ awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Value for linguistic diversity</li> <li>• Inclination to advocate for ELL students</li> </ul>
Knowledge and Skills:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning about ELL students’ language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies</li> <li>• Identifying the language demands of classroom tasks</li> <li>• Applying key principles of second language learning             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conversational language proficiency is fundamentally different from academic language proficiency.</li> <li>○ ELLs need comprehensible input just beyond their current level of proficiency.</li> <li>○ Social interaction for authentic communicative purposes fosters ELL learning.</li> <li>○ Skills and concepts learned in the first language transfer to the second language.</li> <li>○ Anxiety about performing in a second language can interfere with learning.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students’ learning</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">(Lucas &amp; Villegas, 2011, p. 57)</p>

### *Sociolinguistic consciousness*

The first disposition of linguistically responsive teachers, *sociolinguistic consciousness*, resembles the sociocultural consciousness of culturally responsive teaching, with a more directed attention to language. It is to include an understanding of the connection between language, culture and identity and awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education. These ideas are subsumed in research on culturally responsive teaching such as Lisa Delpit's (1995b) language is "intimately connected to loved ones, community, and personal identity" (p. 55) and Villegas and Lucas's (2002b) discussion of how teachers must learn to interrogate the power structures involved in language variation privileging (standard) English and marginalizing those who do not speak English natively or speak a "non-standard" variety of English. AS concerns identity, Lucas and Villegas (2010) explain that teachers need to recognize that language patterns reflect cultural values and membership and find ways of considering students' linguistic background in their teaching to build "bridges to learning" and help integrate students into the school setting (p. 303). Linguistically responsive teachers should also be aware of how language is tied to sociopolitical contexts such that the language of the wealthy and powerful groups are seen as superior because of that social position of the speakers, even though no language or variety is inherently better than any other. These are basic concepts of sociolinguistics that many introductory linguistics courses and textbooks include, and that are essential to linguistically inclusive teaching as well. Being linguistically inclusive also depends on an understanding language variation, its personal and sociopolitical significance, and the inherent structural equivalence of all language varieties. Linguistically inclusive teacher education builds teachers' knowledge of sociolinguistics toward positive dispositions and the advocacy discussed

below and practices that include other languages and language varieties in classroom teaching and learning.

*Value for linguistic diversity*

These aspects of sociolinguistic consciousness support a second orientation, *value for linguistic diversity*. Teachers should understand that their attitudes toward CLD students will likely affect their teaching and CLD students' learning. Building on sociolinguistic consciousness is developing positive orientations toward CLD students and their language varieties, and maintaining high expectations for their learning, not falling prey to preceding students as deficient due to language differences, marginalizing CLM students, lowering expectations or providing them oversimplified, unengaging curricula and learning activities (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Linguistically responsive teachers value linguistic diversity by respecting and learning about students' home languages, allowing students to use their home languages in class to support content learning, and encouraging development of literacy skills in the home language (Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

As suggested in the knowledge and skills discussed below, valuing linguistic diversity also requires knowledge about language that provides a foundation for learning about students' home languages and for developing understandings about the value of using the home language to develop understandings of content. Additional knowledge of language structure, variation and acquisition can also support teachers' development of respect for students' home languages and the funds of knowledge they entail *and* for the significant task of learning a second language and learning content in a second language. Linguistically inclusive teacher education should develop teachers' orientations of valuing linguistic diversity, and add these topics to the knowledge base to support that disposition and related practices.

### ***Inclination to advocate for ELL students***

Beyond understanding and valuing linguistic diversity, linguistically responsive teachers are to advocate for SLES students, who Lucas and Villegas (2010) (also Bartolomé, 2000) suggest are especially marginalized and invisible due to combined cultural and linguistic differences from the mainstream. They suggest linguistically responsive teachers can tutor SLES students, organize and support parent groups, encourage colleagues to learn about teaching SLES, challenge unfair assessment and testing of SLES, and campaign for legislation that is supportive of SLES and their families (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). They can also encourage and assist the families of SLES to participate in educational system and challenge the “common disregard for languages other than English in schools” (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 60). While Lucas and Villegas (2010, 2011) do not suggest specific teacher learning that will support these actions, and nor does the linguistic inclusiveness curriculum proposed here, linguistic inclusiveness teacher education as a broader framework should include this preparation. The curriculum in Chapter 4 should serve to support this last orientation of linguistically responsive teachers by providing a knowledge base and developing dispositions of use in advocating.

### ***Learning about ELL students’ language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies***

Moving to the *knowledge* required of linguistically responsive teachers, Lucas and colleagues first cite the importance of learning about SLES students’ language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies and the skills to do so. Learning about the backgrounds of SLES students is to include learning about their language backgrounds, literacy practices and proficiencies in both English and the home language(s) as well as their schooling and content-area backgrounds. Linguistically responsive teachers are to recognize that not all SLES students have similar experiences and approaches to learning, language, and school, so teachers must

learn about individual students' families and schooling backgrounds. Lucas and Villegas (2011) suggest the following strategies for learning about SLES students' language proficiencies: interacting one-on-one, observing and listening carefully to their other interactions inside and outside the classroom, asking SLES students directly about their experiences (if they are old enough), talking to parents, bilingual adults and the ESL teacher, and visiting the students' homes. The skills to learn about students' backgrounds are not addressed by Lucas and Villegas (2011), but for Lucas and Villegas (2010), tie into the next knowledge requirement for linguistically responsive teaching, identifying the language demands of classroom tasks.

### ***Identifying the language demands of classroom tasks***

Learning about the language and schooling backgrounds of SLES students, Lucas and Villegas (2010) assert, helps teachers to anticipate the aspects of learning tasks that are likely to be especially challenging for specific SLES students. This, in turn, relates to identifying the language demands of classroom tasks. Examples of classroom tasks are the *functions* of language referred to in many methods-based approaches, such as listening to a lecture, summarizing one's thinking, reading expository text and drawing conclusions (Gibbons, 1993) also mentioned by Lucas and Villegas (2010). As to predicting learning tasks that may be challenging for SLES students', Lucas and Villegas (2010) note that this will require knowledge of language forms and functions and "the ability to conduct basic linguistic analysis of oral and written texts in particular disciplines and for particular academic purposes; [including] identifying the key vocabulary..., understanding the syntactic and semantic complexity of the language used..., and knowing the specific ways in which students are expected to use language to complete each learning task" (p. 305). Identifying the functions might be addressed in a methods course, using a functional linguistics approach to text analysis such as that suggested by

Schleppegrell (2004) and Fang and Schleppegrell (2010), for example (Lucas and Villegas (2010), in fact, refer to the work of Mary Schleppegrell). Understanding syntactic and semantic complexity, on the other hand, and perhaps the knowledge to support functional language analysis, requires significantly more linguistic knowledge. Lucas and Villegas (2011) suggest the necessary skills might be incorporated into existing teacher education courses, but that “*teacher candidates would be well served by taking a linguistics course designed especially for teachers where they would learn about the language forms and functions and the fundamentals of linguistic analysis*” (p. 62, emphasis mine). It is this recommended class that is proposed in Chapter 4 and tested in Chapter 5. As mentioned in Chapter 2, others have recommended that teachers take an introductory linguistics course (Bunch, 2010; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005), but that would likely mean taking a course in a Linguistics or English department with different valued knowledge and learning goals. Lucas and Villegas (2011) are suggesting that teachers’ learning in this area be tailored to more specifically applicable knowledge. There is still some ambiguity about what kinds of knowledge linguistically responsive teachers need, but linguistically inclusive teacher education and the curriculum proposed in Chapter 4 aim to provide a knowledge base in support of teachers learning about SLES students’ language proficiency, predicting learning tasks that may be especially challenging, understanding and analyzing the semantic and syntactic complexities of texts, and, as is necessary for the next type of knowledge required of linguistically responsive teachers, applying key principles of second language learning.

#### ***Applying key principles of second language learning***

Lucas and Villegas (2011) list five key principles of second language learning that linguistically responsive teachers need to know and apply:

- Conversational language proficiency is fundamentally different from academic language proficiency.
- ELLs need comprehensible input just beyond their current level of proficiency.
- Social interaction for authentic communicative purposes fosters ELL learning.
- Skills and concepts learned in the first language transfer to the second language.
- Anxiety about performing in a second language can interfere with learning.

Linguistically responsive teachers know that conversational language proficiency is fundamentally different from academic language proficiency, and that students who are proficient in conversational language may still need support for academic tasks that requires academic language proficiency. Knowing that ELLs need comprehensible input just beyond their current level of proficiency means that linguistically responsive teachers use what they know about the language tasks and their students' strengths and weaknesses to make the input comprehensible, not too hard and not too easy, and to scaffold students' learning. Knowing that social interaction for authentic communicative purposes fosters ELL learning, linguistically responsive teachers provide direct and frequent interactions with fluent speakers, such as group work collaborations with peers and facilitated conversations. Knowing that anxiety about performing in a second language can interfere with learning, linguistically responsive teachers are to provide a safe learning environment and non-evaluative responses to student comments when possible.

The final principle that linguistically responsive teachers should know and apply in their teaching, Skills and concepts learned in the first language transfer to the second language, seems to require significant knowledge of second language acquisition. To act on this principle, Lucas and Villegas (2011) cite simple actions, such as encouraging SLES to use materials in their native languages and interact with fellow speakers inside and outside the class to access content, encouraging families to cultivate the students' language development, reaching out to communities and a connecting them with students and school activities, and encouraging

students to maintain and develop their native languages. Teachers can do these things with only a general knowledge that first language acquisition supports second language acquisition and that a variety of parties and teacher attitudes contribute to maintenance and development of the home language. Two last actions that linguistically responsive teachers are to take, however, involve a more developed understanding of language and second language acquisition. These are emphasizing the social and psychological advantages of bilingualism, which entails that teachers have a solid understanding of what the advantages are, and being prepared to discern whether problems that may arise with SLES learning stem from lack of literacy skills in the home language, learning difficulties unrelated to language, or the normal challenges of learning a second language (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Determining the underlying cause of students' problems to be a second language, general language or general learning difficulty often requires a high degree of expertise. In difficult or extended cases, however, determinations will be made or assisted by specialists, and in the end, mainstream teachers do not need this skill. On the other hand, for more immediate and minor misunderstandings, linguistically responsive teachers should be able to identify challenges that stem from the natural progression and processes of second language acquisition and from differences between English and the student's native language if they have a foundational understanding of language structure and second language acquisition, and if they have learned about the students' language itself (and not only the student's proficiency in the home language). That is, Lucas and Villegas (2011) are suggesting that linguistically responsive teachers need a strong foundational understanding of language structure, differences in language structure, second language acquisition and the areas of difficulty and patterns of development of learning English as a second language. This suggests

that teachers need a course on these topics of second language acquisition and bilingualism, or, minimally, a significant unit on the topic in the linguistic course for teachers.

### ***Scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students' learning***

Finally, Lucas and Villegas (2010, 2011) call for linguistically responsive teachers to scaffold instruction to promote SLES students' learning, such as amplifying the language (Walqui & Van Lier, 2010) and using extralinguistic supports such as visuals and graphic organizers. They also mention providing clear, complete instructions; and supplementing texts and oral language in a variety of ways. Among these, adapting texts, minimizing their use of idiomatic expressions, explaining difficult words, and building repetition into instruction require a degree of language awareness that must be supported in the targeted linguistics class. All of these require reflection on language and identification of "difficult words," which, for SLES, are not always the Latinate and Greek "academic" words, and idiomatic language, of which native speakers are rarely conscious. Adapting texts to be more comprehensible and building redundancy into instruction require cognizance of syntax and semantics that are complex, ambiguous, different from SLES students' home languages, or in other ways potentially difficult or confusing. Linguistically responsive teachers thus need to have knowledge of morphological (word-level), syntactic (sentence-level) and semantic (meaning-related) concepts and experience thinking about and identifying complexities at these levels. They must become conscious of their unconscious language knowledge and usage. These are the goals for linguistically responsive teachers, and this reasoning supports the inclusion of basic structural and comparative linguistics topics in their teacher education.

These are the fundamental goals of linguistic inclusiveness as well, that teachers have knowledge of language structure, variation (sociolinguistics) and acquisition that supports the

orientations and practices that Lucas and colleagues outline for linguistically responsive teachers. To do so, *language* must be included in teacher education, and so I propose a linguistics curriculum for linguistic inclusiveness in Chapter 4. Linguistic inclusiveness thereby comprises all the goals of linguistic responsiveness as laid out by Lucas and Villegas (2011), and seeks to complement and to derive support from the other major frameworks of social justice and multicultural education.

### Summary of major frameworks

In Table 4, I lay out the basic frameworks of multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, and linguistically responsive teaching, all of which inform the developing framework of linguistic inclusiveness. Linguistic inclusiveness corollaries to the multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching frameworks have been discussed above, and to linguistically responsive teaching, linguistic inclusiveness adds those linguistic corollaries. Linguistic inclusiveness especially adds the development of a wider language awareness and linguistic knowledge base beyond sociolinguistics and language acquisition, that includes basic English and comparative structure and usage, and instructional practices focusing on linguistically inclusive, equitable and empowering learning for all students.

*Table 4. Comparison of frameworks for cultural and linguistic diversity*

<i>Multicultural Education Dimensions</i> (Banks, 1995, 2004a)	<i>Culturally Responsive Teaching</i> (Gay, 2002a, 2002b, 2010; Villegas & Lucas 2002a, 2002b)	<i>Linguistically Responsive Teaching</i> (Lucas & Villegas, 2011) + <i>Linguistically Inclusive teaching</i> (in italics)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prejudice Reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a knowledge base about cultural diversity (Gay);</li> <li>• Sociocultural consciousness (Villegas &amp; Lucas)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sociolinguistic consciousness               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ understanding of the connection between language, culture and identity</li> <li>○ awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>reflection about attitudes toward languages and ELLs</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equity Pedagogy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>use diversity to enrich instruction</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrating caring and building learning communities (Gay);</li> <li>• An affirming attitude toward culturally and linguistically diverse students (Villegas &amp; Lucas);</li> <li>• Commitment and skills to act as agents of change (Villegas &amp; Lucas);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value for linguistic diversity</li> <li>• Inclination to advocate for ELL students</li> <li>• <i>challenging of power relationships between teacher and student, native and non-native (standard) English speakers</i></li> <li>• <i>recognition of contributions of diverse languages to global, non-monolithic English</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicating with ethnically diverse students (Gay);</li> <li>• Learning about students (Villegas &amp; Lucas)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning about ELL students' language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies</li> <li>• <i>Learning and inquiry stance about languages themselves</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responding to ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction (Gay);</li> <li>• Culturally responsive teaching practices (Villegas &amp; Lucas)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying the language demands of classroom tasks;</li> <li>• Applying key principles of second language learning (comprehensible input, social interaction, authentic communication, first language transfer, reducing anxiety)</li> <li>• Scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students' learning</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content Integration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including ethnic and cultural diversity in the curriculum (Gay)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Including cross-linguistic and English language focus across curricula</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructivist views of learning (Villegas &amp; Lucas)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Including diverse languages and understandings in the classroom</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empowering school culture and social structure</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Positioning CLM students as capable contributors and peers</i></li> </ul>

Though relatively young, the linguistic responsiveness research base is growing, including the history and policy contexts of educating SLES (Stritikus & Varghese, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2011), second language acquisition, bilingualism, and advanced literacy

(Celce-Murcia, 2002; Faltis, Valdés, & Education, 2010; J. Gee, 2002; Scarcella, 2002; M. Schleppegrell & C. Colombi, 2002 among many), the preparation of teachers for working within linguistic diversity (Brisk, 2008a; Bunch, 2010; Lucas, 2011b; Valdés et al., 2005), teacher attitudes toward working with SLES (de Jong & Harper, 2011; Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013), the design of teacher education programs (Athaneses & de Oliviera, 2011; Brisk, 2008b) and preparation of faculty for educating teachers to work within linguistic diversity (Brisk, 2008b; Gort, Glenn, & Settlage, 2011). While a thorough review of this growing body of research is beyond the scope of this chapter, some of it is discussed in Chapter 6 in reflecting on the contributions of this dissertation, a detailed discussion of a proposed content for a linguistically inclusive teacher knowledge base and teacher education curriculum (Chapter 4) and a pilot study of that curriculum offered as a single course (for ELL endorsement; Chapter 5). The vision of linguistic inclusiveness advanced here also offers an ambitious expansion of linguistic responsiveness to parallel and piggyback on multicultural education. In the next sections, I outline theories of learning, teacher education and pedagogy, and language that provide additional frameworks for the linguistic inclusiveness concept and the curriculum outlined in Chapter 4.

### **Theories of Learning**

In taking a position on what teachers need to know and be able to do to provide equitable learning for CLD students, this dissertation is guided by cognitive constructivist and socio-culturalist understandings of learning for public school students as well as for teacher-candidates.

#### **Cognitive constructivist view of learning**

The constructivist view of learning reaches back to John Dewey's promotion of active learning and to Jean Piaget's conceptualization of learning as accommodation of new

information into mental schemata (Dewey, 1990; Piaget, 1980). Learning, in this view, is a process of building one's own mental representations, of constructing one's own knowledge by making meaningful connections between oneself and one's prior experiences on one hand and the new concepts and experiences on the other. In this view of learning, teachers need to take into account learners' prior knowledge and experiences, encourage learners to make sense of the material by making connections, and thus co-construct knowledge (Bransford et al., 2000; Mayer, 1992) as opposed to simply *transmitting* information to be taken in as is by the learner. As in equity pedagogy, linguistic inclusiveness relies on a constructivist view of learning that "challenges the idea of instruction as transmission of facts and the image of the teacher as a citadel of knowledge and students as passive recipients of knowledge" (C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks, 1995, p. 153). It relies on students' formulating and sharing their ideas, and teachers learning about students and engaging their backgrounds and active thinking and contribution in the classroom.

This is the view taken of teacher candidates in teacher education courses like the one proposed, so it will be important to engage and interrogate their prior thinking about language, experiences with language, and skills in analysis, literacy and other areas that can be useful in making connections to the course material. It also suggests that teachers in their own classrooms should engage their students' language experiences and knowledge to co-construct a deeper understanding not only of English, but of language in general. Including CLD students' language experiences in the co-construction of knowledge thus *enriches* the co-constructed knowledge by contributing diverse understandings (Gay, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Linguistic diversity becomes an opportunity for all to learn more deeply about language and about their own thinking. In linking constructivist theories of learning to culturally responsive

teaching, Villegas and Lucas (2002a) posit that “a truly constructivist education... would cultivate students’ ability to think critically, solve problems, work collaboratively, make collective decisions, and understand the multiplicity of perspectives in the world” (p. 77). Similarly, a constructivist perspective on learning is entwined with linguistic inclusiveness and its intended examination of language, engagement with language-based thinking and understandings, critical and deeper thinking in the classroom as well as inclusive and cooperative learning among students of diverse backgrounds. Examining language is a method of engaging in higher-order thinking, such as comparing, evaluating, integrating and synthesizing understandings and ideas and so on (Schleppegrell, 2013).

The cognitive constructivist model also relies on *metacognition*: the monitoring of one’s own learning and control of cognitive processes during learning, including sense-making, self-assessment, and reflection about learning (Bransford et al., 2000; Mayer, 1992). Metacognition in learning from advanced texts or from a second language is aided by critical thinking about the language itself; what is communicated and how it is communicated, which is mutually reinforcing with knowledge of language (Nagy et al., 2003; Schleppegrell, 2013). That is, talking about language and meaning in language, as a form of metacognition (with metalinguistic vocabulary), helps learners to construct understanding of the content as well as the language. It is thus important to engage learners, whether teacher candidates or schoolchildren, in metacognition about their content and language learning.

There is much evidence of cognitive construction in second language learning, as well (de Jong & Harper, 2008; Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Scarcella, 2002), such as that second language learners do not simply absorb each and every grammatical correction they hear, that there are patterns of errors and stages of second language learning (Genesee, Paradis, & Crago,

2004b; McKeon, 1994), and that the first language experience plays a role in second language learning as well (Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Stritikus & Varghese, 2007).<sup>33</sup> All these and other understandings of second language learning as active construction of knowledge influence the view of optimal learning opportunities for SLES and other CLD students and thereby the linguistic learning goals of teachers for the curriculum proposed here.

### **Sociocultural view of learning**

Sociocultural theory is among several frameworks that inform the vision of linguistically inclusive teaching. Educational researchers working on culturally responsive teaching and its methodological approaches also espouse sociocultural ideologies alongside constructivist and note that they are not incompatible (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Nor are sociocultural understandings of language and language acquisition incompatible with a structural view of language also espoused here (discussed below). A central tenet of sociocultural theory, that knowledge, thinking and language are socially mediated, mirrors a central understanding of sociolinguistics and echoes important findings in language acquisition, and the attention that sociocultural theory brings to students' social inclusion and positionality supports the fundamental tenet of linguistic inclusiveness, namely, *including* CLM students in classroom learning, knowledge construction, and social culture. A complete characterization of the theory is beyond the goals of this section, but in the next paragraphs I briefly explain how sociocultural theory informs linguistic inclusiveness and the teacher curriculum proposed in Chapter 4.

Most fundamentally, the socioculturalist view of learning, generally attributed to Lev Vygotsky and widely adopted in education since the 1980s (Johnson, 2006; Minami & Ovando, 1995), posits that learning originates in social interactions. Karen Johnson (2006) summarizes

---

<sup>33</sup> It bears mentioning that despite reference to the work of Noam Chomsky and the framework of generative grammar below, an nativist approach to *second* language learning, where attention to grammar and instruction are de-emphasized, is not espoused here.

this basic conceptualization clearly: “human learning [is] a dynamic social activity that is situated in physical and social contexts, and distributed across persons, tools and activities” (p. 237).

Thus sociocultural theory holds that learning requires participation and interaction and depends on past learning and culture as well as present context. Sociocultural theory also recognizes the central role of language in learning and thought and in the social practices involved in learning (Vygotsky, 1962).

Sociocultural understandings of learning support the emphasis on social interaction and a positive social environment that is central in linguistic inclusiveness (as it is in multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching). For CLD students, social interactions and a positive social environment for improved learning come from an inclusive school climate (Banks, 1995), teachers’ affirming attitudes (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b), and from including their voices in the classroom, which is aided by teachers learning about individual students and their background experiences and knowledges (Gay, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; 2002b and others) and having a knowledge base from which to approach students whose experiences are different from their own.

Methodological approaches to diverse learners and ELLS have integrated *socially meaningful* interactions such as student-led, mixed-group learning activities (Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Peregoy et al., 2013; Walqui & Van Lier, 2010), feeding the tendency to focus on meaning and function in the context of content learning, as opposed to memorizing decontextualized grammar or vocabulary. These applications of sociocultural theory reveal its recognition of learners as meaning-makers (corresponding with the constructivist view), as social beings, and as three-dimensional, thinking individuals and not as categories of students characterized by English language deficits.

Given the emphasis on social interaction as the source of learning and of language, sociocultural theory also holds that *meaning* in language is context-dependent. In simple terms, the meaning of a given word depends on the context in which it is used: in *a big pencil* as opposed to *a big house*, the absolute interpretation of *big* differs greatly. This is a basic understanding in semantics. More consequentially, meaning is often dependent on the larger language and cultural contexts, as studied in sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics. The very existence of particular words, decisions about what can be talked about, what gets attention in language and culture, and how ideas are and are not expressed in various immediate social contexts are dependent on sociocultural norms. Socio- and anthropological-linguistics recognize that the meanings that are learned and the means of expressing them differ across languages and varieties. In acquiring a language or dialect we acquire all of these sociocultural and sociolinguistic factors of language use alongside the structural, and once learned, even this socially-mediated language knowledge becomes subconscious. The linguistically responsive teacher must be aware of how meaning in language is variable both within and across languages and varieties. S/he must also seek to learn about students' social contexts, that is, their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and thinking, both by researching them and by welcoming student input in the classroom to contribute to classroom-wide examination of meanings and possible understandings. Teachers must thus be able to not only think deeply themselves about the contextualized meanings of words, phrases and texts used in their classrooms and materials, but also make this thinking apparent to students and allow them to question and interpret it. These pedagogies of linguistic inclusiveness are supported by a sociocultural understanding of the contextual nature of meaning.

Sociolinguistics and basic language acquisition are also in line with sociocultural thinking in terms of the social origin of language in highlighting the role of language in one's identity and affiliation with a linguistic community.

### **Perspectives on Teacher Education, Learning and Professionalism**

As this dissertation proposes a curriculum for teacher education in linguistic inclusiveness, it follows that it should be influenced by considerations of teacher learning and teacher education pedagogy (Alsup, 2006; D. Freeman, 2002; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Hammerness et al., 2005; Hawkins, 2011a; Varghese et al., 2005). It also takes the perspective of teachers as intellectuals (Nieto, 2005b), professionals (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Labaree, 2004; Varghese, 2004; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005; Zeichner, 2012) and as agents for social justice . Additionally, the sociocultural and constructivist understandings of learning are applied here in the area of teacher learning (Bransford et al., 2000), informing considerations of how teachers might come to enact linguistic inclusiveness.

Zeichner (2003, 2006) outlines three major political approaches to teacher education: the *professionalization* model in which teachers are to be held to professional standards as are other professionals such as doctors and lawyers, the *deregulation* model which promotes testing and not coursework or other requirements as the gateway to a teaching credential, and *social justice teacher education* which is focused on developing teachers' identities as agents of social change toward equity and democracy. While each approach has contributed beneficially to the theoretical discussions of how to provide effective teachers for the schools, they can be taken to detrimental extremes, and the debates highly polarized. Without entering into the controversial aspects of one camp over another, the view taken here is unhesitatingly one of social justice

teacher education, as discussed earlier, as well as one in which teachers are seen as thinking and agentive professionals. Linguistic inclusiveness requires both a social justice disposition and a foundational knowledge base and education to develop professional facility and self-concept with respect to working with language in one's field and with linguistically diverse students.

It is almost by definition that teachers are social justice agents, in that their moral duty is to teach *every* student humanely and toward equitable educational outcomes and a more democratic society. To teach is to fight against ignorance and injustice. Sonia Nieto (2005b) asserts that this social justice motivation is indeed a major factor that brings people into teaching and keeps in the profession despite the many challenges and negative political climate. Zeichner (2006) also notes that virtually all university-based teacher education programs proclaim a social justice goal. Social justice teacher education, like linguistic inclusiveness and multicultural education, seeks to ensure that learning opportunities and teaching approaches are indeed equitable based on the background cultures, languages, and identities of students and teachers. Acting as agents of social change is a moral imperative in Villegas and Lucas's (2002) view of culturally responsive teaching. This requires a certain knowledge base on the part of teachers (and teacher educators) as discussed above concerning culturally and linguistic diversity, especially because the teacher force is not yet as diverse as the student population. That is, teachers must be sensitized about social inequalities reinforced by the schools and learn ways to overturn social injustices in their teacher roles.

That social justice teaching relies on teacher education and a knowledge base relates to the aspect of the professionalization approach that is relevant to linguistic inclusiveness as well, namely, that teaching is complex, variable, dynamic and valuable work that requires significant education in order to gain the requisite knowledge, dispositions, and skills (Labaree, 2004).

Hammerness et al. (2005) call teaching a “creative act” that, far from being script-able, entails teachers “disciplined innovation,” or, well-reasoned flexibility and creativity. Also relevant is Giroux’s (1988) depiction of teachers as *transformative intellectuals* (cited in Johnson, 2006). For our purposes, they are “transformative” in a social justice sense and “intellectuals” in the professionalization view. What linguistic inclusiveness borrows from these discussions is recognition that teaching requires and deserves thorough education and preparation in areas that are relevant to teaching. Language is one area that is absolutely fundamental to teaching, and thus demands attention in teacher education. Language is central in virtually all aspects of education from signage to assessment and from classroom interactions to written assignments to learning itself (Fillmore & Snow, 2002 and others; Vygotsky, 1962). Schooling has been called “primarily a linguistic process” (Schleppegrell, 2004, p. 2). Furthermore, language development continues throughout schooling with advanced literacies and disciplinary language uses, and growing linguistic diversity among students makes understandings and backgrounds (which are to be engaged in sociocultural and constructivist models of learning) variable. Linguistically inclusive teaching must therefore be dynamically responsive and interactive and cannot be reduced to pre-scripted or routinized moves or even curricula. Preparing teachers for linguistic inclusiveness relies on a view of teachers as capable and responsible professionals and of teacher education programs as having a substantial function and duty in their preparation. Teacher education must then integrate *language* understandings among the learning expected of teacher-candidates and should be able to interlace linguistic inclusiveness education with the social justice and multicultural teacher education that they may have in place.

Educating teachers for linguistic inclusiveness also requires consideration of teacher learning, cognition, development and identity. Research into teacher’s mental lives is relatively

recent, but influenced by the general turn toward sociocultural theory in the humanities, emphasizes the importance both of context in the development of teachers' professional identities and of teacher's background experiences and learning processes (Johnson, 2006). Teachers' identities (professional, cultural, political and individual) are ever-changing, affected by the immediate school and classroom contexts and the individual teacher's positionality there (Varghese et al., 2005), so pre-service education can only—but *must*—set a foundation for teachers' lifelong learning and professional development (Hammerness et al., 2005).

This view of pre-service teacher education as necessarily limited but foundational reflects the basic conceptualization of linguistic inclusiveness education as well. First and foremost, teachers' learning must be recognized as socially negotiated, based on their background experiences as well as their immediate contexts, their knowledge of self, students, subject matter, curricula and setting (Johnson, 2006). Simply informing teacher-candidates of language structure, usage and acquisition would fail to engage them in cognition and learning. Teachers' and teacher-candidates' prior experiences with language and languages will greatly affect their ideas and sense of professional identities with respect to including language in their classroom, teaching, and interacting with CLM students, so these background experiences must be integrated into their linguistic inclusiveness education, just as in multicultural education, culturally relevant teaching, and other areas of teacher development (Banks, 2004a; Hammerness et al., 2005; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Teachers who have extensive experience with world languages or teaching English in some capacity, study abroad experiences, or bilingual families, will likely have different concepts of their own abilities and willingness to work with SLES students, for example, from those with limited exposure to other languages. Similarly, those who specialize in English Language Arts may have very different linguistic experiences, expectations

and self-concepts than those in math, science, or social studies who do not likely feel a similar sense of affinity for language. Teachers across subjects are preparing for very different teaching contexts and expectations as well, so they will hold different ideas of how and why language is relevant to their future work and, once in the workplace, will continue to develop varied conceptualizations and professional identities with respect to language. Linguistic inclusiveness education should address preconceptions about language, but also illustrate and engage teacher-candidates with the ways in which language is taken for granted in their work, such as with academic language, subject-area language use, and native, standard English hegemony, and present ways in which they must work to make language expectations explicit in order to provide equitable access for all students.

In addition to addressing preconceptions and dispositions toward language, linguistic inclusiveness education for teachers must lay a foundation for continued learning. A conceptual knowledge base is the foundation for the *adaptive expertise* that is essential in the dynamic and complex work of teaching, expertise that involves both efficiency and innovation (Hammerness et al., 2005). The knowledge base of linguistic inclusiveness provides conceptual tools that allow efficiency as well as innovation. Awareness and basic understandings of language structure, use, variation and acquisition serve as a tool for thinking about diverse students and their interactions with content learning on the job. Without a basic knowledge of how language works, varies, and is learned, teachers' attempts to understand students and adjust teaching to their needs may be inefficient, clumsy, or at worst, nonexistent. With a knowledge base and linguistic inclusiveness dispositions, teachers are better prepared to innovate communicative and learning activities as needed to support their immediate student learning needs and goals.

This is not to suggest that that knowledge base will include all the facts that a teacher will ever need about any language or variety spoken by a student or any way of understanding the language of the classroom. The knowledge base of linguistic inclusiveness is conceptual in nature, including structural levels of language (phonology, syntax, etc.), for example, as way of understanding the complexity of language and as an organizing principle for thinking about how communication transpires or how breakdowns may occur. Similarly, a factual knowledge of the history and structure of all English dialects is unnecessary, but exposure to the concepts of how dialects come to be and how they vary builds knowledge of why students may speak and identify with varieties different from the teacher, and how understandings may vary, supporting an inclusive and reflective disposition and a basis for adapting classroom communications. The conceptual knowledge base serves as a foundation for teachers to learn about students' language backgrounds and, most importantly, for them to be aware of where differences arise and to care about creating an inclusive learning environment.

A pedagogy for linguistic inclusiveness in teacher education is thus not one where facts and grammatical structures are memorized, but one in which teachers question their own assumptions about language while being exposed to unfamiliar or unconscious language concepts and patterns. The approach should be one that allows teachers to develop a *reflective* practice (Zeichner, 2003, 2006) as concerns language. Linguistically inclusive teachers are reflective about their own and their students' language use and understandings, and they explore language in the classroom to improve learning and include CLD students in knowledge construction.

Additional considerations for teacher education aspects of linguistic inclusiveness are the questions of how much and when. It has become clear that teacher learning cannot be

“completed” in pre-service teacher education; there is a limit to what can be learned in the time in a teacher education program and in a context separated from the classrooms where they will ultimately develop their practice (D. Freeman, 2002; Hammerness et al., 2005). There is a time when new concepts can be “told” to teachers and they will make sense (and enter into a developing concept of the teachers’ work) (Hammerness et al., 2005), but this timing relies on a well-established context for reference, and vignettes will not always be as effective as live experience in this function. In a similar vein, Hammerness et al. (2005) point out the “problem of enactment;” that new models and concepts must be rehearsed (ideally immediately) by teacher-candidates in order for the theories and models to inform their teaching practice *and vice versa*, that is, in order for teachers to develop *praxis* (D. Freeman, 2002). Teachers must have opportunities to make sense of the theories and concepts in the context of their teaching, workplaces and their lives – to connect the material to experiences and professional identities they are forming. For linguistic inclusiveness, this is truly a tricky prospect. How is language knowledge to be *applied*? Or, how does one rehearse dispositions of caring and inquiry and skills in on-the-spot exploration of language? Some areas such as functional linguistic analysis of disciplinary texts are rehearsable methods in that texts can be analyzed in teacher education courses, but much of the pre-service linguistic inclusiveness learning proposed in Chapter 4 is conceptually foundational. Teacher-candidates can engage in projects where the goal is to envision and devise an application for some linguistic learning, but in the end, the intended linguistically inclusive teaching is on-the-spot application of knowledge and disposition.

A course based on the curriculum proposed is perhaps best offered early in a teacher education program as a foundation that can serve the learning and be applied in other areas of teacher education, such as disciplinary methods and even developmental psychology. What this

view of linguistic inclusiveness as foundation implies, however, is that the concepts are relevant across the teacher education program and should be intentionally integrated throughout, either additionally or instead (Athaneses & de Oliviera, 2011; Lucas, 2011a; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). This integration, in turn, may require faculty development toward an understanding of linguistic inclusiveness and a locally-unified vision of linguistic inclusiveness teacher education (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011). These are considerations that Lucas (2011b) has entertained but that are to be resolved by each teacher education program (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). As linguistic inclusiveness is developed further as a teacher education goal and integrated into teacher education programs, perhaps it, too, can be de-dichotomized (as foundational and not methodological) (Grossman et al., 2009), for linguistic inclusiveness is not only foundational knowledge but must be embodied in teachers' *practice*.

### **Perspectives on Language**

A final perspective to clarify is that which concerns language itself. There are many views of what language is and what areas are primary. Recognizing the variability of linguistic frameworks, this study takes a somewhat a-theoretical approach with respect to what teachers need to know about language. Nevertheless, the content of the class is mainly informed by a structural linguistics perspective based on the *transformational* or *generative grammar* work of Noam Chomsky and of *structuralists* such as Ferdinand de Saussure and Leonard Bloomfield before him (Strazny, 2005). *Systemic functional linguistics* (Halliday, 1977; Schleppegrell, 2004) is the basis for functional understandings of textual and disciplinary language use patterns, and sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics content is highly compatible with the sociocultural penchant prevalent in much of the education field.

From structural-generative linguistics, I draw on positivist conceptualizations of the structure of languages and dialects, such as the “components” of grammar structure and competence: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, along with concepts within each, such as phonemes, morphemes, and lexical categories. I take the commonalities between structuralism and generative linguistics, ignoring theoretical differences, such as a focus on atomization (generative) versus a holistic (structuralist) view of language and whether or not the model is explanatory and predictive (generative) or simply descriptive (structuralist) (Strazny, 2005). The approach here also gives ample attention to meaning, which generative linguistics might tend to avoid, and admits of a socioculturalist view of language as socially situated and not entirely or exhaustively self-contained.

Similarly, the perspective is not so theoretically-bound as to preclude cognitivist and functional understandings (see e.g. Lakoff, 1991; Strazny, 2005) either. Indeed, Chomsky’s (1982) conceptualization of *universal grammar*, an innate capacity for language, was originally in response to behaviorist and stimulus-response explanations of learning as they were applied to language (Herschensohn, 1998), and his corollary understanding of the child’s active construction of grammar (grammatical knowledge) coincides with constructivist understandings of learning (Bransford et al., 2000). That there are learnable patterns (i.e., structures) in language explains how children learn a first language so quickly and easily and with the particular types of non-adult-like utterances they produce. They acquire a pattern based on universal concepts such as *verb* and perhaps *past tense*, and then produce novel forms based on the patterning, which sometimes turn out to be “incorrect,” such as *goed* instead of *went*. That there are explainable and demonstrable patterns in language (and, of course, exceptions) also provides a basis for teachers to assist with second language acquisition, to examine and

understand their own language use and that of their students, and to lead students in similar examination toward enriched language understanding.

Quite importantly, the objectification of language structures shared between all human languages serves to support teachers' understanding of the complexity of each and every language and their appreciation of the complicated task that is learning any one language, much less a second or third. A structural conceptualization of language illuminates the structural-functional equality of all languages and dialects, and recognition of this equality helps to unseat linguistic prejudice and assumptions about language. A structural metalanguage allows metacognition about language, solidifying concepts and frameworks for thinking about language. It thus sets the stage for linguistic reflectiveness and metalinguistic awareness that can build the linguistic sensitivity, attention to one's own language and communicative clarity, and continued analysis and learning about language that constitute the *inquiry stance* (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) toward language that is fundamental to linguistically inclusive teaching. (See also Schleppegrell, 2013, on metalanguage in functional linguistics.)

It might also be said that the structural concepts provide the "static" knowledge (Varghese, 2004) or declarative knowledge of English that is an essential knowledge base of teachers of English to speakers of other languages (Yates & Muchisky, 2003) and indeed of all teachers (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Valdés et al., 2005). It is this declarative knowledge that is missing in the methods-based approaches to working with SLES in the classroom (e.g. Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012).

Also included in this basically structural approach are considerations of pragmatics, sociolinguistics and culturally-influenced language use. That members of any society have diverse language characteristics and often unconscious judgments of such characteristics is an

observable fact that constitutes the focus of sociolinguistics. It is also an idea that merits deconstruction in a course aimed at increasing language awareness; that is, sociolinguistic discussions center on recognizing that language varies by social identity and position and by exposure more than by conscious choice, and this recognition furthers the goal of unseating linguistic biases. The focus of pragmatics and cultural linguistics is on an awareness of the unconscious acquisition of socially-mediated linguistic characteristics, including traits on all of the structural “levels” of language. An example is using questions (structurally) to give commands (pragmatically) in culturally-defined situations of politeness (e.g. *could you open the window?*). Understanding the illocutionary force behind utterances and how speech acts are culturally defined – the interaction of social culture and language structure and the socio-cultural mediation of language use, knowledge and understanding—is taken here to be important metalinguistic awareness toward linguistically inclusive teaching. The structural approach taken here precludes neither a focus on meaning (semantics, functional linguistics and pragmatics) nor on social and cultural influences on language.

Awareness on the structural levels of language can in fact serve to support the functional approach proposed for teacher knowledge and for the teaching of academic language by, notably, Mary Schleppegrell and colleagues. These researcher-educators apply Michael Halliday’s (1977, 1994) *systemic functional linguistics* framework in education contexts (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2004). They demonstrate *functional linguistic analysis* methods of examining the layers of meaning that are the functions of texts and how the different meanings are expressed through particular language structures in different contexts or subject areas. Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) outline classroom methods for uncovering the *experiential*, *interpersonal* and *textual* meanings of written texts, and show how language form enacts science

text, for example, as generally more abstract, objective, authoritative and impersonal through its use of nominalization, declarative mood, and lack of evaluative vocabulary or modality. The analysis they propose seems most plausible for teachers when underlain with a basic understanding of structural linguistics, especially syntax and morphology (parts of speech, *Subject* and *Predicate*, concepts such as *complement*, *modifier*, *subordinate clause*, etc.). Functional linguistic analysis also supports a socio-culturalist focus on meaning-in-context-oriented analysis of language.

The structural linguistics approach taken here is supplemented by functional and socio-cultural viewpoints, where each framework is asserted only at a basic, pre-theoretical level. That is, where socio-cultural and structural approaches are in disagreement, for example, those areas are beyond the proposed course content and the frameworks assumed for its design and implementation. The intersection of the three approaches serves as the framework for the “linguistics content” of the course, and all three are put to work toward the central goals of linguistic inclusiveness, namely cultivating an inquiry stance toward language and unseating prejudices through deeper understanding of language structure, usage and socio-cultural mediation.

## **Chapter 4: A Language Awareness Curriculum for Secondary Teachers**

In this chapter I propose a curriculum for teacher-candidates intended to provide a basic knowledge base and positive dispositions for linguistic inclusiveness. The curriculum topics are discussed in detail so that teacher educators might reflect on the merits of such a course. Thorough explanations are intended to clarify any unfamiliar concepts, so that the chapter is accessible whether the reader is familiar with linguistic models or not, and also so that those who might endeavor to teach such a course might contemplate specific concepts and learning activities for inclusion in their syllabi in addition to the more general conceptual learning goals of the course. In what follows, I explain specific content for the proposed course, along with reasoning as to why teacher-candidates benefit from exposure to the specified concepts and how the content supports linguistically inclusive teaching.

The curriculum discussed here was originally envisioned as a one-term university-style course that might meet 10-15 times, once per week for two or three hours, for example. These logistical details are impactful, as meeting more often limits the amount of reading that can be assigned between classes, for example, while less time in class means limited opportunity for guided learning activities, group discussions and student presentations. The curriculum here assumes an ideal middle ground, but to a large extent the recommendations are flexible with respect to the learning format. Examined in detail, the curriculum can be considered for other contexts as well: as modules for inclusion in other or multiple courses in a teacher education program or professional development seminars for in-service teachers. It might also be useful for professional development for teacher educators (Bunch, 2010). The discussion that follows represents an experienced linguistics instructor's view of what kinds of linguistic knowledge and understandings can cultivate linguistically inclusive teaching, with a particular focus on

secondary teacher-candidates, though much of the content is relevant for other education levels (and non-teaching contexts) as well. The proposed curriculum forms the basic content of a course I would teach in 2013 at a major, public research university in a program for pre-service secondary teachers' English Language Learner endorsement. This specific class is further discussed in the case study presented in Chapter 5.

Teacher educators have recommended that teacher education include an introductory linguistics course covering many of the same topics I am proposing, such as phonology, morphology, and syntax (Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Steiner & Rozen, 2004; Valdés et al., 2005), or the basic structure of English, but details are rarely given as to *which* concepts, what level of knowledge or *why* that knowledge is important for teachers. In this chapter, I address these details of which concepts are relevant in educating linguistically inclusive teachers and why or how they might be approached.

### **Recommendations from teacher education literature**

The question of *why* a linguistics course for teachers has been answered in two basic ways: first, teachers self-report that they do not have sufficient knowledge of language, especially to meet the needs of English Language Learners (Gándara et al., 2005; Levine & Education Schools, 2006; Scarcella, 2002). Knowledge of language in this case may especially refer to second language acquisition and language use issues, but much of this higher level study of language relies on knowing the basic structure of language, such as is covered in a standard introductory linguistics curriculum (Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). The curriculum proposed here is meant to address teachers' self-reported needs and the recommendations of teacher education faculty researchers.

Secondly, while it has been recognized for some time that early literacy and other aspects of elementary teaching benefits from teachers' knowledge of language, especially of basic phonetics and phonology (Dewitz & International Reading Association, 2010) and of socio-cultural differences in preparation for schooling and its linguistic expectations (e.g. sociolinguistics) (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Stevens, 2008; Valdés et al., 2005), more recent research and concern among teachers, researchers, and policymakers has turned to the teaching of *advanced literacy*, that is, literary and academic registers and especially written forms, that are required for success in secondary and higher education (August & Hakuta, 1997; Brisk, 2008a; Bunch, 2010; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; M. J. Schleppegrell & C. Colombi, 2002; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Teachers need to scaffold virtually all students' development of advanced literacy (Scarcella, 2002), and to do that, teachers need training and education to develop the requisite linguistic awareness, knowledge, skills and dispositions. Given that advanced literacy involves knowledge of the more rare or complex grammatical structures, vocabulary, pragmatics, and metalinguistic knowledge and strategies (Bunch, 2010; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Scarcella, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2004), it follows that teachers need a foundational knowledge of these topics.

There are many recommendations in the literature as to the specific linguistics knowledge, dispositions and skills that today's teachers need. Most focus on sociolinguistic knowledge, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Valdés et al., 2005). Others recommend that teachers be able to *analyze the language demands* of classroom activities and scaffold the advanced literacy acquisition of first and second language learners (Achugar et al., 2007; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Scarcella, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2004; M. J. Schleppegrell & C. Colombi, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005) and even teach students

about the structure and usage of language (Delpit, 1995c; Scarcella, 2002). Valdés et al. (2005) suggest that teachers be able to help students with “strategies for analyzing the texts they are reading to help them understand those texts, infer meanings for words used in such texts, and reflect on the grammatical forms that one encounters in them,” to “become aware of these particular uses of language” and “bring them to the level of awareness of their students” (p. 166), and to “problematize language and to examine the kinds of oral and written proficiencies that are required for their students” (p. 167).

To support first and second language advanced literacy, Scarcella (2002) recommends that teachers be able to give instruction focused on developing vocabulary, grammar, and pragmatics, teach how to use multiple linguistic and nonlinguistic cues to figure out the precise meanings of words, give feedback, make linguistic components salient for students, and focus attention on specific features of language and get students to use them in their writing.

Darling-Hammond, et al (2005) also recommend teacher knowledge of the building blocks of language, including the sound system (phonology), the structure of words (morphology), and the structure of sentences (syntax). Policy researchers, Steiner and Rozen (2004) value teacher knowledge of spoken and written English, making reference to phonetics and phonology (phonics and phoneme awareness), morphology (structure of words), syntax and vocabulary (related to semantics), which are all of the core structural linguistics subjects, also recommended by Fillmore and Snow (2002), who add to the list: English spelling, development of reading skills and writing, how to judge correctness in students’ writing, and what makes a sentence or a text easy or difficult to understand. They recommend *seven* courses to prepare teachers for CLD (as mentioned in Chapter 2). Few teacher education programs are able to include all seven of these courses (Richardson, 2002), but there are redundancies in their list, and

with careful planning, most of these topics can be covered in the single linguistics course for teachers that I propose here. In outlining the proposed curriculum I first unpack the introductory Language and Linguistics course they and others recommend, and based on common introductory linguistics textbooks, “linguistics for teachers” books, and recommendations from teacher education research as mentioned, touch on the developmental and sociolinguistic topics they include as well.

## **Resources**

Multiple types of teaching resources were consulted in designing the curriculum. Several *Introduction to Linguistics* textbooks (Finegan, 2004; Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams, 2003; O’Grady, Archibald, Aronoff, & Rees-Miller, 2010; Tserdanelis & Wong, 2004), similar books for non-specialists, (S. Brown & Attardo, 2005; Parker & Riley, 2000) and books relating to “linguistics for teachers” (Barry, 2002; Cleary & Linn, 1993; D. E. Freeman & Freeman, 2004; Justice, 2001; Power & Shagoury, 2002; Savage, 1973) were consulted, and I make use of my experience teaching introductory linguistics courses, albeit in Linguistics, Anthropology, and Modern Languages departments, in considering linguistics concepts to include. At the time of writing, I have used four different textbooks for introductory linguistics courses targeting teachers (elementary and secondary) or courses where the majority of my students were teachers or teacher-candidates. (All of these courses were for ELL endorsement.) Those textbooks are as follows, and I draw heavily from them:

Kristin Denham & Anne Lobeck’s (2013) *Linguistics for Everyone; an Introduction* (Second ed.). Boston, MA: Michael Wadsworth and CENGAGE Learning.

Tatiana Gordon’s (2012) *The Educator’s Guide to Linguistics*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

William O’Grady, John Archibald, Mark Aronoff & Janie Rees-Miller’s (2010) *Contemporary Linguistics: an introduction* (6th ed.). Boston, New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s.

*Language Files : materials for an introduction to language and linguistics*, 11th edition (2011), edited by Vedrana Mihaliček & Christin Wilson. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

I also consulted journal articles and book chapters from teacher education literature, some of which are proposed as supplementary readings in the curriculum (e.g. Celce-Murcia, 2002; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Philips, 2012; Scarcella, 2002).

### **Themes**

With an eye toward classroom relevance and application, three main themes should be explored throughout the course while studying each major topic area: 1) first and second language acquisition and development (*what aspects of the current linguistic area are students still acquiring or developing and how can acquisition be scaffolded?*), 2) peculiarities of English structure (comparative structural awareness and foundational knowledge for making subconscious linguistic knowledge explicit for speakers of other languages and dialects), and 3) disciplinary language use (assessing the language demands of lessons, making language use patterns and expectations explicit, scaffolding the reading and analysis of disciplinary texts).

### **Curriculum**

The first part of the curriculum involves the five structural components of language, phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics, plus pragmatics. I discuss concepts in each that are important in raising teachers' awareness of the structure of English and cross-linguistic differences. The second part of the curriculum addresses overarching perspectives on language that are relevant to teachers working in linguistically diverse classrooms: sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, acquisition and bilingualism, and academic language and functional linguistic analysis as a means of understanding its complexities.

## **Phonetics and Phonology**

Of all the core subfields of linguistics, phonetics and phonology may seem the least relevant for secondary teachers. Attention to the sounds of English is useful in early literacy learning and teaching, but it may seem less useful for secondary teacher candidates because adolescents in their classes will presumably be literate. That this foundational knowledge of linguistics and literacy is relevant for all teachers in three ways, however. First, SLES students, adolescent or otherwise, may not be literate in any alphabetic writing, depending on their language and schooling backgrounds, so teachers will be faced with students who are indeed learning to read and write. Secondly, all teachers will need to teach reading and spelling, if only of subject-area vocabulary. An understanding of the English orthographic system and its peculiarities is essential for linguistically responsive vocabulary teaching that recognizes non-transparently spelled words that may be difficult to decode and thus to remember. Most importantly, teacher-candidates' linguistic awareness and sensitivity can be developed through coming to understand the richness and complexity of these areas of language knowledge that are so automatic and taken for granted –and yet objectively observable. Brief study of phonetics and phonology can provide a powerful lesson that the subconscious knowledge we all have of our languages is complex and functionally equal across language varieties. This lays a foundation for thinking objectively about language in order to make classroom language expectations explicit and for recognizing the funds of linguistic knowledge that every student possesses. Three themes in phonetics and phonology are proposed: orthography versus phonetics, the basics of articulation, and the concept of phonemes.

### ***Orthography vs. Phonetics***

One of the more obvious understandings that teachers of SLES should have is that English orthography is complicated and often non-transparent, especially for those without strong knowledge of the morphology and even the etymology of certain words. Though the principle behind an alphabet is that letters stand for sounds, the letter-to-sound correspondence in English orthography is not one-to-one. Some sounds are written in digraphs (*th, ch, sh*), doubled letters are not lengthened or doubled sounds (*hammer, letter*), some letters have alternate pronunciations, such as “hard” and “soft” *g* (in *guy* versus *giant*), there are multiple ways to represent some sounds (especially vowels, such as the sound in *eat*, the same as in *Tina, Mommy, Tracey, peel, receive, Pete* or *replay, algae, Jamie*), and there are many cases where “silent” letters represent no sound at all (*l* in *should, gh* in *light, e* in *cake*, and though it varies, for some, the *t* in *often, w* in *sword, and l* in *palm and talk*). Other examples of non-transparent spelling abound: (*bury, buy, one, honor, do, though, thought, through*). The orthographic system maintains historical spellings that reflect historical pronunciations and those of languages from whom words have been borrowed (that use the Roman alphabet). The basic orthography is also described as *morpho-phonemic*, meaning that the spelling of morphemes is basically constant (Chomsky & Halle, 1968), which can be helpful in inferring the meanings of unfamiliar words in writing when the morphemes are familiar, but can be confusing when sounds change in related words due to affixation, for example (*specific, specificity*). Knowing that English spelling does not reflect the sounds pronounced with a one-to-one letter-to-sound correspondence is important in understanding difficulties SLES might encounter in decoding unfamiliar written words in English, and is basic to recognizing specific cases when they arise in content language and in devising ways to scaffold SLES’s connections between oral and written language. Some SLES

students will have strong oral skills, and some, especially at the secondary level, might have stronger written than oral skills; *many* will still be building a strong connection between oral and written representations of words (and sounds).

It might seem that many teacher candidates would be aware of this spelling complexity, since we all have to learn how to spell and double-check our spelling of particular words even in adulthood, and since computer spell-checkers are such a prevalent, everyday reality. However, a West-E exam practice exam question on this fact that I included on the “entrance quiz” was answered incorrectly by some teacher-candidates. The question asked which word might be hardest to decode for a learner who is used to a language whose orthographic system has a one-to-one sound-symbol correspondence, *municipality*, *neighborhood*, *development* or *government*. (The intended answer is *neighborhood* because the *igh* is not pronounced.<sup>34</sup>) Despite the fact that the question even draws attention to what the decoding complication is (one-to-one sound-symbol correspondence), some teacher-candidates in classes described in Chapter 5 nevertheless failed to identify the spelling quirk. Barring extraneous error such as misinterpreting the question or lack of effort, a wrong answer suggests that not all teacher-candidates are aware of English spelling-to-pronunciation complexities, and that this awareness merits development in a course preparing teachers for linguistic diversity. That is, just mentioning it is not enough to stimulate thinking that is sufficient to answer the question correctly, much less to stimulate ideas for linguistic responsiveness and phonological or orthographic scaffolding methods.

To develop orthographic-phonetic awareness in teacher-candidates, learning a phonetic transcription system, such as the International Phonetic Alphabet, and transcribing English words can be a valuable experience. Transcribing is practice in analyzing the *sounds* in individual

---

<sup>34</sup> Another possible answer could be *government*, because the *n* is rarely pronounced, or *municipality* because the *u* is pronounced [ju].

words, recognizing how the spelling of the same sound varies in the orthographic system. It forces the learner to interrogate the orthographic representation of words that most literate adults take for granted, to relearn the sound-spelling correspondences and non-correspondences of English, and to learn a different “writing system” (IPA) and thereby experience the learning that SLES may encounter in learning English spelling. A simplified activity is to have teacher-candidates generate words that exemplify each of the non-transparent spelling patterns listed above. Denham and Lobeck (2013) provide many examples of orthographic peculiarities of English as well as phonological rules that lead to words not being pronounced as spelled (*probably* as [prabli] by deletion, *cavalry* as [kælvəri] by metathesis, and *athlete* as [aθəlit] by insertion). Reading through words that exemplify different spelling peculiarities might raise awareness in a similar, in abbreviated, way to transcribing words.

These exercises also challenge any overly simplistic notions teacher-candidates might have of careful enunciation as a scaffold (Echevarria et al., 2012). If we do not *normally* enunciate carefully, or even pronounce all the letters in words, then enunciating without directly and simultaneously drawing attention to the written form, careful enunciation will not help SLES students make connections between natural pronunciations and spelling. Understanding this non-correspondence is especially important for secondary teachers who have not been trained in literacy. Time spent on this topic at the very least can sensitize teachers to challenges of learning the English orthography that they likely take for granted.

In the course under examination in Chapter 5, teacher-candidates were not required to memorize the IPA, but were assigned reading from Denham and Lobeck (2013) explaining the IPA, morpho-phonemic spelling, and phonological rules, and as homework or in the classroom, they transcribed words, provided examples of non-transparent spellings, and assessed the

pronunciations of words exemplifying several phonological rules of English. This curriculum draws attention to sounds as distinct from letters and to ‘quirks’ of English spelling, supporting a deeper understanding of oral versus written language and learning and providing a foundational knowledge for scaffolding the connections between the two.

### ***Basics of articulation***

Introductory linguistics curricula usually include a section on articulatory phonetics that involves descriptions of the vocal tract and the place of articulation, manner of articulation, and voicing characteristics of the consonants of English, and characteristics of the vowels which are somewhat more abstract. Follow-up exercises usually ask students to determine the characteristics of particular consonant and vowel sounds, group sounds according to shared characteristics, or demonstrate contrastive sounds. This is usually followed by memorization of the IPA characters for the sounds of Standard American English.

While time spent thinking about the articulation of particular sounds and about the complexity of articulation, which is automatic and unconscious for native speakers, can be valuable, a deep understanding of the phonetics of English is not among the most necessary or applicable linguistic knowledge for teachers. A brief introductory activity would serve to raise awareness about articulation and its complexity; that is to have teacher-candidates attempt to sketch the vocal tract simply by thinking about and feeling their own mouth structures, and then to think of consonant sounds of English that are articulated at each area in the vocal tract. The instructor can then lead in labeling the places of articulation relevant for English, while pointing out that other languages may have other or additional places of articulation, and confirm sounds made at each place of articulation. This brief activity serves to draw attention to how individual

sounds are produced, even if not all descriptive parameters and features and IPA characters are introduced.

Perhaps most importantly, a focus on physical, articulatory aspects of phonetics initiates teacher-candidates to the objective analysis of language (structure), divorcing language from social considerations and thereby from assumptions for a time, in part for practice in objective awareness and structural analysis, but also so that they might come to understand that there is much about language that is automatic, unconscious and not normally subject to intentional manipulation. This realization is fundamental in understanding the giant task of language acquisition and beginning to think about the “language demands” of classroom work in a very concrete way. It also sets the stage for applying this same understanding of the unconsciousness of linguistic knowledge to more overtly socially-relevant aspects of language which are also unconscious, taken for granted and vulnerable to prejudice and discrimination. In short, even a brief introduction to articulatory phonetics can serve as experiential learning about the complexity of language, the unconsciousness of our knowledge of language, and the potential for assumptions and prejudice about unconscious language patterns, and on the other hand, teacher-candidates’ ability to objectively analyze language and provide clear scaffolds for SLES learning.

### ***Phonemes***

A last concept in phonetics and phonology that is essential for linguistically aware teacher-candidates is the concept of *phoneme*. Some teacher-candidates may know about phonemes in the context of early literacy and *phoneme awareness* or *phonological awareness* in young children. But many secondary teacher-candidates, and those who have not studied second or world languages may not have a deep understanding of concept of phonemes as unconscious

language knowledge and their potential impact on dialect (or “accents”) and on second language comprehension and production.

Phonemes are the distinctive consonant and vowel sounds used in a given language, referring to the sounds and not the letters or other written characters. Phonemes are language-bound in two ways. First, a given phoneme may have quite variable pronunciation in different phonetic contexts, such as the different ways of producing the phoneme /t/ in the words *time*, *better*, *button*, and *hat* (especially in American English dialects). This phonetic variation is generally unnoticeable to native speakers, but can be confusing for second language speakers of English, where the /t/ in *better* is different from other allophones of the *t*-phoneme on multiple phonetic measures (voicing, manner of articulation and sonorancy) and resembles an *r*-phoneme in other languages. Knowing how and when to produce these variations (allophones) is specific to the given language and dialect.

Accepting all the pronunciations of the *t*-phoneme (in words *time*, *better*, *button*, and *hat*) as the same *t*-phoneme is the second way in which phonemes are language-specific. In other languages, the *t*-sounds in *time* and *stop* would be considered different phonemes. Phonemes are a *conceptual* understanding of sounds and not directly the phonetic sounds themselves.

Phonemes are how physical sounds are sorted into memes. Furthermore, phonemic categories are acquired during infancy based on the ambient language; by 12 months of age, infants recognize only the phonemes that are distinctive in their own language (Kuhl et al., 2006).

(Adult-like *production* of phonemes comes much later.) This fact underscores the unconsciousness of phonemic knowledge of one’s language and its “inaccessibility” for most people. The same is true for speakers of marginalized dialects; their phoneme inventories and

phonological patterns can differ from the standard dialect and are similarly acquired in infancy, becoming automatic and unconscious.

Inventories of phonemes vary across languages in the number of consonant and vowel phonemes and in the particular distinctions that are made between phonemes. What is an allophone in one language (such as the aspirated /t<sup>h</sup>/ in *time* versus the unaspirated /t/ in *stop* or *hat*, may be distinctive phonemes in another (such as Korean /t<sup>h</sup>al/ *mask* versus /tal/ *moon*). The vowel sounds in *bed* and *bad* are distinctive phonemes in English, but not distinguished in many other languages. These facts, coupled with the unconsciousness of phonological knowledge, are the basis for foreign and regional “accents.”

Understanding that phonemes are conceptual, that they are variably pronounced (allophones), that inventories differ cross-linguistically and that they are acquired early can deepen teacher candidates’ sensitivity to their own and their CLD students’ pronunciation and conceptualizations of sounds.

Following an exploration of articulatory phonetics, the concept of phonemes can be developed through allophone demonstrations (such as *time*, *better*, *button*, *hat*, and having students generate their own examples), discussion of the phonology acquisition research, and through examining the phoneme inventories of other languages. Many introductory textbooks have phoneme-identification exercises that emphasize the logic of determining whether two sounds are allophonic or phonemic in a given language based on a data set. This type of exercise is not necessary for teacher-candidates to gain an understanding of phonemes and cross-linguistic variation. A simple exercise of finding the phoneme inventory of a selected language online or in a reference book, and comparing it side-by-side with that of English, allows teacher-candidates to identify areas of similarity and difference, where English has phonemes (or places

or manners of articulation) that other languages lacks or vice versa. Teacher-candidates can also think about how speakers of the other languages might pronounce (and hear, conceptualize, remember and spell) English words with phonemes not found in their first language, and how English speakers might do the same in the other language. These activities were assigned in the course under study here; the phoneme inventory comparison activity was done in class, using transparencies to lay one inventory over the other, and discussion of the differences between inventories entered into the language sketch assignment.

### ***Stress and Intonation***

A brief overview of stress and intonation can also be demonstrative of the layers of complexity that exist even within phonology and of cross-linguistic differences. Recognizing changes in the stressed syllable across words in a word family (*compéte-competition-compétitive*) is exemplification of stress that teacher-candidates can easily identify with, and they can see the difficulty stress shifting poses for SLES, even if they find it difficult to identify the stressed syllable in each word themselves.<sup>35</sup> The goal is not truly to teach about English stress patterns, which are quite complicated, nor to train teacher-candidates in identifying stressed syllables, but to raise awareness of the role of stress in English phonology as opposed to other languages, some whose word-stress is fixed on a particular syllable and some which lack a stress system altogether. Intonation is another phonological concept that teacher-candidates may be more or less aware of (e.g. how *yes-no* questions have rising intonation at the end or how one can utter a sentence with an angry intonation). Intonation plays a role in pragmatics, and can be introduced or reintroduced with that topic, or included with phonology to connect phonology more clearly with *meaning*. A simple intonation exercise is to consider how many ways a simple word or

---

<sup>35</sup> Evidence from a recent course for elementary teacher-candidates showed that identifying the stressed syllable can be difficult for many students in an introductory linguistics class.

phrase can be uttered with different intonations to generate different social meanings or “subtexts,” such as response to being summoned *yes?*, just scored a point in a game *yes!*, or *yes* with a low growl, indicating annoyance. SIOP includes intonation among the aspects of oral presentation assignments that a teacher should help students with (Echevarria et al., 2012).

### ***Discussion of phonetics and phonology concepts***

This brief study of phonetics and phonology lays a foundation in objective knowledge of language structure, awareness of similarities and differences, understanding the basic equivalence of language varieties, and a basis for understanding and interrogating methods for working with SLES that may arise in other courses and training. With a basic understanding of the non-alignment of orthography and phonetics and of cross-variety differences in phonology, teacher-candidates, who may learn elsewhere that they should speak slowly, repeat themselves and enunciate, can examine their own careful speech as well as the benefits and drawbacks of enunciating spelling-based pronunciations (or, the importance of linking careful with natural, casual pronunciations). In another light, one must be able to be reflective about one’s own speech to engage in Walqui and van Lier’s (2010) strategy of *amplifying* language input for SLES, not simplifying it. Similarly, where SLES’s first language phoneme inventories differ from that of English (much less writing systems, which may be non-alphabetic), a teacher’s sensitivity to the challenges of learning the phonetics, phonology and orthography (and phonics) of English as a second language can be valuable. The same foundation in English phonetic and phonological systems, especially coupled with some exploration of other languages’ systems, raises awareness of potential challenges in understanding, pronouncing, remembering and spelling words with unfamiliar phonemes and stress patterns. While an overview of all phonology-related methodologies is beyond the scope of this study, suffice it to say that a basic

understanding of several phonological concepts such as *phoneme* and *stress*, establish a foundation for learning, interrogating and internalizing teaching methods especially aimed at equitable work with linguistically diverse students.

Pedagogically, beginning a linguistics course with phonetics, especially analysis of the vocal tract system, serves well to set the stage for an analytical disposition toward language and recognition that language can be decomposed objectively and studied as an object.

### **Morphology**

Teacher candidates, and indeed most university students, enter a linguistics class with a basic understanding of affixes (prefixes and suffixes) and families of words related by a shared root, of the importance of teaching these as well as grade-level and disciplinary vocabulary, and of the concept of academic vocabulary as different from conversational vocabulary. Teaching methods curricula emphasize these concepts as language-learning objectives (Echevarria et al., 2012). The concept of *morphology*, the richness and variability of English morphology, and the relationship of morphology to vocabulary learning are lesser known but valuable to the teacher candidate, as is awareness of cross-linguistic differences in morphological structure (typology) and morphological development.

### ***Inflection versus derivation (acquisition)***

Two morphological distinctions of primary importance are the concepts of *morpheme* as opposed to *word*, and that of *inflectional* versus *derivational morphology*. Most linguistics students are aware of affixes and able to decompose a complex word (e.g. *transportation*) into its component morphemes (*trans-port-ation*). The knowledge is solidified by knowledge of the concepts and terms, *morpheme* and *morphology*. The task is less obvious when inflectional morphology is involved (*cats, catches* → *cat-s, catch-es*), because inflectional morphology is

rarely on the top of our minds. It is automatic in our speech (as native speakers) and acquired by first grade (Tyler & Nagy, 1989). It goes virtually unnoticed unless mistakes are made (e.g. *\*she run every day*). It is also rather quirky that English has relatively little inflectional morphology compared to other Indo-European languages; in the present tense, only the third-person singular verb form requires inflection (*I go, you go, he/she goes*), and overall, there are only eight inflectional affixes to communicate tense, subject-verb agreement, and aspect on verbs, plurality and possessive on nouns, and so on (Denham & Lobeck, 2013). Lightbown and Spada (2006) use a missing inflectional ending as the peeve of a grammar stickler in a humorous cartoon demonstrating native speaker impatience with SLES errors; this example suggests that teacher-candidates could yet be sensitized to the challenges of learning the sparse and irregular inflectional morphology of English. Understanding the concept of inflectional morphology versus derivational, the sparseness and irregularity of the system, and the automaticity with which native speakers produce inflectional morphology (coupled with the difficulty in expressing the meaning or function of inflectional morphemes) reiterates the complexity of any grammatical system and encourages patience and introspection when working with SLES.

### ***Beyond affixation in English***

Further complicating the morphology of English are the multiple other word formation processes beyond affixation, such as compounding (*blackbird, English teacher, stir-fry*), base modification (*advise-advice, man-men, breath-breathe*), suppletion (*go-went, good-better*), conversion (*a box* (noun), *to box* (verb) *something up*), stress shift (*a présent, to présent*), and reduplication (rare in English, but *table-schmable*). Similarly, words do not simply come about from roots and affixes, but may be eponyms (*sandwich, Kleenex*), onomatopoeia, acronyms (*scuba, radar, NATO, "asap"*), alphabetisms (*DVD, a.s.a.p., the EU*), backformed based on

reanalysis of existing forms (*hamburger* → *burger*, then *fishburger*, *intuition* → *to intuit*), or, of particular potential difficulty for SLES, clipped forms (*professor* → *prof*) or blends (*spoon* + *fork* → *spork*, ?? + *horizon* → *Verizon*). These morphological structures are fun to explore and exemplify, but also demonstrate variability in the English lexicon and morphology, some of which has social and semantic ramifications. For example, clips and blends are generally more casual lexical items, more rarely used in formal registers. Similarly, certain structures may be more challenging for SLES to learn, understand or decode, such as converted forms, suppletive inflections, stress-based changes in part-of-speech and clips' and blends' relationships to their root morphemes. An awareness of this variability in English morphology equips a teacher candidate to be cognizant of the types of vocabulary and morphological structures involved in lessons and speech. That conversion is rampant in English (*prompt* is a noun, verb or adjective, many nouns are also used as verbs without change in form: *box*, *table*, *bottle*, *skate*, *run*, *cup*, *take*) calls attention to potential sentence parsing difficulties for SLES, especially those whose first languages have richer morphologies (with greater functional load). It shows that inflectional morphology and syntax are at work in determining the part-of-speech of many words—there is no single, “correct” designation that teachers “should know” and be able to teach, but that each sentence must be addressed individually. Lewis Carroll’s poem, “Jabberwocky,” which includes a number of nonsense (or made-up) words can be used to demonstrate how syntax and inflectional morphology are used to determine parts-of-speech of many words (Denham & Lobeck, 2013). Ambiguous sentences such as “flying planes can be dangerous” demonstrate the flexibility in sentence interpretation that is due to conversion.

### ***Beyond Greek, Latin and cognates***

Some ELL methods books recommend that teachers make use of (Latinate) words that may have cognates in SLES students' first languages (Echevarria et al., 2008; Y. S. Freeman & Freeman, 2009). Being aware of Greek, Latinate and native Germanic words in English (in addition to words borrowed from many other languages) is a first step toward making use of cognates for speakers of various languages. But the use of cognates cannot substitute for understanding the diversity of English morphology and of world morphologies. While Spanish is the first language of the majority of SLES students, for whom the use of Latinate words may be an access point, it will not be possible to rely on cognates to help all (other) SLES nor to clarify all target vocabulary. Many teachers may be unaware that English shares cognates with Spanish because of the many words borrowed into English from French and Latin, not because English is *so* closely related to Spanish.<sup>36</sup> The languages differ in other structural areas. For example, as a Germanic language, English uses prepositions and verb particles to express direction and manner, while Latinate languages often incorporate these concepts into the verbs themselves (e.g. Germanic *go up, go down* versus Latinate *mount, descend*); there is no Spanish cognate for "up," then, in a sense: it is often part of the verb (e.g. *ascender* "to go up, climb up," *elevant* "to raise (up)," *crecer* "to grow up").

Emphasis on Latinate and Greek roots is also justified because they are more widely used in written and academic language than in daily conversational registers (Freeman & Freeman, 2009, citing McWhorter, 2001 and Brook, 1998). This does not mean that all academic vocabulary is Greek or Latinate in origin; any number of key vocabulary items may be Germanic or borrowed from elsewhere, or derived through affixation or other morphological patterns such

---

<sup>36</sup> While English and Spanish are both in the Indo-European language family, Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese and Latin (which is a dead language) are in the Latinate branch and English is in the Germanic branch, along with German, Danish, Flemish and others.

as compounding. The emphasis on Greek and Latin words may also stem from the relative ease with which they are recognized as target academic vocabulary. These may not always be sufficient reasons for privileging Latin and Greek words as opposed to less recognizable, but more common, Tier 2 vocabulary.

Some methods books recommend teaching morphological word families, and thereby, encouraging morphological awareness (of roots and affixation) which consists of word-learning strategies, such as inferencing that support reading comprehension (Y. S. Freeman & Freeman, 2009; Graves, 2006). Some also recommend encouraging *word consciousness* as both a cognitive and affective stance, which fits in well with linguistic inclusiveness (Y. S. Freeman & Freeman, 2009).

### ***Typological Variation***

The complexity and variability of English morphology can be contextualized against an understanding of other types of morphology. While languages do not always fit neatly into the categories, an understanding of fusional, agglutinating, isolating, polysynthetic and templatic (transfixing) morphologies can be enlightening. Fusional languages, such as most other European languages (Russian, Greek, Spanish, Danish, etc.), have rich inflectional systems with affixation for tense, aspect, case, gender, and plurality (and others). A speaker of a fusional language would be less familiar with conversion and stress shift as morphological processes. Similarly for speakers of agglutinating and polysynthetic languages, where multiple morphemes occur in sequence, with morphemes indicating a wide variety of meanings and distinctions (such as formality and mood in the former and various verbal aspects in the latter). Isolating languages, such as Mandarin and Vietnamese lack inflectional morphology (and have little derivational morphology beyond compounding), such that their speakers may find English inflection more

challenging as second language learners. The templatic morphologies of Semitic languages (e.g. Arabic and Hebrew) present an intriguingly different type of morphological complexity, underscoring again that speakers of other languages are highly capable of complex language operations, inspiring awe about the variety found in language structures, and instilling a sense of respect for SLES and their successes in learning a language very different from their own.

***Morphological awareness, vocabulary acquisition (and literacy skills)***

These concepts in morphology build a much deeper understanding of ESL challenges and of English structure that can support methods such as teaching word families, roots and select suffixes and prefixes (Echevarria et al., 2012) which teacher candidates may be familiar with from literacy studies and their own education. Beyond deeper understanding of methods and of the richness of the English lexicon and morphology, teacher candidates might also benefit from learning about the interconnectedness of morphology and vocabulary acquisition. Like phonological awareness, morphological awareness has been found to correlate with young students' literacy skills (Carlisle, 2000; Green et al., 2003; Kirby et al., 2012; McCutchen et al., 2008; McCutchen et al., 2009; Nagy et al., 2003; Nagy et al., 2006). It is also shown that while morphology contributes directly and independently to literacy skills, it is also mutually reinforcing with vocabulary knowledge; the more vocabulary is known, the more morphology is known and vice versa. Further, some studies have shown that interventions aimed at building morphological awareness have led to improvement in literacy skills (for discussion, see Berninger et al., 2010; Carlisle, 2010).

**Syntax**

The idea of learning about syntax seems to be met with some trepidation, probably due to the myriad theories, possible sentence structures and terms for referring to various structures

(*dependent clause, relative clause, embedded clause, subordinate clause, etc.*). Some nervousness might also stem from feeling one should be fluent in the parts of speech, when in fact, as mentioned above, a word's lexical category often depends on how it is used in a sentence as opposed to anything inherent or to morphological structure (when the word undergoes *conversion*). Once this point is understood by teacher-candidates, syntax might not seem so daunting, and studies can begin with the simplifying principles of syntax which are the basic phrase structure and sentence components, before moving on to complexities that are taken for granted, and then cross-linguistic variation. Understanding, or being reminded of, basic sentence formation principles is important not only as a basis for understanding challenges that English syntax poses for SLES and for scaffolding language development, but also as a foundation for the analysis of academic and disciplinary language that is so applicable and beneficial in the classroom (e.g. Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010).

Through this descriptive and objective analysis of syntax, teacher-candidates should come to realize that the “grammar rules” they have feared, loathed, or subscribed to are what are called “prescriptive” rules that reflect conventions laid out by certain (often self-appointed) authorities or academic elite (and that serve to oppress those who are not raised speaking this so-called “proper” dialect). There is in addition a system of *descriptive grammar rules* which are the generalizations about how a language is structured that are the focus of study in this course.

### ***Simplifying principles***

The most basic understanding of syntax that a teacher should have is—likely a review—of the concepts of *lexical categories* (*noun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition*) versus *functional categories* (articles, demonstratives, degree words, modal and auxiliary verbs), and of the basic sentence components, *subject* and *predicate*. Next is knowing that sentences are formed of a

*subject* noun phrase followed by a *predicate* verb phrase, and that any “phrase” is a chunk of meaning, a meaningful group of words, built around a lexical category *head*. A noun phrase is a participant in the meaning of the sentence; a person, place, or thing (abstract or concrete). A prepositional phrase expresses direction (*toward the door*), location (*in the classroom*), time-expression (*at dinner time*), manner (*with a spoon*), and so on. The next and last simplifying principle of syntax is that, in English, any functional category *modifiers* come before the *head* word, and any *complement phrases* (phrases that “complete” the idea expressed in the head, such as the noun phrase complement of prepositions, as in *to*<sub>Prep</sub> [*NP the store*]) come afterwards. (This results in a hierarchical structure of phrases inside phrases (the noun phrase, *the store* inside the prepositional phrase, *to the store*) inside other phrases (verb phrase, *drive to the store*)). Most introductory linguistic textbooks emphasize this hierarchical organization of sentences, and, via *recursion*, the potential of making theoretically infinitely long sentences. They also lead students in practicing the diagramming of sentences, using various formalisms. While diagramming sentences may be fun and helpful inductive learning for some teacher-candidates, it is not necessary that teacher-candidates be expert in this process, and some might reject the activity as inconsequential. What can suffice to solidify the concept of phrases as the way in which sentences are organized into meaningful units, thus preparing teacher-candidates for functional analysis, is simply to practice identifying phrases within example sentences. Denham and Lobeck (2013) provide exercises in identifying subjects and predicates, along with literary excerpts for identifying prepositional phrases, adjective phrases, noun phrases, etc. Heath (2000) muses that what linguists do is to make explicit what we already know about language; basic syntax is a prime example. Despite any lack of grammar teaching in the schools, many students are empowered by reviewing this much syntax, which is an essential foundation.

## ***Complexity***

Lest teacher-candidates feel that English syntax is so simple and obvious, and lose patience with students who struggle, a look at some complexities of syntax is recommended. The first basic complication is that there is great variation in the complements that individual head words require. For example, *talk* and *speak* take an *about* prepositional phrase as complement, while *discuss* and *say* take a noun phrase complement. *Listen* takes a *to* complement, while *hear* takes a noun phrase, etc. O'Grady et al. (2010) provides examples and exercises on this variability, and Pullum (2013) discusses a complement error in a SLES author's publication that causes him not to criticize, but to marvel at the astounding success of this person's, and most people's, second language learning (given the complexity of language).

Another complication that is enlightening is the use of pleonastics, or meaningless words used to fill in syntactic structures. Three examples are existential *there* (in *There is a test tomorrow*), expletive *it* (in *It is interesting that...*), and Dummy *do*, used for negation (*I do not know* instead of *I know not*) and question-formation (*When did she leave?* instead of *When left she?*). While the purpose of syntax is generally to organize information, in these cases non-informative words are included for the purpose of syntactic structure instead. Because these words are meaningless and only functional in the syntax, they are easily omitted by SLES and hard for native-speaker teachers to explain.

Denham and Lobeck (2013) also provide examples and exercises concerning syntactic structures where information is omitted but understood, such as *verb phrase deletion*, “she said she would get a llama, and she did \_\_\_,” and *gapping*, “Ziggy bought a Harley, and Alfie \_\_\_ a Yamaha.” The terminology is not important, but recognizing where information is omitted, often for concise writing, and very often unconsciously (“It is easy [for someone] to please him.”),

raises teacher-candidates awareness of potentially challenging structures. The SIOP model asks teachers to identify language structures and grammar that enters into a lesson and may be challenging, such as passive voice, imperatives or if-then sentences, and to “be aware of the syntax used in [their] subject areas” (Echevarria et al., 2012, p. 34).

Finally, examples of embedded clauses (any sort of sentence within the larger sentence, e.g. *He said that [it would rain], [That the rain came] is important, I am happy [because the rain came]*, etc.) are also important background for uncovering the syntactic complexities of academic language. Some also recommend that teachers avoid using embedded clauses for SLES at earlier stages of acquisition (Echevarria et al., 2008), so teacher-candidates can benefit from practice in identifying them.

### ***Variation***

The last point that is fundamental syntax understanding for teachers is that syntactic organization varies across languages (and dialects), just like phonology and morphology do. Not every language orders the basic sentence components of *subject*, *verb* and *object* in the “SVO” order that English uses. All six possible orderings are exemplified in languages around the world, and SOV is in fact, more common than SVO ordering.

Another important cross-linguistic difference is the order of modifier, head and complement in phrases. Heads can be ordered initial, medial or final within their phrases, and not all types of phrase in a language (verb phrase, noun phrase, etc.) necessarily follow the same ordering. That all logical possibilities for subject, verb, object, and modifier, head and complement are exemplified in languages shows that all orderings are equally “logical,” functional and expressive. Awareness of this variation also opens teacher-candidates’ minds for recognizing and exploring students’ languages, understandings, and capabilities.

## **Semantics**

Some basic concepts of semantics such as synonyms and antonyms are familiar to most teacher-candidates, so a section on semantics need not be extensive, but other concepts concerning word meaning can contribute to language awareness when considered in the context of teaching vocabulary in various disciplines and across languages and cultures.

### ***Complexity of word meaning – reference, sets, prototypes, connotation and polysemy***

The main goal of semantics in a teacher-education course is to problematize concepts of word meaning. Many might think of a word's meaning as being that which is given in a dictionary, *or* the particular meaning or referent they have in mind at the time. Clear exemplification can be given to demonstrate that words and phrases have a *sense*, which is similar to the relatively unchanging meaning that is given in a dictionary, and a *reference*, which is the changeable "thing in the real world" to which one is referring. Thus, *the boy* has any number of possible referents, depending on the context in which it is uttered (and which boys are present), but one can determine the referent by using the sense of the word (something like "a male child"). With this distinction in mind, word meaning can be further complicated as having set-theoretic structure: some items fit in the set of referents of the word *bowl* and some in the set for *cup*. Furthermore, one person's or culture's set for any given word may differ from another person's or group's. One final complication is the concept of *prototype*, or ideal exemplars of a word's meaning or set of referents: robins and sparrows are prototypical exemplars of the word *bird* for North Americans, while ostriches and pelicans are non-prototypical. Prototypes depend on individuals' experiences, however, and thus differ across cultures and regions and other potential linguistic groupings. Awareness of these complications of word meaning can sensitize teacher-candidates to potential semantic causes of miscommunication and misunderstanding.

Word-meaning relationships, such as synonym and antonym can also be problematized, raising linguistic awareness. Many have heard that synonymy is rarely perfect, sometimes due to set-theoretic concepts (on set of referents is larger, or has an area of non-overlap; e.g. *crunchy* versus *crispy*, perhaps), and sometimes due to *connotation*, the associations that one makes with a given word. *Lady* is a near-synonym for *woman*, but has more etiquette-based, politeness and traditional gender-role connotations for many (e.g. “sit like a lady” not “sit like a woman”). Connotations also vary according to people’s experiences and cultures, and are not always obvious in a second language.

Another important semantic concept is that of polysemy as opposed to homophony. Homophones are words that sound alike but have different unrelated meanings, such as *bank* as a river bank and *bank* as the business that deals with one’s money. Polysemy is a case of different usages of what can be considered the same word, or, a word with multiple, *related* meanings, such as *formula* as a mathematical concept (a calculation or symbolic phrase expressing one) and *formula* as a chemical concoction (which can also be expressed in a symbolic phrase), and *formula* in the general sense of “solution” or “plan of action” as in “formula for success.” Polysemy abounds in cross-disciplinary uses of academic language. Teacher-candidates’ awareness of the concept of polysemy, allowing them to think about polysemous uses of disciplinary vocabulary, can be a tool for helping students learn that vocabulary and for predicting or repairing miscommunication.

### ***Lexicalization***

One last concept that challenges assumptions about the meaning of words is the concept of lexicalization. Lexicalization refers to how ideas (or meanings) are expressed in the words (lexicon) of a given language. Lexicalization differs across languages. For example, there is no

satisfactory English equivalent for the Korean word, *gosohada*, which is a fifth “flavor” term, meaning something like *savory and nutty*. Another example comes from how concepts of fingers and toes are expressed in different languages; English has separate, unrelated words for the two (though both are *phalanges*), in French and Japanese, *toes* are *fingers of feet*, and in Korean, they are *feet-strands*, as *fingers* are *hand-strands* and *hair* is *head-strands* (and *chopsticks* and *spoons* are kinds of *strand* as well). The basic enlightening concept is that languages might choose to carve out “chunks” of meanings from the world in any number of ways (words), just as they select portions of the color spectrum for each color term (*green, blue, teal, aqua, purple, periwinkle*, etc.). That there is generally *random* variation in how lexicalization happens across languages simply demonstrates that there is no better or worse, simpler or more complex, nor any “primitive” language.

Pullum (1991) discusses the lexicalization of concepts surrounding “snow” in the Inuit language, Inuktitut, otherwise known as the myth of “hundreds of ‘Eskimo’ words for snow.”<sup>37</sup> In a humorous chapter on the subject, Pullum (1991) illuminates the exoticization of the culture based on misinformation about the language, and thereby reminds us of the dangers of assumptions about language, and prejudices that are hidden in those assumptions and misunderstandings.

Understanding lexicalization differences as among of the wondrously many potential structural differences in language, and not as fodder for linguistic prejudice and misinformation is a step toward linguistic responsiveness. Linguistically inclusive teachers need to be aware of

---

<sup>37</sup> The myth stems from ethnographic work of Boas with the Inuktitut, reporting that there are four separate root words that refer to “snow on the ground,” “falling snow,” “drifting snow,” and “snow drift,” similar to how there are multiple words *liquid, lake, river, brook, rain, dew, wave, foam* in English instead of words derived from a single root word, like *water*. According to Pullum (1991), what happened next was that the media, the general public and even other scholarly writings exaggerated the number of “Eskimo words for snow” (sometimes in the hundreds) along with an exoticization of the Inuktitut culture.

the potential for different understandings in, through and of language, but not assume differences in worldview or cognitive abilities based on language.<sup>38</sup> Gordon (2012) also has enlightening discussion on this topic.

For the course under study, lexicalization was introduced in class and teacher-candidates read the Pullum (1991) chapter.

### ***Figurative Language: Idioms and Conceptual Metaphors***

Figurative language, which teacher-candidates may be told to avoid for the sake of SLES students (Echevarria et al., 2008), is also a topic elucidated by semantic knowledge. Teacher-candidates can be exposed to *idioms* (*be on the same page, have a bee in one's bonnet*) and think about the literal and idiomatic meanings, and then they can generate their own examples of idioms as an exercise in reflecting on their own language use. When exposed to idioms from other languages (in translation, e.g. Korean idiom, *one's belly button is bigger than their belly*), teacher-candidates get first-hand experience with the inaccessibility of figurative language for SLES or any student who is not familiar with a particular figurative expression. Figurative language also includes *conceptual metaphors* which are used unconsciously in everyday language (as opposed to the literary device of *metaphor*, used creatively in literature for artistic effect). Conceptual metaphors, as discussed by Gordon (2012), encompass a range of figurative uses of language connected by a theme, such as *happy* conceived of metaphorically as *up*, and *sad* as *down* in *I'm feeling down, that [lifted] my spirits, [I feel high], her spirits sank, the depths of depression, the height of ecstasy* (examples from O'Grady et al., 2010).<sup>39</sup> Because conceptual metaphors are an unconscious use of figurative language, it will be difficult for Teacher-

---

<sup>38</sup> Gordon (2012) has a concise and insightful discussion of *linguistic relativity*, or the idea that language determines culture or even thought. She does not refer to the Inuktitut words for snow, but discusses research on the topic of how people of different languages think.

<sup>39</sup> Denham and Lobeck (2013) refer to conceptual metaphors as “dead metaphors” and describe several other types of metaphor as well as simile. O'Grady et al. (2010) simply refers to them as “metaphors.”

candidates to rid their speech of all figurative language, as is recommended, but exposure to these concepts can raise teacher-candidates' awareness of figurative language and ability to make it explicit when it occurs in classroom communication.

### ***Discussion of semantics concepts***

Typical introductory linguistics textbooks include chapters covering most of the word-meaning concepts (especially sense versus reference, set theoretic modeling and prototypes, connotation, polysemy versus homophony, and idioms), but there is variation. Denham and Lobeck (2013) do not cover all these concepts, while O'Grady et al. (2010) have thorough coverage. Gordon (2012) covers many of these concepts with interesting cross-linguistic comparisons and considerations, and also discusses conceptual metaphors in an enlightening way. Only Denham and Lobeck (2013), among these three, discuss idioms, and only O'Grady et al. (2010) discuss lexicalization, *per se*. That said, any of these can be used as course readings, with classroom activities and online searches to supplement where needed. A search for idioms on the web, especially from other languages, would be fun and enlightening, for example.

### **Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is included in many introductory linguistic textbooks but in my experience is not necessarily covered in introductory classes due to time constraints or to theoretically-oriented approaches. Pragmatics concerns situationally-based meanings at and above the sentence-level, where meanings are highly context- and culture-dependent and variable. As such, a pragmatics unit has practical implications for teachers working in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Additionally, being social context-dependent, pragmatic competence develops relatively late in first language acquisition, so the topic is relevant for teachers working with students at the late elementary and middle school levels as well. Three topics in pragmatics set a

strong foundation for thinking about this context-dependent meaning in and across languages, registers, and dialects: indirect speech acts and illocutionary meanings, the role of intonation, and conversational routines and participation structures.

Since pragmatics studies are practice in thinking about how language is used, somewhat related to pragmatics is the concept of language *functions*. Language functions are referred to in defining language development standards and in determining language-learning objectives for lesson planning in teaching methods models (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2012; Echevarria et al., 2008), where teachers are expected to “think about how language will be used in your lesson” (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 28). There is no definitive list of these functions, but some examples are defining, describing, comparing, summarizing, persuading, and synthesizing (see also Gibbons, 1993), some of which correspond to pragmatic functions. Among the three pragmatics focal points discussed below, thinking about the *illocutionary meaning* of phrases resembles thinking about the functions of utterances.

### ***Indirect speech acts and illocutionary meanings—register and cultural differences***

The central idea of pragmatics is the analysis of the meaning behind sentences and utterances, what is said and what is meant in a given context. The distinction is between the locutionary or literal meaning of sentences and the illocutionary or intended message. For example, when a roommate says “do you want to take the garbage out?” the locutionary meaning is a yes/no question about the interlocutor’s desire, but the illocutionary meaning is a polite request. When the locutionary and illocutionary meanings are mismatched, utterances like these are called indirect speech acts. An enlightening exercise is to examine the use of structural (or locutionary) questions or illocutionary commands (how we actually phrase commands and requests) in English, where indirect speech acts are common. Once teachers begin to think about

intended meanings, it seems amazing that we ever learn such a complicated system, and teachers become sensitized to the potential for miscommunication and the challenges of learning the pragmatics of a second language, especially when teachers or native speakers are unaware of indirect speech acts.

### ***Intonation***

Complexity in pragmatics also stems from the pragmatic force of intonation, which is especially unconscious. A fun example comes from a Harry Potter movie where Harry answers only “yes” to a question his aunt poses, and she accuses him of sounding ungrateful. Students can be asked in what other ways the simple word “yes” can be uttered, with different intonations, to communicate different illocutionary meanings. It should be pointed out here, if not in the phonology section, that intonation patterns are not universal, and that the pragmatic force of intonation is language-dependent and could underlie cross-cultural miscommunication. Awareness is the first step to understanding when miscommunication arises and to making expected patterns explicit.

### ***Conversational routines and gamuts***

Two final concepts in pragmatics that Gordon (2012) discusses are conversational routines and conversational gamuts. Conversational routines are set conversational exchanges that are conventionalized in given contexts in a given culture. For example, when entering a store, the salesperson is expected to ask “How are you, today?” and we are expected to respond “fine, thanks” and then we can begin talking about what we are shopping for if we want the salesperson’s help. We are not expected to answer the question at length, nor to ignore it. In Japanese, when encountering a neighbor getting into their car, one might say “are you going somewhere?” and the routine response is “yes, I am going somewhere and will come back.” A

few examples of these will familiarize teacher-candidates with the concept and empower them to reflect on the conversational routines they use and expect in their work. And cross-linguistic examples can illustrate that conversational routines can also be made explicit for students who might not be aware of them.

Conversational gamuts are words and patterns (sometimes intonation patterns) that are used to manipulate conversations, such as using a lengthened “Anyway” to indicate you’d like to end a conversation, or “I know” to interrupt and interject your example in agreement with the other speaker. Conversational gamuts differ cross-linguistically as well, such as the timing of confirmation that one is listening to a friend’s story.

These basic concepts in pragmatics illustrate how language is used in different situations in different cultures many times in indirect ways. They provide a basis for thinking about how meaning is communicated and how we shape our speech and conversations unconsciously for different social contexts and communication goals, all of which must be learned along with other behavioral expectations of any new and unfamiliar social contexts. The next topics also examine socially- and culturally-mediated language use.

### **Sociolinguistics**

Sociolinguistic consciousness is a main component of Lucas and Villegas’s (2011) framework of linguistically responsive teaching, and others in teacher education have recommended that teachers be knowledgeable about and sensitized to sociolinguistic concepts (Carnegie Foundation, 2007; Valdés et al., 2005). Villegas and Lucas (2002a) also suggested teachers should take a sociolinguistics course in order to develop cultural responsiveness. Teachers clearly need to understand the social significances of linguistic diversity and consider

their role in changing or propagating sociolinguistic attitudes. Sociolinguistic studies include important concepts in that area, such as language and social power, linguistic prejudice, language and identity, dialects and their history.

### ***Regional and social dialects***

One of the most enlightening areas of sociolinguistic studies for teachers may be the history of US English dialects, including those that are regional, such as Southern or Western US English, and those corresponding to social groups (also called *sociolects*) such as African American English and Chicano English. First, the simple fact that dialects are recognized as such, as distinct language forms (or *varieties*), each with a complete grammar structure and systematic patterns at all structural levels (phonology, syntax, etc.), means that the ways that *others* speak, with “accents,” different word usages, and seeming “bad grammar,” are not malformed or uneducated versions of standard English. Knowing about dialects and exposure to examples of their patterns and rules can help to undermine misconceptions of non-standard varieties as inferior or as failed attempts at the standard. Teacher-candidates can be led in examining their own subjective views in comparison to the objective descriptions of dialects, and can later use the objective knowledge of dialects to remain reflective about their subjective views and judgments and develop positive dispositions toward other varieties and also to challenge linguistic prejudice when it is encountered in their teaching contexts. Descriptions of regional and social dialects are found in many introductory linguistics textbooks and anthologies, and in documentaries (e.g. *Do you speak American?* and *American Tongues*). The pragmatic and objective understanding of dialects is also bolstered by learning about the basic history of regional dialects and how they were influenced by the languages and dialects of the early colonists and other immigrants.

### *Language, power, prejudice and identity*

Many teachers may have, on some level, an assumption that language variety is a choice, and that speakers of non-standard varieties refuse to conform or learn the standard variety. This is only partially or sometimes the case. It should become clear through sociolinguistic studies that each individual acquires the language of the environment, and cannot be expected to know any other language or variety. Learning a standard variety as a second dialect is effortful and not automatic. This is a fact of language acquisition, but underlies both a pragmatic view of dialects and an understanding of the connection between language and social identity that is important in working with diverse students. As Delpit (1995b) points out, the language that any child brings to the classroom is “intimately connected to loved ones, community, and personal identity. To suggest that it is 'wrong,' or even worse, ignorant, is to suggest that something is wrong with the student and his or her family” (p. 55). Language variety reflects not only an individual’s background, but their home environment and the identity that grew from it. Teachers should understand that linguistic prejudice is thus an attack on a person’s identity. One powerful means of illustrating linguistic prejudice is to pinpoint ways in which the local variety differs from so-called Standard US English. In my region, a major difference is that we do not differentiate the vowel sounds in *cot* and *caught* which are distinct in Standard English. This example shows how speech patterns that are unconscious and seemingly innocuous (to us) can nevertheless be used to discriminate. Teachers who think they speak “correctly” may find it a powerful experience to see how the tables might be turned, so to speak.

Another aspect of identity involves choosing to speak in certain ways, which falls under the concept of intraspeaker variation.

### ***Intraspeaker variation***

Intraspeaker variation refers to the repertoire of speech patterns that each individual speaker makes use of in different social contexts. Some types of intraspeaker variation are *slang*, *jargon* specific to leisure activities or vocation, and *registers*, or levels of formality. The concept of register has entered into teacher education, and some may be familiar with the concept as used to distinguish students' casual, spoken registers (as youths) and the more formal and academic school registers of talking with teachers, reading, writing, and public speaking, or of particular disciplines. Valdés et al. (2005) provide an example of one man's speech in different contexts throughout a portion of his day that can be analyzed and discussed to explore the concept of intraspeaker variation. The key question to guide the discussion is, "how might this person have said this in another social context?" It is important for teachers to know that though, as adults, we unconsciously alter our speech patterns to match the social context, first and second language students are still learning about the social contexts themselves and about the specific patterns of speech appropriate for each context. Students are still developing their repertoires of language use knowledge and learning the more formal, complex and discipline-specific forms. Being aware of the concept is fundamental to becoming cognizant of students' learning in this area and to developing ways to support students' learning of different registers and language patterns, keeping in mind that for CLD students, certain registers and varieties will feel more foreign, and that all youths will be formulating identities that manifest themselves through language.

### **Anthropological Linguistics**

Conceptually related to sociolinguistics, the area of anthropological linguistics relevant to linguistic inclusiveness concerns the influences of culture on language use. Culture is difficult to define, and opinions vary about how culture and language are related, but without getting bogged

down with controversial discussions, it will be beneficial for teachers to understand potential differences in language use across languages and cultures. A number of studies of cultural language use differences have been discussed in the literature on culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education (Gay, 2010; Minami & Ovando, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Articles and anthologies of cultural language use abound, but some that illustrate interesting patterns are discussed below. Teacher-candidates might be asked to present the articles in jigsaw groups, lead critical discussions, or even present the main ideas dramatically.

### *Participation structures*

Philips (2012) discusses differences in the participation structures expected by Anglo-American teachers in Warm Springs Native American reservation schools in Oregon and those developed naturally in the culture of the Warm Springs people. For instance, classroom structures often held expectations that students should demonstrate their knowledge as individuals in competition with fellow students, whereas Warm Springs participation structures valued peer group collaboration and positioned only elders as knowledgeable authorities. Similarly, teachers often solicited students' ideas and knowledge before beginning a lesson, whereas Warm Springs education resembles apprenticeship, where the knowledgeable or skilled master demonstrates for some time before the learner might attempt to imitate, and rarely would the learner ask questions or insert opinions and ideas about the activity. The mismatched expectations about how and when students should speak up stemmed from differences in culture. Teachers may respond well to this example since it is situated in an education context.

### *Cultural pragmatics of questions*

Heath (1982) is a well-known example of educational linguistics illustrating differences of language use and pragmatics between African Americans and white Americans. Heath found

that there were several kinds of questions based on expected answers, such as information-seeking questions (“where is your sister?”) and display questions where the question tested whether or not a child had the expected answer (“what color is that?”). It was found that in white, middle-class households and in schools, display questions were often used, whereas in African American homes they were rare. African-American children engaged in other types of question and answer exchange, such as analogy questions (“what is that like?”) or creative responses that avoid directly answering the question (such as reciting a poem on a similar topic). This article demonstrates many pragmatic uses of questions, answers and other verbal interactions in various communities and how cross-cultural mismatches can cause difficulty in the school when teachers are not cognizant of their assumptions and the potential for pragmatic differences.

### *Culture values in language*

Sohn (1983) writes about five dimensions along which the cultures of Korea and the United States differ, and the differences in language use that result. One example is that where US culture values individualism, Korean culture places more value on collectivism. This cultural difference manifests itself in the American usage of “my” in cases where Koreans use “our,” such as *our house*, *our baby sister* and even *our language* and *our country*. Another example is US egalitarianism versus hierarchism in Korean culture, as exemplified in the more strict use of titles when talking to or about, for example, school principals, company leaders or presidents, ministers, and teachers. First names are rarely used among adults as are the second person pronouns for “you.” This article may raise the question of how culture is defined and measured and how we must be ever-vigilant against essentializing other cultures, but it also shows how we can reflect on our own culture and recognize that our ways of talking about the world are not context-free or universal.

## **Acquisition & Bilingualism**

While second language acquisition and bilingualism are especially relevant for secondary teachers who will work with SLES students, first language acquisition is often emphasized in traditional introduction to linguistics courses, with the goal of illustrating children's active construction of grammatical knowledge.<sup>40</sup> Teacher-candidates can benefit from an understanding of first and second language acquisition in comparison, and of bilingualism to as a foundation for understanding the language knowledge and learning of their SLES students.

Language acquisition and the research that describes it are complex; there is no simple answer and controversies abound about how second languages are acquired and what teachers should do to facilitate acquisition (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). This is perhaps the first lesson that teacher-candidates should learn. What makes it complex are the three themes of acquisition studies proposed for this curriculum: basic concepts in first, second, and bilingual language acquisition, theories of language learning, and individual characteristics that are factors in second language acquisition.

### ***Basics of first and second language acquisition and bilingualism***

A brief introduction to first language acquisition, such as that presented in Denham and Lobeck (2013), Gordon (2012), or Lightbown and Spada (2006) suffices to introduce essential facts, such as the universal stages (babbling, one-word, two-word, early- and late-multiword), some exemplification of development, such as U-shaped learning of irregulars<sup>41</sup> or stepwise learning of negation, and English morpheme order-of-acquisition findings (e.g. R. Brown, 1973).

---

<sup>40</sup> This understanding of child first language acquisition is a foundation for Chomsky's (1982) theory of Universal Grammar, but also for the understanding of language acquisition as innately human, and thereby, universally equal (or equalizing).

<sup>41</sup> U-shaped learning refers to patterns of "learned" target-like (or correct) usage, followed by a period of incorrect usage and then back to a state of target-like usage. U-shaped learning of irregulars can be explained as first "learning" the forms by imitation, then constructing a rule-based pattern that leads to incorrect (regularized) irregular forms, then finally adding the irregular forms into the developed grammar as exceptions to the general rule.

That the stages are universal demonstrates similarities across languages and thus the functional equality of languages – that none is more complex than another, but that all humans acquire language along a similar developmental path. It also reiterates the concept of a gradual development process (for language) that teacher-candidates would have studied with respect to child psychology (socio-emotional and cognitive development).

Having learned about the stages of acquisition, teacher-candidates can be led in thinking about the ages at which different kinds of learning (e.g. phonological, syntactic, pragmatic) take place, underscoring the “inaccessibility” of most first language grammatical knowledge (Denham & Lobeck, 2010b; O’Grady et al., 2010). Exemplification of child speech patterns throughout development further demonstrates the intricacy of the language acquisition endeavor. Finally, understanding both the complexity of language acquisition demonstrated in the gradual and stage-wise learning and the universality of the stages helps teacher-candidates to conceptualize the equality of languages and of the enormous task of acquisition, even for first language learners (much less for second language learners, as is discussed later). This awareness can inspire dispositions of patience and sensitivity with student learning of language and also an inquiry stance to determining the language development levels of students, as is recommended in the SIOP methodology and elsewhere (Echevarria et al., 2008).<sup>42</sup>

What is generally less well-explicated in these and other introductory materials is the school-age development of first language, although it is recognized to continue for up to 20 years (Aitchison 1996 cited in Valdés, Bunch, Snow & Lee, 2005), and teachers likely recognize this continued growth and learning. It is important for teacher-candidates to think about what aspects

---

<sup>42</sup> Proficiency levels for designated ELL students may be clearly outlined and defined by state education agencies, but it is unclear how teachers become familiar with the intricacies of each level or gain a basic understanding of second language acquisition stages, progression and factors other than in a class like the one proposed (or on specifically on second language acquisition).

of language are still being learned in their classrooms—beyond vocabulary, which most understand is the case. Discussions of academic and content-area language, and of pragmatics, syntax and morphology also help teacher-candidates to think about what their first language students are still learning.

Next, it is enlightening to compare first language stages to second language stages (use of the first language, silent period, telegraphic and formulaic language use, and productive or *interlanguage* use (Genesee et al., 2004b; Gordon, 2012)). This demonstrates the differences in the processes of first and second language acquisition and underscores the relative difficulty of second language acquisition. Teacher-candidates may intuitively know and be sympathetic about second language challenges, but having the stages explained and exemplified clearly can help solidify a more concrete, conscious and informed knowledge as a basis for a linguistically inclusive teaching philosophy.

Similarly, first language morpheme acquisition order can be compared to second language order (Gordon, 2012). Teacher-candidates can discover similarities in the ordering that show how learning English as L2 is similar regardless of learners' first languages. This is an interesting finding for teacher-candidates to learn about, given the emphasis and credibility that is assigned to the role of one's first language in learning a second. Both the structure of the second language (L2) being learned and structural differences between the first language (L1) and L2 are factors in second language acquisition (Lightbown & Spada, 2006), which means that teacher-candidates benefit from knowing about the structure and complexities of English as well as similarities and differences between the structure of English and that of SLES students' first languages as this curriculum seeks to have them learn.

With some understanding of similarities and differences between first and second language acquisition, teacher-candidates should also be led in thinking about bilingualism. Genesee and Nicoladis (2007) define bilingual acquisition as that which occurs simultaneously with input from both languages from birth or when the “second” language is added before the first has been established for three years or more. This definition contradicts a common assumption that children learn language “as a first language”—effortlessly through immersion and attaining native-like proficiency—as long as they are within the *critical period* (before puberty) (Denham & Lobeck, 2013; O’Grady et al., 2010); that children soak up languages “like sponges” (for discussion, see Marinova-Todd, Marshall, & Snow, 2000; Samway & McKeon, 2002). It means that even those who begin learning English, for example, at kindergarten learn it as a *second* language, with all the potential differences in progress and ultimate attainment that may entail (discussed in Gordon, 2012; Lightbown & Spada, 2006), and that they are still second language English speakers at the secondary level, whether or not they are designated “ELL.”

Scarcella (2002) discusses the advanced literacy development of adolescent SLES, citing factors that influence their acquisition process. One of the factors is literacy attainment in the first language, highlighting for teacher-candidates the importance of supporting SLES’s first languages. While this may come up in methods-focused and other courses teacher-candidates have taken, this reading provides the research base and teacher-candidates’ understanding for the recommended strategies. Additional readings on bilingualism and heritage language maintenance might be assigned to significant benefit as well (Fillmore, 1991; Genesee & Nicoladis, 2007; Genesee, Paradis, & Crago, 2004a). In our class for secondary teacher-candidates, only Scarcella (2002) was assigned as “bilingualism” reading, alongside first language basics from Denham and Lobeck (2013) and readings on second language (theories and

individual factors) from Lightbown and Spada (2006) and a reading on common myths, Samway and McKeon (2002).

### *Theories of acquisition*

Teacher-candidates will be somewhat familiar with general theories of learning that also encompass the learning of languages. Lightbown and Spada (2006) provide an accessible discussion of behaviorism, nativism, cognitivism, and socio-cultural theory as pertains to language acquisition. With this as preparatory reading, teacher-candidates can be lead in discussing the theories' claims, evidence, and predictions for language learning, as well as in exploring teaching methodologies supported by each theory. For example, behaviorist theory would support the repetition of language patterns, with feedback in some form, until the correct patterns become automatic. Teacher-candidates referred to this as the "drill and kill" method, recognized from other courses. Teacher-candidates may also be familiar with Chomsky and Krashen from the nativist perspective, Piaget and perhaps Dewey as fitting in the cognitivist-developmental perspective and Vygotsky from the socio-cultural perspective. This familiarity can help teacher-candidates to consider how each theory may contribute to explaining how language acquisition transpires, and that scholars, teachers and laypeople may have different understandings of the process and what teachers should do. This theoretical knowledge of acquisition is fundamental for teachers. In our class, teacher-candidates discussed theories in groups and created posters to present to the class concerning the basic claim of the theory they discussed, main proponents, evidence supporting the theory, and teaching methods supported by the theory.

### *Individual characteristics as factors in learning*

A second complicating factor in second language acquisition that merits attention from teacher-candidates is the characteristics of individuals and contexts that have been shown to play a role in facilitating or hindering learning. Lightbown and Spada (2006) offer an overview of \_\_\_ individual factors affecting second language acquisition: intelligence, aptitude, personality, learning styles, motivation, age of acquisition, learner beliefs, and identity and ethnic affiliation. As with the discussion of theories, the authors provide some findings concerning the role of each characteristic in language acquisition. Having read about these factors, teacher-candidates can recognize the importance of understanding individual SLES students and varying their teaching methods and the participation structures in their classrooms in order to meet a variety of learning styles, personalities, aptitudes, and motivations. Teacher-candidates can be led in discussing students they may have worked with who exemplify varying personalities, motivations, and so on, or their own experiences in learning second languages in immersion settings and their individual characteristics. A more engaging approach to this learning would be to include case studies of successful second language learners exhibiting various characteristics, along the lines of Norton and Toohey's (2001) article about an elementary student and a working-aged woman who were able to exert their agency and to participate in communities of practice where they could practice and improve their (second-language) English speaking. Reading about factors such as motivation and learning styles in the abstract as in Lightbown and Spada (2006) provides a good summary of the concepts, of factors precluding generalizations and emphasizing the individuality of second language learning, but teacher-candidates' understandings will be stronger if contextualized and personalized. If additional article-length case studies are found,

they might be assigned in “jigsaw,” where groups of students read and present on each article, followed by discussion and reflection.

### ***Bilingualism, L1 and L2***

A third theme for teacher-candidate learning about language acquisition concerns the context of the child’s language acquisition, whether it is first language or second language, and thus conceptualizations of first (L1), second (L2), and bilingual acquisition.

Under theories of acquisition, teacher-candidates might learn of Krashen’s ideas about the automaticity of first language “acquisition” versus the conscious effort of second language “learning.” This theory underscores the nativist concept of a critical period for language acquisition and the hypothesis of a fundamental difference between first and second language acquisition. While these theories remain controversial, much research has taken the distinction as a given. Genesee places the difference between bilingual first language acquisition and childhood second language at 3 years of immersion. What this means for teacher-candidates, is that the factors discussed by Lightbown and Spada (2006), enter into the language learning of most “ELL” students and many others they will encounter, making engagement, progress and outcomes variable. It also underscores that being US-born does not guarantee first-language English.

### **Academic Language and Functional Analysis**

A topic not addressed in many introductory linguistic curricula but widely discussed in teacher education literature is academic language. Schleppegrell (2004) posits an broad understanding of academic language that she calls the *language of schooling* and calls for explicit attention to language akin to linguistic inclusiveness. She explains that “schools value those ways of using language that are characteristic of the professional, technical, and

bureaucratic institutions of our society...[and] in the absence of an explicit focus on language, students from certain social class backgrounds continue to be privileged and others [who are not exposed to those ways of using language in their community or home environments] to be disadvantaged in learning, assessment, and promotion, perpetuating the obvious inequalities that exist today” (p. 3). What this means is that teachers need to be aware of their language usage and how it might differ from the language usage in students’ environments outside the classroom, and they must then bridge that gap by teaching their expected classroom language forms.

The concept of academic language has been around at least since Cummins (1979a) distinguished cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) from basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) in the context of second language acquisition. Cummins’s focus was on when and how these two conceptually different kinds (or parts) of language were learned by second language learners, but for our purposes, the differential learning also implicates structural differences between the language forms.

Recent research in systemic functional linguistics has explained how the language of schooling is formally and structurally different from conversational language (Schleppegrell, 2004), outlined structural differences in textual forms between disciplines (Christie & Maton, 2011; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Fang et al., 2008), and indicated that all students benefit from explicit instruction about these forms and methods of making meaning (Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011). For secondary teachers, especially, it is important to learn about the academic and disciplinary language that they themselves use every day but that is foreign and inaccessible to many students, preventing them from accessing the rigorous content that they have a right to learn. While many teacher-candidates may be preparing to teach the specialized vocabulary of their fields, fewer will have thought about the syntax, tone or voice of texts, and text

organization that is not only used in their teaching and materials, but also *expected* of students. Functional linguistic analysis is a method of discovering the language use patterns and layers of meaning in a given text, and can be a useful tool for teacher-candidates who are beginning to understand what exactly academic language is (Achugar et al., 2007; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Fang et al., 2006). It can also be used in the classroom to uncover the intricacies of academic language along with students (Fang et al., 2008; Gebhard et al., 2007; Schleppegrell, 2013; Schleppegrell et al., 2004).

This unit for the teacher curriculum in linguistics consists of basics of academic language, disciplinary language variation, and uncovering layers of meaning through functional language analysis.

#### ***Academic language: basic characteristics***

The most obvious area of language difference is perhaps in the vocabulary used inside versus outside the classroom. Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002) define three tiers of vocabulary; tier 1 includes everyday vocabulary such as function words, words that label physical objects, and generally, words that require little or no instruction even for SLES (Sibold, 2011). Tiers 2 and 3 correspond to academic vocabulary. Tier 3 words are subject-specific (*secession, cellule, denominator, essay*) and generally low in frequency outside the field. This vocabulary would be considered *jargon* in linguistic terms (O'Grady et al., 2010), and teacher-candidates can likely generate examples from their specializations if given a few examples from other areas (such as phonetics *jargon, occlusive, obstruent, apical, EEG, waveform, spectrogram*). Tier 2 words are those that are in general use across disciplines (*conclusion, analyze, effects, predict*), and words that have multiple meanings, some of which are specialized uses in a given subject (*movement* (e.g. social movements in history), *synthesis, variable, verse*).

The SIOP model refers to this type of vocabulary as “general academic vocabulary” (Echevarria et al., 2008), and reminds teachers to include it in lesson planning. Because it is more common and not discipline-specific, Tier 2 vocabulary might be less obvious to teachers and thereby less often emphasized or explicitly defined for students. Attention to these theoretical tiers of academic vocabulary and noting that Tier 2 vocabulary involves *polysemy* (covered in the semantics unit) and Latinate word families (from morphology and other methods courses) can bring it to the awareness of teacher-candidates for inclusion in their lesson plans.

Vocabulary is not the most challenging part of academic language for SLES, nor is it the most challenging part for teacher-candidates to identify. As educated adults, many of us take for granted our ability to understand what is considered to be academic language. Consider the following example, from a study on supporting science learning (Gomez et al., 2010). Text 1 represents a text that the average ninth grader in the study would have been able to read and understand independently. Text 2 is an excerpt from an environmental science textbook in the local curriculum in “academic language.

Text 1: A bird’s wings are well shaped for flight. The wing is curved. It cuts the air. This helps lift the bird. The feathers are light. But they are strong. They help make birds the best fliers. A bird can move them in many directions. Birds move their wings forward and down. Then they move them up and back. This is how they fly.

Text 2: Beginning about 75 years ago, hundreds of small dams began to be “decommissioned.” In the last decade, 177 dams were removed nationwide, with 26 of these in 1999 alone. Salmon conservation was not the sole reason for decommissioning these dams. Many were in poor condition, dilapidated from lack of maintenance and they posed a flood risk for areas downstream.

About 9 of the 59 lexical items in Text 2 could be considered academic language:

*decommissioned, dilapidated, flood risk, and downstream* (Tier 3), *sole, condition, maintenance, pose* and possibly, *nationwide*, compared to just one in Text 1 (*directions*). But what is more striking is the syntactic simplicity of the sentences in Text 1. Only one sentence has anything

resembling a subordinate clause (*helps (to) lift the bird*); even conjoined phrases are avoided (*But they are strong*). All sentences are active (not passive), there are no adverbials (e.g. *Beginning about 75 years ago*), and most subjects are concrete nouns. What, then, typifies academic text is a question that teacher-candidates can answer by contrasting texts like these. Here, we can see that there are passive structures in Text 2 (*began to be decommissioned*), adverbial phrases (*In the last decade, nationwide, alone and in 1999 alone and with 26 of these in 1999 alone, beginning about 75 years ago and dilapidated from lack of maintenance*), and conjunction (*and they posed a flood risk*). Also *areas downstream* has modifier *after* the noun being modified, as does *sole reason for decommissioning these dams*, the latter being a complex noun phrase with pre- and post-modification. Finally, empty syntactic structure (or missing information) is found in *177 dams were removed nationwide, with 26 of these [dams] [having been removed] in 1999 alone*. Even if this academic writing can be understood by some students, it carries a tone that is unfamiliar and may be off-putting until it the student comes to feel linguistically capable.

Academic language has also been described as decontextualized, explicit, and complex or highly structured (Snow, 1983 cited in Schleppegrell, 2004)(Snow, 1983 cited in Schleppegrell, 2004)(Snow, 1983 cited in Schleppegrell, 2004)(Snow, 1983 cited in Schleppegrell, 2004)(Snow, 1983 cited in Schleppegrell, 2004)(Snow, 1983 cited in Schleppegrell, 2004). “Decontextualized” refers to the fact that in academic writing, the audience cannot interact with the author and seek clarification as is possible in interpersonal conversations. “Explicit” refers to the precise reference of academic vocabulary (jargon), the more elaborate lexicon, full and often complex noun phrases as opposed to pronouns which can be understood in context. Finally, academic language is said to have complex syntactic structure (such as long noun phrases) and complex message structure that integrates new information as well as relationships between participants

and pieces of information. Schleppegrell (2004) argues that there *is* a context for academic writing; the academic context is created through the linguistic choices of the author, accessible to those who can participate in meaning-making in the particular linguistic ways utilized. Contrasting with the “explicitness” of academic vocabulary, there is also obscuring of information, such as in the use of passives or abstract nouns as subjects, where the agent of the action is left unstated. As for complexity, spoken language comes with its own variety of complexity, but academic language is characterized by expanded noun phrases, embedded clauses, adverbial phrases (as seen above), as well as clausal complexity (multiple clauses within a sentence, as opposed to Text 1 above), and lexical density (more lexical items per phrase as opposed to function words and pronouns or shorter phrases) (Schleppegrell, 2004). Celce-Murcia (2002) mentions three particular syntactic structures used in academic language that pose particular challenges for SLES writers; (middle voice (*the glass broke* as opposed to active and passive voices), existential *there*, and contrastive connectors used differently, such as *in contrast*, *on the other hand*, and *on the contrary*).

One last characteristic of academic language is the use of *grammatical metaphor*, such as in nominalization. Grammatical metaphor arises when a noun or adjective expresses a verbal (action or process) meaning, such as *destruction* or *destructive*, which are, at their base, referring to actions of *destroying*. Sentences like *the destruction of Rome was tragic* include grammatical metaphor in the nominalization of *destroy*. This nominalization also makes an abstract noun as subject, and omits information about who or what destroyed Rome (the agent of the action of destroying), which renders the sentence itself rather abstract and challenging.

Like any variety of a language, academic language is “cognitively demanding” (Cummins, 1979a, 1999) to the extent that it is unfamiliar (Schleppegrell, 2004). This means

that, while it is familiar and automatic for teachers, it is unfamiliar and demanding for students until they become familiar with it, especially SLES students, even if they are fluent in spoken language. There is no proven answer to what can be done to make academic language structures familiar for student readers, but a first step is for teachers to be aware of the challenges that academic language poses, and a second step might just be for teachers to draw attention to the structures and meanings with explicit focus on the language of academic and disciplinary texts.

### *Disciplinary language variation*

Better than memorizing a list of general characteristics, teacher-candidates can benefit from discussions of characteristics from their own specific fields, with example texts, and from engaging in the analysis of texts through methods such as *functional linguistic analysis*. In an accessible article, Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) introduce general features of academic language, features specific to history, science and mathematics writing, and a process, functional linguistic analysis, that can be used by teachers with students to discover different types of meaning expressed in texts by looking at particular structural features. Example texts are used to demonstrate that texts in the various disciplines have specific characteristics. Science writing, for example, typically has nominalization to help summarize and consolidate meanings, passive voice or abstractions often functioning as agents, and generally, densely packed information. There is wide use of the declarative mood, positioning the author as expert and authoritative. The language of math is described as tripartite: there is natural language (spoken and written prose), mathematics symbolic language as used in formulas and equations, and visual representation such as graphs, diagrams, and other visual elements. In math, readers must translate between these three representational systems. Math prose has technical vocabulary, everyday words that take on specialized meanings, and long noun phrases that condense

mathematical processes into nominalizations, omit some information, and include premodifiers and classifying adjectives that precede nouns as well as qualifiers that come after nouns. There are also relational processes using *be* and *have* (*A square is a quadrilateral* (and not vice versa) and *A prime number is a number that can only be divided by one and itself*), and precise and technical meanings of conjunctions. Language used in history textbooks is also discussed in this article, but not that of English language arts.

It is valuable for teacher-candidates to see, briefly, how the language of their field differs from the others, as in an article like this one. Supplemental readings can be used to delve deeper into disciplinary language and see other example texts analyzed, such as Schleppegrell (2007) for math, Schleppegrell and Achugar (2003) and Schleppegrell et al. (2004) for history, Chenhansa and Schleppegrell (1998) or Fang (2005) for science, and possibly Chen (2008), a functional description of a poem by Thomas Hardy, for English Language Arts. Disciplinary articles can be presented in jigsaw or discussed in mixed discipline small groups, so that teacher-candidates synthesize the information about texts of their fields and engage in cross-discipline comparison. Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) also present the functional linguistic analysis method of analyzing texts, which can be demonstrated or practiced in groups as well, using texts that teacher-candidates bring in themselves.

### ***Uncovering layers of meaning through functional linguistic analysis***

Three layers of meaning can be examined in texts, using functional linguistic analysis laid out by Fang and Schleppegrell (2010). The experiential meaning of a text is what it says about happenings in the world, or, the basic content. Experiential meaning is examined by determining, sentence-by-sentence, what are the processes (*being, doing, sensing, or saying*), who are the participants (noting that the agent is often masked or omitted), and what are the

circumstances of time, space, and conditions (as indicated often in adverbs or prepositional phrases). This type of analysis is often enlightening in history texts, where nominalizations of processes and passive structures often obscure participants. Curiosity about the participants might then be raised in students about who did what, instigating and practicing critical thinking about how texts represent and veil meanings.

Interpersonal meaning in a text is the social relationship it enacts between participants including the author and the audience. The author's stance, evaluation, or perspective on the events is indicated by modal verbs (e.g., *should, might, ought to*), modal adjectives (e.g., *definite, absolute, usual*), modal adverbs (e.g., *perhaps, certainly, typically*), modal nouns (e.g., *requirement, necessity*), and other attitudinal vocabulary, and by sentence mood (declarative, interrogative and imperative). Sentence mood also indicates the author's relationship with the reader, where questions might draw a reader in as more of an equal in a personal way, where declarative and imperative moods indicate authority, distance or a sense of expertise. It might be enlightening to analyze the voice of certain historical or literary writings, though Fang and Schleppegrell's (2010) example used a science (health-related) text to demonstrate the authoritative voice, use of conditionals to be accurate and not over-predict, and use of modals (*might, should, could*) in recommendations.

The third type of meaning, textual meaning, concerns how meanings are organized into a coherent message. Analysis for textual meaning looks at the *theme* of each sentence, which is the shared or known information, usually in the sentence's subject and the *rheme*, which is the new information usually provided in the predicate. Oftentimes, the rheme of one sentence is carried over into the theme of the next, in a chaining effect, but themes are also repeated when they are (part of) the main theme or message of the text. Analyzing texts at this level examines

questions of “what is this text about?” and demonstrate how texts are organized for a coherent message. It could be used to draw students’ attention to genre forms for writing, and also applies to science writing, where processes in a predicate (rheme) are often nominalized as themes in following sentences.

Reading about functional linguistic analysis further illuminates differences in subject-area language usage and methods for looking at the form and meanings of texts that can scaffold reading and help students to access the content of specific texts and to practice careful reading and critical thinking.

According to Schleppegrell (2013), thinking in terms of the functional categories helps learners to develop new understandings about language and its larger systems using tools to parse the elements of a clause into meaningful segments; see how an author is making language choices related to what the text is about, how it is structured, and the voice it projects; recognize how to say the same thing in different words and how to recognize differences in register. It also foregrounds *language resources* over accuracy or single-sightedness in language use, leads to extended oral contributions by L2 learners, and allows for motivating and engaging exercises (Schleppegrell, 2013). To engage in these linguistically inclusive classroom learning practices, teacher-candidates should be knowledgeable and practiced as well.

### **Discussion of the curriculum**

There are thus ten major topics recommended for this course: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, which are the core structural components, plus pragmatics, sociolinguistics, cultural-anthropological linguistics, acquisition and bilingualism, and academic language and functional linguistics. In a university course, depending on the duration of the term, each topic could be addressed in a single week, assuming they are assigned equal value for the

course.<sup>43</sup> The order of topics is not fixed, but it would be most beneficial to cover the structural components before acquisition, anthropological linguistics, and sociolinguistics because these latter topics include issues at each of the structural levels. Similarly, semantics precedes pragmatics conceptually, and basic concepts of syntax and morphology conceptually support studies of academic language and functional linguistic analysis. Though the concepts within each topic were carefully selected and considered in the preceding sections, time constraints and local professional preference could mean excluding certain concepts or minimizing time spent discussing them in class. Topics such as phonetics and phonology, or semantics and pragmatics might be combined in the same class meeting, or with testing or other assignment deadlines to work within logistic constraints. Of all the topics, functional linguistic analysis likely requires the most reading and some of the most intensive reading, based on my research and preparation to date. There may be more than one reading that is pertinent for each discipline in addition to general introductions or overviews such as Fang and Schleppegrell (2010).

For secondary teachers especially, I suggested three main themes be continually examined throughout the course: 1) first and second language acquisition and development, 2) peculiarities of English structure (comparative structural awareness), and 3) disciplinary language use. Of these, peculiarities of English structure are generally a main focus in each topic; for example, traits particular to English are that English morphology includes many processes other than affixation (e.g. blending, clipping, and suppletion) and that inflection is minimal but carries a significant functional load (in determining part of speech and sentence structure). The other two themes each correlate with one week's topic, but students can be asked to consider and

---

<sup>43</sup> Certain subjects may be deemed more important and more deserving of concerted classroom discussion and exploration, such as bilingualism and second language acquisition or functional analysis of academic language. If this course is to be foundational and not necessarily a complete linguistics education, the topics can be assigned equal time and the more applicable topics should be continued and reintroduced in subsequent teacher education courses.

discuss them during the other class meetings or take notes throughout the course on questions such as “which phonemes are likely to pose the most difficulty for SLES students?” or “what morphological patterns are common in the vocabulary of your discipline?”

To close, I return to the recommendations in the teacher education literature. A number of scholars have recommended that teachers know about the basic structure of English or that they take an introductory linguistics course (Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Steiner & Rozen, 2004; Valdés et al., 2005). Others mainly focus on sociolinguistics in order to build teachers’ positive dispositions toward speakers of dialects other than the (local) standard or of SLES students (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Valdés et al., 2005; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Also in consideration of SLES students, linguistic responsiveness adds second language acquisition to recommended teacher awareness (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008).

Among other recommendations, for teachers to be able to *analyze the language demands* of classroom activities and scaffold the advanced literacy acquisition of first and second language learners (Achugar et al., 2007; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Scarcella, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2004; M. J. Schleppegrell & C. Colombi, 2002; Valdés et al., 2005) entails a foundation in functional linguistics and awareness of academic and disciplinary language use differences, vocabulary or morphology, and basic syntactic and semantic concepts. Some recommend teachers be able to teach students about the structure and usage of language (Delpit, 1995c; Scarcella, 2002), which suggests a facility with syntax and morphology as well as awareness of sociolinguistic variation and the concept of prescriptive grammar. Each of these recommendations from the teacher education literature is addressed in the proposed curriculum,

and each of the proposed topics is relevant to the perceived learning needs of teachers working within (and toward) cultural and linguistic diversity.

Although languages are a fascinating topic of study, teachers need not become linguists or know all there is to know about language and linguistics in order to provide equitable learning opportunities for SLES and cultural and linguistic minority students. I have attempted to select pertinent topics and cogent concepts and to reason through why each is beneficial in developing positive dispositions and a solid knowledge base for linguistic inclusiveness and its practices. Ultimately, the design of each course will be at the discretion of the teacher education program and the course instructor and based on local learning needs.

## **Chapter 5: Case Study of Teacher-Candidate Learning in a Language Awareness Course**

For the spring of 2013, the opportunity arose that I might teach a course for secondary teacher-candidates based on the curriculum discussed in Chapter 4. This course would allow for a case study of how teacher-candidates might acquire knowledge, dispositions, and skills in line with the developing conceptualization of linguistic inclusiveness and the specific curriculum proposed. In this chapter I present the study of that course and of teacher-candidates' learning.

The study focuses on the learning experiences of the teacher-candidates who were students in the course. Qualitative in nature, the study has aspects of case study, curriculum criticism, action research, and grounded theory (Bloor & Wood, 2006; Glesne, 2011; Lichtman, 2006; Merriam, 1998; Sherman & Webb, 1988). Merriam (1998) is quick to clarify that terminologies for qualitative research approaches (also categorized as “theoretical traditions,” “designs,” “data analysis techniques,” “research strategies” and “disciplinary orientations”) are changing and overlapping, and this study is no exception in having characteristics of several approaches commonly discussed in the research literature.

Data sources are students' coursework, my observations and field notes as the instructor, and students' evaluations solicited in reflective essays and course evaluations. The purpose of the study is to examine teacher candidates' experiences of one particular realization of a course which has been recommended in the literature on preparing teachers for linguistic diversity in order to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the curriculum. The study contributes to an understanding of linguistic inclusiveness knowledge and dispositions that can be gained in such a course with such a curriculum.

In the sections that follow, I present an overview of the methodological considerations and procedures as well as a description of the course syllabus, setting, and students before turning to the findings in the form of themes and examples of student learning.

Similar courses were also taught for elementary teacher-candidates in an intensive ELL endorsement program the following term as well as in a general introductory class including elementary and secondary teacher-candidates and other students later that term. Some comparisons are drawn between the classes, though deliberate study of the elementary and mixed classes was not undertaken.

### **Framework and Methodological Considerations**

This research project has aspects of both positivist and interpretivist paradigms; positivist in the vision of the class as an *intervention* to be evaluated toward improving (linguistically inclusive) practice, yet interpretivist in its fore-fronting of the students' (henceforth "teacher-candidates") experience of the course and emphasis thus on their *subjectivity* (Glesne, 2011).

The positivist conceptualization is represented by analyzing the effects of the course using pre- and post-tests, for example, to deduce what knowledge and ideas are gained through the course. The effects cannot truly be measured because they are not isolable from teacher-candidates' prior experiences or experiences that take place simultaneous to but outside of the course. The inevitability of these confounding factors suggests a more interpretivist approach that values the teacher-candidates' reports of their own learning *as data* and the research-instructor's interpretations of that learning and of the reports *as findings* along with the inherent subjectivity of these methods.

In the positivist conceptualization, the study takes the form of a *curriculum criticism* (Ross, 1988). In analyzing the learning of the teacher-candidates and attributing the learning to

the curriculum itself, I am evaluating “the match between intended outcomes and conditioned means for achieving those outcomes,” (Ross, 1988, p. 163) or, the match between the teachers’ learning and the learning intended by the curriculum. This study is thus a critique of the curriculum’s appropriateness for teachers and effectiveness in bringing about certain learning.

According to Ross (1988), curriculum criticism relies on a connoisseurship on the part of the critic (the researcher, myself) in making judgments about what is valuable in the data (teacher-candidates' learning), just as an art critic makes judgments about what is valuable in a work of art. A connoisseur is able to perceive differences and characteristics that “most people” cannot perceive (Ross, 1988). In this sense, the validity of the study relies on my connoisseurship of linguistic – or linguistically inclusive – thinking, that is, my ability to accurately identify linguistically-oriented or -informed thinking in the teacher-candidates’ writing (which serves as data), and also on my honesty in fairly critiquing and including relevant data. Both the researcher and the reader should also recognize possible perspectives of other “critics.”

Other important aspects of curriculum criticism are the focus on context, the recognition that experiences are not repetitive in the same sense (or, *replicable*), and that “the exact words, actions and products of the participants form the core of the evidence upon which criticism is based” (Ross, 1988, p. 164), all of which are applicable in this study. The data will be drawn from teacher-candidates’ own writings and make reference to their “exact words.” The study setting involves a particular group of teacher-candidates, a particular instructor and a particular curriculum, setting, group, time, and learning activities that cannot be precisely replicated. Both the data and the setting thus emphasize the context and subjectivity inevitable in the study.

Another proposed requirement of curriculum criticism, that researcher observations must be non-interventionist (Ross, 1988), is somewhat problematic for this study, where the “intervention” of me teaching makes the study more closely resemble an *action research* study. Similarly, that observed phenomena are to be the focus of observations and not pre-specified hypotheses makes even a curriculum criticism resemble *grounded theoretical* studies (discussed below).

Bloor and Wood (2006) define *action research* as that which pursues action (or change) *and* research (in the form of knowledge or understanding). Given the role of the researcher in this study as *pursuing* linguistic inclusiveness, this study meets both criteria for action research. The action is the social change of cultivating linguistic inclusiveness in the teacher-candidates, and the research is an understanding of how to do that, whether they have or develop aspects of linguistic inclusiveness, and in what ways. Other explanations of qualitative research do not include action research in their listings (Lichtman, 2006; Merriam, 1998), and the best fit for this study in their overviews is a *generic qualitative study*, although grounded theory is also relevant.

This research also matches definitions of *case study*, in that, with a focus on the specific course as enacted in the spring of 2013 with a particular group of teacher-candidates and a particular curriculum, it is a study of a “bounded system” (Merriam, 1998, p. 40). Case studies are to be *particularistic, descriptive* and *heuristic*, as well as relatively concrete, contextual, and developed by reader interpretation and reader generalizability (Merriam, 1998). In being particularistic, that is, particular to a specific context, occurrence, or bounded system (in this case, the class as it transpired), they provide relatively concrete, vivid examples that are “more... sensory than abstract” (Merriam, 1998, p. 44). These examples are contextualized and context-dependent, not directly representative of other cases or examples that might occur in other

contexts. As such, case studies are interpreted by the researcher (as in curriculum criticism) and by the reader, who builds her/his own understanding. This study provides particular examples of teacher-candidates' learning in the given context which the reader will interpret with respect to the goals and enactment of the curriculum. The case study should thus be deeply descriptive of the particular case and context, so that it can be understood (and the researcher's interpretation assessed) by the reader. Generalizations beyond the immediate population of participants depend on the readers' understandings and experiences. This study is a case study of the particular class, and as researcher, I offer descriptions and interpretations about the class that are subject to the reader's interpretations. No claims can be made about the generalizability of the teacher-candidates' learning or success of the class to other contexts, except through the reader's sense of identification with contextual aspects and capacity to replicate the class. To the extent that I judge the success of the class, this is an *evaluative case study* (Merriam, 1998).

While some consider grounded theory to be an approach or methodology alongside case study and curriculum criticism (Merriam, 1998; Sherman & Webb, 1988), this study reflects a grounded theoretical approach specifically to data analysis (Bloor & Wood, 2006), called *inductive* data analysis in Cochran-Smith et al.'s (2009) exemplary study of teacher-candidate learning in social justice-oriented teacher education. Where there is agreement is that in grounded theoretic approaches, no pre-conceived theory leads the study or the data analysis. The study is not set out to test a grand theory. Instead, a theory of "what's happening" or "how this is experienced" arises from the data itself through the identification of themes in the participants' words or actions. The less grand or overarching theory is *grounded* in the data. This understanding of grounded theory describes the approach to data analysis in the current study, where there is no existing grand theory of how teachers become linguistically inclusive that

guides the analysis even of whether or not the class “worked.” The study seeks themes of what teacher-candidates think, learn, gain, and connect to from among a variety of possible topics (linguistic topics or dispositions, knowledge, skills, for example) during the class.

The data analysis method employed here exemplifies grounded theory by seeking themes that emerge from the data (participants’ narratives) to allow the building of a model (Glesne, 2011) of what teacher-candidates learn or engage with in a course such as this. The data analysis method employed is one of *open coding* in a *constant comparative method* (Bloor & Wood, 2006; Merriam, 1998), where *themes*, or ideas and topics that were similar across different teacher-candidates’ thinking, were assigned labels, or, *codes*. For example, a teacher-candidate’s writing (or a section of data) that referred to “proper grammar” and one about “grammar rules my mother taught me” might both be assigned the code “prescriptive grammar.” Codes were constantly compared across the data, sometimes becoming more general to include more teacher-candidates’ examples and ideas, sometimes becoming more nuanced and differentiated in continuous rounds of coding and consideration of the data included in each code. The finalized codes are included alongside data examples in the discussion of findings so that the reader can assess the validity of the codes and conclusions (and the connoisseurship of the researcher).

This study involves a complex interplay of qualitative research approaches. I am reassured by Merriam’s (1998) conclusion that there is no consensus on how to classify “the baffling numbers of choices or approaches” to quantitative research (citing Creswell, 2007, p. 6), but the main approaches here are curriculum critique and case study of the course through grounded theoretical or constant comparative data analysis.

### **Reliability, validity and generalizability**

A quintessential aspect of qualitative research is recognition of the subjectivity of the researcher. The subjectivity of the researcher, in turn, affects the validity of the study.

Reliability and generalizability, mentioned in the preceding section, are discussed in this section as well.

The goal of this qualitative study is not to understand individuals or the class as in-depth case study examples, nor on the other hand is it to uncover *replicable* results so that the findings are *generalizable* to the population of “all teacher-candidates.” The goal for generalizability lies somewhere between these two extremes: to discover possible realities—possible take-up by teacher-candidates like these (possible teacher-candidates) of materials like these (materials potentially selected for teacher education) engaged in in these ways (possible learning methodologies) in this type of possible setting. Otherwise stated, if these teacher-candidates had these certain reported experiences, it is possible that others will too, and these experiences can be used to analyze the effectiveness and relevance of the curriculum (taking into account the materials, activities, instructor, classmates and class atmosphere, and other particulars of the context and enactment of this course) and its *transferability* to other contexts. While this single case study *proves* nothing, Wolcott (2005) points out that “every case is, in certain aspects, like all other cases, like some other cases, and like no other case” (cited in Merriam, 1998, p. 228). It is up to the reader to decide whether the findings can apply to his or her particular situation; this is known as *reader generalizability* (Merriam, 1998). Since *reliability* refers to the replicability of a study as a means of verifying the findings, it does not apply in a case study-type, or highly contextualized, study of this kind. That is, this study cannot claim to be reliable in the

sense that it could be replicated. The results may be deemed *transferable* or *generalizable* to other populations and contexts, but that depends on the reader's judgment.

The reader must take into account the *validity* of the study as well, or its *credibility*, in Lincoln and Guba's (1985) postmodernist reinterpretation (cited in Merriam, 1998). Validity has to do with how well research findings match reality and how well the observations or measurements are a measure of what they say they are measuring (Merriam, 1998). The validity of this study, as discussed above, depends on the judged accuracy of the codes as reflective of teacher-candidates' thinking and on the *trustworthiness* of my overall interpretation of the codes and findings. I have included the codes alongside exemplification in the teacher-candidates' own words, which allows the reader to evaluate the connection between the codes and the examples given as an assessment of the validity of the findings and an estimation of my interpretation and its validity. It is not possible, however, for the reader to evaluate portions of the data that are not reported. The trustworthiness of the findings inevitably depends on a degree of trust concerning my selection of teacher-candidates' writing samples and codes to exclude which can only be estimated through the judged validity of what is included in the findings.

Another means of judging the credibility of the study is to recognize and make explicit my subjectivity and positionality as researcher and instructor in the study and how efforts are made to minimize or at least recognize the potential effects (Glesne, 2011). This explicitness allows appraisal of the effects of my positionality on my interpretations, comparison of interpretations, and evaluation of whether or not my interpretations are accurate within this study and transferable to other contexts.

## **Subjectivity and positionality of the researcher**

As in any qualitative study, *reflexivity* on the part of the researcher is paramount (Lichtman, 2006), not only for considerations of the validity and trustworthiness of the findings which are interpreted from various theoretical perspectives and personal positionality, but also in the dual role of researcher and instructor. Qualitative researchers are quick to note that subjectivity colors nearly every aspect of a qualitative study (Glesne, 2011; Lichtman, 2006; Merriam, 1998), in fact, starting with the interest or rationale itself. I have illuminated many of my perspectives with respect to the study by positioning it in social, political, demographic, and research (and time) contexts in Chapter 2, by explicating theoretical and conceptual frameworks that shape the overarching goals and understandings in Chapter 3, and by discussing the reasoning behind the curriculum (and perhaps revealing some personal investment in it) in Chapter 4. Here I mention the more immediately personal aspects of my positionality and subjectivity as they may be seen to affect my interpretations of data and my simultaneous roles as teacher and researcher.

First, as concerns my roles in the teaching of the class, it should be mentioned that I am a white, female, monolingual English speaker. I have studied French, Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, and Korean (the last being the language of my partner, with whom I speak at a conversational level every day). I hold a doctorate in theoretical linguistics, and taught linguistics courses for many years prior to teaching this class. This much was also known to the teacher-candidate students in the class, which was offered through a college of Education, and this positionality would have some effect on my role as teacher and interactions with the teacher-candidates.

Prior to the class under investigation here, I had taught various introductory linguistics courses for many years in several university-level venues (two research universities, a branch university, a smaller public university, and in evening “extension” courses at a research university) through Linguistics, English, and Anthropology departments, but I had never taught in a college of education nor have I taught at the elementary or secondary level. I always found teaching introductory classes rewarding because I am admittedly passionate about helping people not only to understand the topic of language as fascinating in itself, but to use the knowledge to understand themselves and others more fully and intentionally. I entered the field of education research recognizing the significance of language in education and in social inequities and with a developing conceptualization of linguistic inclusiveness. I designed the curriculum in Chapter 4 as a product of this personal interest and professional goal.

As concerns my dual role as instructor and researcher, it should also be noted that the data sources used here are teacher-candidates’ writings submitted as coursework with me, the instructor, as evaluator. The writings will reflect teacher-candidates’ relationships to me and to the course. That is, as assignments submitted for a course, to be graded by me, they will reflect an effort to demonstrate to me successful learning in the class. Since there were no assignments geared at critiquing the relevance of the course content to teaching contexts and philosophies, and no teacher-candidate would submit an assignment stating they had learned nothing, there is surely a positive bias in the data itself. Of course in both instructor and researcher roles, I take a critical look at the teacher-candidates’ claims of learning to see that they are verified with correct exemplification and use of terminology, for example, as *evidence* of learning and engagement with concepts. This critical examination is comparative across teacher-candidates and even courses I have taught, and helps to mitigate the positive bias that is inevitable in the data.

As concerns my role as researcher in interpreting the data, it would be safe to say that I am heavily invested in the “success” of the class in terms of reaching teacher-candidates and seeing them learn. This personal investment could be suspected to lead to a bias in *finding* learning and connections in the teacher-candidates’ thinking (data) or interpreting the data positively as examples of learning. For this reason, specific samples of teacher-candidates’ writing are included alongside the codes in the findings section below. I would also offer that my experiences in theoretical linguistics and in teaching might moderate that bias in two ways. First, a theoretical mindset might focus my attention on structural and theoretical learning to the disadvantage of more sociocultural and subjective kinds of learning, resulting in less learning recognized overall.<sup>44</sup> Secondly, having taught similar concepts on other occasions, I tend to be critical of my teaching and syllabus and of student work in comparison with other classes (e.g. “this didn’t go as well as last time,” “I should have spent more time on ...,” “they didn’t get it the way I had hoped,” ...). Thus, while I am passionate about the topic and about teacher-candidates’ learning, this is balanced with a propensity to be critical and demanding, which can mediate a positive bias in interpreting the data to some extent.

In any case, my interpretations of teacher-candidates’ experiences come from a particular point of view that may differ from others’ who are looking from outside the class or from teacher-candidates’ perspectives. It is necessary to recognize a bias throughout this study toward a positive evaluation of the course, due to the data sources and to the role of the researcher in the course as designer and instructor of the curriculum, evaluator of student learning, and interpreter of the findings. With this inevitable bias in mind, I, as researcher, do make an effort to critique

---

<sup>44</sup> Failure to recognize more sociocultural and personal understandings is of course undesirable, and to be avoided as much as possible, for if this is a foundations class, the more general socio-cognitive learnings are especially valuable. It is also likely that facts and structural knowledge are easier to articulate and easier to recognize than is the more sociocultural and socio-emotional thinking that typifies dispositions. These musings about the data and interpretation are simply offered for the reader’s consideration.

the course and to select what teacher-candidates' writings reflect to be the most important concepts and effective learning strategies. In any case, as a case study, it cannot be concluded that any successes documented here are representative of every teacher-candidate in this class or others in other contexts at other times. The reader's interpretation of the findings and interpretations is of primary importance.

### **Procedures**

Before delving into the findings, this section outlines the basic procedures of the study, starting with the research setting and including recruitment of participants, approval of the study from the university's internal review board (human subjects protections) and participants' consent, data collection methods and data sources, and data analysis methods.

#### ***The research setting***

The course under study was offered in a cohort-based, intensive, one-term ELL endorsement program for secondary teachers (during the term following completion of their certification program) at a large, public research university on the US West coast. This was the researcher-instructor's first time teaching the course in a college of education, but introductory courses on language and linguistics with some similar content had been taught previously.

The class included 14 teacher-candidates who had completed a secondary teacher education program the previous term as a cohort. These 14 teacher-candidates represented about one-third of the whole cohort, those who *opted* to seek an endorsement for working with ELL students in one university quarter (spring) before beginning their in-service teaching. Teacher-candidates were from all specializations: math, science, social studies (SS) and English Language Arts (ELA), with ELA representing the majority (eight teacher-candidates).<sup>45</sup> The

---

<sup>45</sup> ELA teacher-candidates were all women. There were four social studies, one math and one science teacher-candidates who were all men.

class was offered alongside three other endorsement courses (Methods, Assessment, Foundations) and a teaching practicum and weekly practicum guidance class.

Our class met once per week in the evening, from 7:00 till 9:00, immediately following the 2.5-hour weekly Assessment class. Our class met for two hours, once per week for ten weeks, with one class cancelled for a colloquium, for a total of nine class meetings, or 18 class hours.

The textbook for this course was Denham and Lobeck (2013), *Linguistics for Everyone*, supplemented by readings in morphology and vocabulary acquisition (Nagy & Anderson, 1984), pragmatics (Gordon, 2012, excerpts), semantics (O'Grady et al., 2010), language acquisition (Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Pullum, 2013), cultural linguistics (Heath, 1982; Pullum, 1991; Sohn, 1983; Wilce, 2012), sociolinguistics (Maltz & Borke, 2012; O'Grady et al., 2010), academic language (Celce-Murcia, 1995; Scarcella, 2002), functional language analysis and disciplinary language (Chen, 2008; Fang, 2005; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2007; Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003; Schleppegrell et al., 2004), and teaching ELLs (Harklau, 1994).

Teacher-candidates completed the following assignments: entrance and exit quizzes (or, pre- and post-tests), weekly linguistic exercises, a linguistic knowledge and attitudes autobiography, group jigsaw<sup>46</sup> presentations of assigned readings, two-page reflections on two student-selected topics, a five-page reflection essay on the course as a whole, a language sketch, and a group presentation on applications of linguistics to teaching. They also gathered their coursework in a portfolio.

Two similar courses were offered in the following term: a cohort-based intensive ELL endorsement for elementary teachers at a large, public research university (meeting daily, 3

---

<sup>46</sup> The term *jigsaw* is used to refer to classroom situations where groups of students were assigned different readings and were to summarize and present on those readings to classmates who had not read them.

hours and 50 minutes, for two weeks, totaling approximately 38 class hours); and an introductory linguistics course (offered through Anthropology) required for a non-cohort-based ELL endorsement but open to other students at a branch campus of a large, public research university (meeting three times per week, 3.5 hours, for four weeks, totaling approximately 40 class hours). The focus of this study will be on the first class, made up of secondary teacher candidates seeking ELL endorsement. The other classes offer some enlightening comparisons.

The programmatic context of the course was a challenging intensive program, and the linguistics course had an ambitious syllabus of readings and work given the limited class time. Additionally, because the class was made up mainly of ELA teacher candidates, who had previously taken an introductory linguistics or *Structure of English* course, basic (structural) linguistic concepts were given somewhat shorter shrift during class discussion and in the grading than in the other courses I have taught. More time was spent discussing the supplementary readings and applications in teaching contexts, and on cultural and socio-linguistic topics. These adaptations were made to accommodate the different learning needs of secondary teachers in different disciplines, a topic which is discussed in greater depth below.

### ***Recruitment and consent***

As a case study of a particular course, and as such, sampling, *per se*, is not undertaken. Participants are teacher-candidates who completed the course, and their experiences serve as data to evaluate the course content's relevance and accessibility.

To "recruit" participants, I made it known to the teacher-candidates at the beginning of the course that I might engage in research concerning the relevance and effectiveness of the course for the teacher-candidates, in terms of their learning and engagement with the material. I communicated that the university's Internal Review Board (IRB; Human Subjects) might require

that I get teacher-candidates' written consent after the course had ended to use their written course materials, my field notes about class activities, participation and overall learning atmosphere, and potentially, questionnaires, surveys and interviews as data for the analysis; their participation would be voluntary and no identifying data would be made public. Until the IRB approved my methodology, I would not solicit their participation or input, and we would carry on the class "as usual." The participants were informed, thus, of the somewhat experimental nature of the class and of my academic interest in their take-up of the material. Whatever it might entail, they were also aware that I was a "linguist" by previous training.

At the end of the course, I explained the research again briefly and stated that once approval from the internal review board was in place, I would contact them to invite those interested to participate in an online survey, where they might also sign up for a focus group interview. In the end, the IRB determined that because the goal of the research was assessment of the course itself and not the gathering of student data, IRB oversight and official consent forms were not necessary.

### ***Data collection***

Many items undertaken as natural activities of the course served as sources of data for the research, such as reflection papers and pre-and post-tests, explained in the next sections. Additional activities requested of participants were to be an online survey and optional focus group or individual (or pair) interviewing. Once the course and their endorsement program had ended, however, teacher-candidates did not respond to email soliciting their participation in the study. Data thus comes from written documents and my own observations.

### *Pre-test and post-test*

As a brief warm-up to the class, a pre-test involving questions about language and linguistics was given on the first day of class. The same test was given as an end-of term post-test in order for teacher-candidates to review and gauge their learning. The pre- and post-tests are used for the research as data in the assessment of teacher-candidates' learning and effectiveness of the course. The pre- and post-tests for secondary teachers included questions about how many languages exist, how English differs from another language of teacher-candidates' choosing, what they know about language and what they want to learn about language. It also included four of the more structurally-oriented questions from the West-E exam online practice exam (Washington Professional Educator Standards Board, 2008).

### *Instructor field notes*

In the natural course of teaching, I took notes for myself on the effectiveness and “success” of each lesson or learning activity. I also observed classroom participation, discussion and interactions surrounding the course materials. Because the purpose of the study is to decipher areas where teacher-candidates connect with the content and areas that were less successful or interesting, I rely more heavily on teacher-candidates' written materials and participation in the class than on my observations and inevitable critiques of my own syllabus or classroom performance or of infrastructural challenges such as the amount of class time, student fatigue, and so on.

### *Teacher-candidates' coursework*

A number of items assigned as coursework offer insight into teacher-candidates' response to the course content and activities. Linguistic autobiographies were assigned during the first class (due the second week) to get teacher-candidates thinking about their language experiences

and attitudes and how they were learned, and to be used as a baseline for examining their learning in the class. Over the course of the term, two reflection papers were to be written on a topic of the teacher-candidate's choice – whatever struck a chord with the teacher-candidate—“as important, useful, relevant, familiar, reminiscent of an experience; new to you, uncomfortable, difficult to grasp, controversial, ‘deeper’ than it seems at first glance; and especially, *applicable* in your work (and discuss *how*),” as cited from the syllabus. The final essay would also be informative for the study, as it was assigned to be a personal reflection on teacher-candidates' learning in the course, focusing on which areas were most useful and applicable, which areas remained difficult, what tools were gained, what teacher-candidates felt they would take from the class, how it could be applied in teaching, and what might be next steps in learning and improving their teaching. Each assignment is discussed along with teacher-candidates' samples in the Findings sections below.

### ***Data analysis***

All documents underwent document analysis with open or *in vivo* coding: coding for themes that arose in participants' writing (Bloor & Wood, 2006). Since the goal was to understand what content was learned and valued by teacher-candidates, themes particularly sought were topics in the class content (e.g. syntax, functional linguistic analysis, pragmatics), specific readings which teacher-candidates might cite, or learning activities (e.g. language sketch assignment, group discussions) that were considered to be effective or meaningful or not so. Other themes were also expected, such as connections to previous experiences or other classes, or larger themes such as dispositions about language and teaching or deeper linguistic issues in sociolinguistics, acquisition, and teaching strategies, for example. Another guiding principle in looking for themes was the conceptualization of dispositions, knowledge, and skills (often cited

in teacher education research as components of teacher learning) that teacher-candidates might demonstrate in their writing. For the most part, however, a grounded theory approach to data analysis was employed, allowing the data to lead in the identification of themes. According to Merriam (1998), a study is a grounded theoretical approach only if a theory arises from the data, so perhaps it is more accurate to simply consider the data analysis to employ a constant comparative method, as discussed above.

## **Findings**

In this section, I present the findings concerning what teacher-candidates learned and what topics and concepts they were able to connect with personally and professionally as evidenced in their written assignments. I make minimal use of my own observations for the main reason that teacher-candidates' writings were rich in data and findings, having been directed precisely toward answering that question (as a constructivist-sociocultural pedagogical method and not only or primarily a research procedure). The sections that follow include investigation of teacher-candidates' learning as represented in classroom discussions, pre- and post-tests, linguistic autobiographies, two reflection papers, final essays, and anonymous course evaluations required by the university.

### **Classroom Discussions**

While classroom discussions were not recorded or fully annotated in my field notes, one clear observation emerges concerning the teacher-candidates who were especially engaged and overtly participatory. The top three most participatory teacher-candidates in the secondary class were an ELA teacher-candidate and two social studies teacher-candidates. The ELA teacher-candidate engaged in critical thinking (sometimes making connections to previous courses and teaching experience and sometimes interrogating the theories) and sought classroom and ELL

applications for many of the topics. The two participatory social studies teacher-candidates (and one other who was less vocal in the class but noticeably reflective) expressed their thoughts and opinions on the immediate topics, appeared intrigued by newly learned linguistic and socio-cultural ideas, and at times sought clarification. Another top participator was an ELA teacher-candidate who had a more overtly cynical view of theories and findings reported in the assigned readings<sup>47</sup> and of the applicability of course materials, but also seemed to have prior knowledge in many of the class topics. This student expressed to me in person that ELA teacher-candidates, having taken linguistics before in some form, felt they “had already been thinking for a long time” about what was being discussed in the class, and that they (speaking for her/himself and unnamed other teacher-candidates) were having trouble finding topics for the reflection papers. (Nevertheless, this teacher-candidate wrote reflection papers showing adequate engagement with course content.) The other six ELA teacher-candidates were generally less overtly engaged or less *often* engaged in the class; while the other social studies, math and science teacher-candidates were less overt but generally visibly attentive during discussions and lectures.<sup>48</sup>

Due to the complexity of judging teacher-candidates’ engagement while I was teaching, data drawn from teacher-candidates’ writings constitutes the larger and more fundamental source for generalizations and conclusions.

---

<sup>47</sup> This teacher-candidate maintained a feeling that an assigned article reporting differences in the pragmatics of a community of African-Americans’ and the local white teachers’ use of questions (Heath, 1982) was “essentializing” African-Americans, even though I had urged the class during discussion to think about each anthropological linguistics article as a case study and thereby a *possible linguistic scenario*, a generalization about *language* and not about groups of people.

<sup>48</sup> The atmosphere and overall participation patterns did not reveal obvious gender-based differences, as seen in the variable participation of men and women and of ELA and other subject area teacher-candidates. Ages ranged from an estimated 25 to 40 (no direct data was gathered), but two of the more participatory students were potentially in the older range, one mentioned having a teenage child. Further consideration of gender, age and other demographic factors potentially affecting participation and other student experience is interesting, but beyond the scope of this study.

### **Pre- and Post-tests**

Analyzing the pre-tests gives insight into the knowledge, skills and dispositions about language that teacher-candidates bring from their personal and educational backgrounds to the course. Pre-tests were then compared to the post-tests to help understand what new insights might be attributed to the course. Pre-test and post-test questions solicited two or three things the teacher-candidates know about language, and two or three things they want to learn. Answers to these questions are indicators of knowledge and dispositions about language and linguistics. Data were also drawn from three other questions 1) a West-E question on orthographic decoding (Which poses the most difficulty for an ELL whose first language is written in “an orthographic system with one-to-one sound-symbol correspondence,” municipality, development, neighborhood, or government), 2) a question soliciting corrections that might be offered to a student-generated sentence, “Not just your team does all the work and you just sit there and wait for the ball to come to you,” and 3) a question soliciting two or three similarities and differences between English and another language.

Themes that arose in analysis of the pre-tests, and thus of teacher-candidates’ background knowledge and dispositions, were dispositions of social justice, equity, understanding, caring, patience, and responsibility, miscellaneous knowledge of language and linguistic facts, and knowledge and lack of knowledge of language structure. The dispositions teacher-candidates demonstrated on the pre-test are generally those of eagerness to support ELLs and concern for their equitable learning. Dispositions are exemplified with the comments paraphrased in Table 5.

Table 5. Dispositions of secondary teacher-candidates evidenced on pre-tests

<i>Disposition Theme</i>	<i>Question from pre-test</i>	<i>TC responses (&amp; TC Specialization)</i>
social justice	What do you know about language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language is power (ELA)</li> <li>• language and power are related (ELA)</li> <li>• language can create equity or division (ELA)</li> </ul>
equity	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no language is more correct (ELA)</li> <li>• no language is better than any other (ELA)</li> </ul>
equity <sup>49</sup>	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to help with academic conventions (e.g. verb agreement, prepositions,...) (ELA)</li> </ul>
equity	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to build on L1 strengths (ELA)</li> </ul>
sensitivity, understanding	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language is part of identity (SS)</li> <li>• language is hallmark of culture (SS)</li> <li>• language is a vehicle for thought (Math)</li> <li>• perception of reality is linked to language (Science)</li> </ul>
caring, responsibility, equity	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to encourage students to engage with own English learning process (Science)</li> <li>• how to use language to create a positive learning environment (ELA)</li> </ul>
patience	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there are many unconscious rules that native speakers know (Math)</li> <li>• English has many irregularities (Math, SS)</li> </ul>

The *knowledge* of language and linguistics that was evidenced on the pre-test was more scattered. It is both unequally distributed across teacher-candidates and miscellaneous in nature, some structural and some clearly lacking structural knowledge of language. Evidence of knowledge of language structure is indicated by ideas such as that language is complex but systematic and that the *liquids* (a phonetic term for a type of sound) *l* and *r* are difficult to produce. Teacher-candidates also showed diverse or, “miscellaneous,” knowledge of language, such as that learning might be easier at younger ages, that languages are categorized into

---

<sup>49</sup> This teacher-candidate showed significant knowledge of the basic linguistic philosophy that languages and language forms are objectively equal (in complexity, logic, functionality, and validity) citing the concepts of prescriptive (normative) and descriptive (objective, structure-oriented) grammar. As such, the citing of verb agreement and use of prepositions as “academic conventions” (teacher-candidate’s wording), suggests an understanding that even descriptive grammar “correctness” is a matter of access to academic contexts, and thus of social justice and equity.

language families based on a shared ancestral language, and that knowledge of language is largely unconscious. While miscellaneous knowledge was evidenced across teacher-candidates' subject-area specializations, three of the ELA teacher-candidates (TCs) showed themselves to be especially knowledgeable about language – as indicated by the TC identifiers in Table 6.

A lack of structural knowledge was evidenced by an ELA teacher-candidate whose response to “what do you know about language” included only general statements such as that language is used to communicate and is a beautiful thing if understood, or teacher-candidates whose comparison of languages made reference only to the writing system. While it is impossible to deduce ignorance of structural concepts based on these answers, the code is used to annotate that no structural knowledge was demonstrated even when prompted (in a class such as this). It is possible that teacher-candidates might have purposely avoided writing about structure in order to resist a presumed positivist or structuralist perspective or assert a sociocultural or aesthetic primacy in their feelings toward language. Again, the code is meant to annotate only the answer on the test and not to indicate teacher-candidates' absolute knowledge, but it suggests a certain disposition toward language.

Some teacher-candidates reported wanting to learn “methods” of addressing ELL needs, as revealed in wanting to know how to modify language for improve accessibility for ELLs.

Additional exemplification of pre-test knowledge is given in Table 6.

Table 6. Teacher-candidate knowledge about language evidenced on pre-test

<i>Knowledge Theme</i>	<i>Question from the pre-test</i>	<i>TC response (&amp; TC Specialization, identifier)</i>
Structure	What do you know	• language is complex but systematic (ELA)
Structure	What do you know	• liquids <i>l</i> & <i>r</i> are difficult to produce (ELA, #10)
Miscellaneous	What do you know	• some languages have no writing (ELA, #10)

Miscellaneous	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language families (ELA, #10)</li> </ul>
Miscellaneous	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prescriptive vs. descriptive (ELA, #7)</li> </ul>
Structure, Miscellaneous	What are the differences between languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• syntax, origin of language, use of tone (ELA, #7)</li> </ul>
Miscellaneous	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• babies can make the sounds of all languages but the ability is lost as we age (ELA, #11)</li> <li>• language is learned from society (ELA, #11)</li> </ul>
Miscellaneous	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grammatical structure of non-Germanic languages (ELA, #11)</li> <li>• innate stages of acquisition (SS)</li> </ul>
Miscellaneous	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• learning language is easier when younger (SS)</li> <li>• many language have a shared root language (SS)</li> <li>• there are many unconscious rules that native speakers know (Math)</li> <li>• Chomsky found similarities among all languages (SS)</li> <li>• still learning sounds until 7-9 years old (SS)</li> <li>• language is innate for humans (SS)</li> </ul>
Lack of structural	What are the differences between languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alphabet (Spanish vs. English) (SS)</li> </ul>
Lack of structural	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• used to communicate</li> <li>• a beautiful thing if understood (ELA, #3)</li> </ul>
Methods	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to modify language for access and learning (ELA)</li> <li>• how to relate languages I have learned to my students (ELA)</li> <li>• non-verbal scaffolds (SS)</li> </ul>

Teacher-candidates' performance on the post-test was analyzed separately and then alongside the pre-test for comparison. On the first coding, clear indications of language-positive dispositions were noted; dispositions of social justice, curiosity or inquiry, of responsibility, and awareness of structural and sociolinguistic ramifications of language. Social justice or equity orientations toward language are revealed in teacher-candidate thinking about common assumptions that Americans may have about language, valuing "slang" (as student self-expression), recognizing the systematicity of varieties other than the mythical standard English,

and noting the role of language in maintaining cultural hegemony. In teacher-candidates' responses to the question about what they still want to know after the class, evidence of curiosity about language arises as teacher-candidates' wanting to know more about the history of language, about the structures of other languages, about how to learn second languages more quickly, and in their wanting to learn other languages. Especially striking are expressions of advocacy or of teacher-candidates' sense of responsibility for access to content and language development, such as the science teacher-candidate who stated that he was working on figuring out best areas of language structure to focus on incorporating into his classroom; an ELA teacher-candidate thinking about how to communicate with other subject-area teachers about their responsibility to address language, and a SS teacher-candidate planning to be reflective about his own usage and assumptions about language. This last comment demonstrates that learning about language – its structural complexity and differences and similarities across varieties as well as cultural and disciplinary usage differences – can provide an awareness that stimulates reflection about language that is an essential disposition for linguistically inclusive teaching. Another teacher-candidate's response reflects a similar disposition: "the complexity of language is more amazing and wonderful than I thought." Additional examples are in Table 7.

Table 7. Teacher-candidate dispositions evidenced on post-test

<i>Disposition Theme</i>	<i>Question from Post-test</i>	<i>TC response from post-test</i>
social justice	What do you know	• language is used to maintain cultural hegemony
social justice	What do you want to know	• common assumptions that Americans have about language
social justice	What do you want to know	• common assumptions that foreigners have about learning English <sup>50</sup>

<sup>50</sup> There is some irony and room for improvement in this students' awareness of cultural and linguistic hegemony contrasted with the use of "American" and "foreigner" here if reference was being made to either native (monolingual) English speakers versus SLES or to native-born versus immigrant Americans. It is unclear due to the

social justice	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• slang should be more highly valued</li> </ul>
social justice	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• just because it "sounds wrong" doesn't mean it doesn't have rules"</li> </ul>
social justice, equity	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all languages are connected in some way</li> </ul>
curiosity	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to more easily learn another language</li> </ul>
curiosity	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• history of language, other communication systems, how language changes</li> </ul>
curiosity	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• structure of languages other than English</li> </ul>
curiosity	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more about agglutinative languages, more about Korean, Vietnamese, new morphologies (SS)</li> </ul>
curiosity, responsibility	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• causes of differences and difficulties in language learning (ELA)</li> </ul>
responsibility, advocating	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "working on figuring out best areas of language structure to focus on incorporating into my classroom" (Science)</li> <li>• there are specific things we can do to scaffold academic language" (ELA)</li> <li>• a simpler method to help students understand academic language (SS)</li> </ul>
awareness, responsibility	What was the last conversation you had about language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reflections/assumptions about my own language (SS)</li> </ul>
wonder of language	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• complexity of language is more amazing and wonderful than I thought (ELA)</li> <li>• linguistics has many functions and should be explicitly taught (ELA)</li> </ul>

There was a significant amount of language awareness and structural, cultural, and sociolinguistic *knowledge* reflected on the post-test as well. While I did not code separately for types of structural knowledge (phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantics, pragmatic), all of these were exemplified, especially in response to “what do you know about language.” Many responses were “factoid”-like, but one science teacher-candidate’s response especially showed thinking about how structural awareness can have classroom applications and

---

brevity of the teacher-candidates statement. It could also have been a reference to language attitudes in the US compared to other countries.

evidence of an inquiry disposition: “language has structures that can be analyzed to help students understand.”

Knowledge of language structure was also applied in response to the prompt for feedback on the example student writing, “Not just your team does all the work and you just stand there.” A social studies teacher-candidate responded with questions s/he could ask to elicit the student’s awareness of the basic subject-verb-object word order and conceptualization of agent-verb-theme ordering that underlies the basic form and function of simple sentences (“Who is doing the action? What are they doing? And who is the action done to?”). This method of questioning mirrors a functional linguistics approach to helping students understand structure-function (meaning) connections. It draws attention to the expected structure of sentences by eliciting the functional parts (thematic roles) in the expected order.<sup>51</sup> Compared to this teacher-candidates’ pre-test response, “What does ‘not just’ apply to?”, this response shows deeper awareness of syntactic and functional linguistic concepts and ability to guide students’ engagement with language.

An additional theme exemplified was an *awareness* of cross-linguistic differences that might support reflection about one’s own language use and inquiry about SLES students’ first language structures. Knowledge of sociolinguistics and acquisition was also exhibited, as was thinking about language scaffolding methods. Perhaps in response to the somewhat involved analysis methodology of Fang and Schleppegrell (2010), one teacher-candidate replied that he/she would like to learn a simpler method to help students understand academic language (SS); another teacher-candidate’s take-away was that there are specific things teachers can do to scaffold academic language. The post-test thus gives a glimpse of dispositions and knowledge that teacher-candidates take with them from the class.

---

<sup>51</sup> This feedback is not perfect, of course. It falls short of assisting with the focus or other emphatic fronting that the student was attempting to use; something like “*It should not be the case that your team does all the work...*”). But it shows and elicits an understanding of basic sentence structure and draws attention to language form and function.

Table 8. Teacher-candidates' knowledge evidenced on post-test

<i>Knowledge Theme</i>	<i>Question from post-test</i>	<i>TC response on post-test</i>
structure	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• polysemy is one word with two or more meanings (SS)</li> <li>• language has structures that can be analyzed to help understand (Science)</li> <li>• morphemes, bound and free morphemes (ELA)</li> <li>• polysynthetic languages (ELA)</li> <li>• word formation/ structures (SS)</li> </ul>
structure	How would you give feedback on this sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>TC asks:</i> who is doing action, what is the action, who is the action done to (SS)</li> </ul>
structure	How are languages different	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• word order, verb conjugations (Science)</li> </ul>
structure	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• why Latin &amp; Greek roots are not in the Common Core for high school, since technical vocabulary (to which they apply) is in the Common Core (ELA)</li> </ul>
structure, cross-linguistic	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there are morphological differences across languages (SS)</li> <li>• language is made up of semantics, morphology, syntax and languages have different form (SS)</li> <li>• there are a lot of phonemes that don't occur in English (SS)</li> <li>• there are a variety of ways in which language is formed (ELA)</li> <li>• English is in the Indo-European language family (SS)</li> </ul>
structure, cross-linguistic	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more about agglutinative languages, new morphologies (SS)</li> </ul>
awareness of world languages	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to speak Spanish, Tagalog and more (ELA)</li> </ul>
acquisition	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• theories of development (SS)</li> <li>• acquired in stages (Science)</li> </ul>
sociolinguistics	What do you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social context can be a key element in understanding language (SS)</li> </ul>
methods	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a simpler method to help students understand academic language (SS)</li> <li>• there are specific things we can do to scaffold academic language (ELA)</li> </ul>
miscellaneous	What do you want to know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• history of language, other communication systems, how language changes (SS)</li> </ul>

Considered alongside the pre-test, it is evident that not all dispositions and knowledge necessarily come from this class. Many had entered the class with social justice and equity-oriented dispositions as evidenced on the pre-test, and the knowledge exhibited on the post-test was clearly not all new, especially for ELA teacher candidates, and not all attributable to this class. On the other hand, there was very little class time left for teacher-candidates to complete the post-test on the last day of class following their presentations. Their answers on the post-test were likely hurried and not necessarily representative of *all* they learned during the class.

Regardless, comparison of responses on the pre- and post-test per teacher-candidate revealed a greater depth of understanding on the post-test in several cases. Four teacher-candidates' answers exemplify this added depth of understanding. One ELA teacher-candidate entered the course saying (on the pre-test) that language is complex but systematic and exited saying (on the post-test) that the complexity of language is more amazing and wonderful than s/he thought. A social studies teacher-candidate entered knowing that Chomsky found similarities between all languages and exited knowing that language is made up of semantics, morphology, and syntax and that languages differ in these areas. The social studies teacher-candidate who highlighted sentence form and function in the question about feedback s/he would offer on the awkward student sentence on the post-test, had asked only "what does 'not just' apply to?" on the pre-test. And a science teacher-candidate who entered with a wonderful disposition of wanting to know how to encourage students to engage with their own second language acquisition revealed a pointed sense of responsibility on the exit quiz in writing that s/he was thinking about how to incorporate language into her/his own classroom. Additional comparisons are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Comparisons of Pre-tests and post-tests

TC's Specialization	Pretest responses	Post-test responses
ELA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language is complex but systematic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• complexity of language is more amazing and wonderful than I thought</li> </ul>
SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chomsky found similarities between all languages</li> <li>• differences between languages: alphabet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language is made up of semantics, morphology, syntax and languages have different structures</li> </ul>
SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language is used for communication and is part of identity</li> <li>• want to know: how to leverage L1 assets</li> <li>• differences between languages: alphabet, cognates, irregulars/ rules</li> <li>• feedback: what does “not just” apply to?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there are a lot of phonemes that don't occur in English</li> <li>• social context can be a key element in understanding language</li> <li>• want to know: a simpler method to help students understand academic language</li> <li>• feedback: who is doing action, what is the action, who the action is done to</li> </ul>
Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one's perception of reality is linked to language</li> <li>• it is possible to master artful and academic language in a second language</li> <li>• want to know: how to encourage students to engage with own second language acquisition</li> <li>• want to know: research-based scaffolds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• language has structures that can be analyzed to help students understand</li> <li>• language is acquired in stages</li> <li>• differences between languages: word order, verb conjugations</li> <li>• working on figuring out best areas of language structure to focus on incorporating into my classroom</li> </ul>
SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• easier when younger</li> <li>• shared root language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• word formation/ structures</li> <li>• morphological differences across languages</li> <li>• want to know: history of language, other communication systems, how language changes</li> </ul>

Between the two tests compared here, these teacher candidates had completed four courses including mine and a teaching practicum with SLES students as the whole of an ELL endorsement program, any and all of which might have contributed to deeper understandings

about language acquisition, language differences, the importance of language in learning and teaching, and to dispositions of responsibility, curiosity and advocating for SLES. It seems likely, however, that details of linguistic structure (such as knowing about polysynthetic languages and stages of acquisition) and form-function connections came from our course content and experiences. In general, then, the pre- and post-test suggest that some teacher-candidates gained depth of understanding of language (structure, usage, acquisition, and variation) and strengthened dispositions of inquiry, equity and responsibility for students' language development.

### **Linguistic Autobiographies**

A "Linguistic Knowledge and Attitudes Autobiography" was due in the second week of class, and analysis of teacher-candidates' writing offers additional insight into what they were thinking about language before the course. The narrative would have been written *after* some lecture and discussion about prescriptive versus descriptive grammar and the basic principles of linguistic studies, the role of language in school and in teachers' work (citing Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2002), and thinking about the English, first language, cultural, and schooling backgrounds of SLES students from the first class meeting in addition to any reading they might have started for the second meeting (on phonetics and phonology). To motivate thinking about linguistic topics and the role of language in their lives, teacher-candidates were to write a two-page narrative on the following topic:

"how and what you have learned about language up to this point: about how to do language, about what language is, about how to teach or talk about language, about the role of language in your life, work, play, relationships, about how 'others' do language, about different kinds of language. What do you remember being taught explicitly and how did you (and others) react? What *realizations* about language can you remember making yourself? Can you pinpoint any *assumptions* you have made about language? Any *attitudes*? What have been your feelings or general thinking about language (your

first language(s), your second language(s), other people's languages) and grammar?"  
(from the course syllabus)

Five general themes, or clusters of themes, arose from analysis of the autobiographies, and the subject-area specializations of teacher-candidates exemplifying each theme were tallied as well. The themes are, in order of increasing linguistic responsiveness: prescriptivism, Standard English for power, an equity disposition, empathy, and linguistic awareness. The categories overlap with each other in some cases, so the codes are presented in the tables alongside the excerpts from teacher-candidates' autobiographies for clarity of exemplification. In addition, the same teacher-candidate may have written on more than one theme; no attempt was made to categorize the entire content of each teacher-candidates' writing into a single theme.

***Prescriptive mindset or sense of aptitude***

The first theme is that of prescriptivism, referring to normative thinking about "proper" grammar and value judgments or emotional reactions to "incorrect" grammar or usage by others. One SS and five ELA teacher-candidates manifested this theme. Also included in this theme were evidence of a narrow understanding of grammar as that traditionally taught at primary schools (one SS teacher-candidate), dichotomous thinking about feedback aimed at correct grammar and that aimed at content or meaning (one ELA), and notably, a sense of personal aptitude for reading, writing, or grammar or an identification with the English language (three ELA). Examples of this disposition are comments such as "I still get annoyed by ...," "I often avoid dangling prepositions, as I am an English major, after all" and "...English, the language I love."

This theme consists of a disposition contrary to linguistic inclusiveness in its privileging of standard or prescriptive language. This disposition is grouped together with aptitude for

English or grammar because the latter also suggests a personal identification as expert or talented that is predicted to affect the teacher-candidates' dispositions (negatively) toward language varieties and possibly other languages and SLES English *errors*, also contradicting linguistic inclusiveness goals. While the tone of the quotations is not obviously one of animosity toward other language varieties, they do suggest that a deep understanding and positive attitudes toward variation are lacking. More examples of this theme are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Prescriptivism exemplified in Linguistic Knowledge and Attitude Autobiographies

<i>TC's subject-area</i>	<i>Quotation from Linguistic Autobiography</i>	<i>Codes</i>
ELA	I have a somewhat innate tendency to consider [grammar] as highly important, and a “nervous twitch” to correct it when I find error. I often avoid dangling prepositions, as I am an English major, after all.	prescriptivism
ELA	All of these [grammar] corrections used to infuriate me, but somewhere along the line, I internalized these prescriptive rules. Now they are my rules, and I’m just as irritating, I fear. I care about these little things, although I try to reserve the judgment inherent in labels such as “not very bright.”	prescriptivism
ELA	It has been difficult to let go of the desire to correct for grammatical rules and instead to read for ideas and inner thinking. This way of approaching the writing of ELL students is very much a work in progress, and I’m not sure when objectives regarding conventions are appropriate for ELL students.	dichotomy: grammar <i>or</i> content (feedback)
ELA	[there are] hierarchies in my own native tongue. There was casual, uneducated, “grammatically incorrect” English which my father spoke with...“clean” and “precise” language that my teachers and smart, educated people I saw in the media speak with. My father ... encouraged me to use articulate speech ...was elitist about language use. I remember being scolded for not using a word properly or when my sentences did not make sense. ...He would say derogatory things behind their backs when they spoke less desirable dialects or used slang... . I remember feeling irritated when I heard students using “improper” English. I’ve never been a huge fan of slang. My only other exposure to languages came from school. I never learned to communicate in another language...I learned some Spanish when I lived in Madrid, Spain for almost a year. At this point, what I learned is lost. I do not use it.	elitism, prescriptivism, minimal take-away from world language experiences

SS	it usually bothers me, and reduces my respect for the writer, ... [written language] should inherently be more precise and more structured than spoken language. ...[e.g. figurative use of "literally"]	prescriptivism (written language)
ELA	languages other than my own that others seemed to consider as less valuable than our own -- Spanish and a very old Native American language that few could speak fluently...	prescriptivism, language/racism
SS	In my younger days, I was quite uptight about language. I thought there was one correct way to do it, and I worked hard to master grammar so that I wouldn't appear stupid. This emphasis on standard English assuredly came from my family.	early prescriptivism, narrow grammar
ELA	I learned the rules and names of grammar	narrow grammar
SS	I remember learning grammar through corrections	narrow grammar
ELA	The problem with grammar is that when you hear the word, most people think of boring and useless rules. ... The question remains for all teachers: How do I effectively teach grammar rules in a fun and innovative way?	narrow grammar
ELA	I will admit that I was a grammar snob, growing up... From an early age, I was a good reader, a great writer, and had a knack for spelling, grammar, and punctuation. I remember correcting the language of peers, siblings, and (much to his chagrin) my stepfather, almost constantly. I went through high school and most of college self-identifying as someone inherently good at doing language. I thought of it as a natural talent. ...[later] I felt guilty about my past attitudes toward language and all the people I had misjudged as deficient in one way or another based on how they spoke. I began to resent grammar. ...questioned whether or not grammar should even be taught in schools. ...I realized that my talent for reading and writing was not an inherent quality, but likely due to the fact that books had always been a part of my life and that my parents spoke Standard English at home.	English aptitude, identity
ELA	the language I considered "mine" in fact belonged to many other people, including those who may know it as a second, third, or fourth language... but I have no gift for communicating in a language that is not mine ...want to help others navigate the sometimes convoluted rules and usage of English, the language I love .	English identity

### *Standard English as social power*

A second disposition in evidence was one of recognizing the power associated with Standard English and a sense of responsibility for modeling and teaching it. Four ELA and two SS teacher-candidates spoke on this theme. Representative comments are “my current theory that the teaching of Academic Language must be explicit, targeted, and carefully executed...” (ELA), “It is the responsibility of educators to ensure that all students are fluent in Standard English and Academic Language, and this means that we must teach them explicitly,” and “I want to be able to strike a balance [in my teaching] between following the traditional rules and language conventions and using language as it is actually spoken.” Additional exemplification can be seen in Table 11.

This theme reveals a more equity-oriented attitude toward standard English and variation in language than the previous theme, especially where teacher-candidates showed a sense of responsibility to make the expected forms explicit for those who have not had access to them. These comments demonstrate recognition of linguistic prejudice, a sense of agency, and social justice goals that are in line with linguistic inclusiveness. What is missing in these writings is validation of students’ *other* varieties.

Table 11. "Power of Standard English" disposition evidenced in Linguistic Autobiographies

<i>TC's subject-area</i>	<i>Quotation from Linguistic Autobiography</i>	<i>Codes</i>
ELA	...without proper grammar teaching, it is difficult for individuals to communicate in the real world.	Standard English for power

ELA	I realized that Standard English is tightly interwoven with academic success and thus social mobility ... my current theory that the teaching Academic Language must be explicit, targeted, and carefully executed. Because not all children enter the school system on an equal playing field in terms of ability with Standard English, it is the job of teachers to not only teach Academic Language, but to draw upon the diverse linguistic resources in the classroom in a meaningful way.	Standard English for power, explicit teaching, equity
ELA	I understand that most people do not think this way. Therefore, language is a powerful tool in society. It is the responsibility of educators to ensure that all students are fluent in Standard English and Academic Language and this means that we must teach them explicitly. However, I still have questions about how to teach in a way that honors all language. <sup>52</sup>	Standard English for power, balance, honoring SLES languages
ELA	I have found [how language is learned and used] to be enormously complicated and fascinating; a basic question of whether students need to know how to speak what I've always considered my mother's English. ... teaching of standard, academic English to students while both reserving my mother's judgment and empowering students. I look at code-switching as a way into new situations and a tool for social change	Standard English for power; responsibility, inquiry
ELA	the language of the educated class as power	Standard English as power
ELA	This year, I have had to push myself even further than before to speak with correct, prescriptive grammar. I do believe that this is important to model and teach so that my students will learn this skill, this hat they will need to wear in order to function in an academic setting.	Standard English for power
SS	I want to be able to strike a balance between following the traditional rules and language conventions and using language as it is actually spoken. This, I feel, is especially important in giving ELL students the tools they need to be able to operate outside of a classroom context. ...While it could be argued that students are bound to pick up more conversational English outside of the classroom, it seems unlikely that a teacher constantly telling them that these language forms are wrong would facilitate that process.	Standard English as power, responsibility to SLES

<sup>52</sup> The last comment by this teacher-candidate, about honoring students' language varieties, places this thinking also in the next theme of sociolinguistic awareness and a sense of linguistic equity.

*Equity and sociolinguistic awareness*

A third theme was that of linguistic equity, also coded as sociolinguistic awareness and other *in vivo* codes. Teacher-candidates thinking along this theme showed that they were seeking balance between teaching Standard English on the one hand and honoring students’ languages, recognizing linguistic resources and the value of bilingualism, or seeing beauty or opportunity in language diversity on the other. Five ELA teacher-candidates and three others wrote within this theme. Exemplary comments are “language belongs to the people who use it,” “language, in short, connects us but also divides us, can create equality but also perpetuates social hierarchies,” and “students need to feel comfortable using their own language and means of representing what they are observing and what they are thinking, but the words and symbols that we are learning in class are important.” Further exemplification can be seen in Table 12.

This theme shows teacher-candidates thinking one further step toward linguistic inclusiveness in validating student language, and in some cases, in welcoming its use in the classroom. Some teacher-candidates already revealed laudable linguistic inclusiveness dispositions at the time the linguistic autobiographies were written.

Table 12. Equity and Sociolinguistic Awareness evidenced in Linguistic Autobiographies

<i>TC's subject-area</i>	<i>Quotation from Linguistic Autobiography</i>	<i>Codes</i>
ELA	Language belongs to the people who use it. I believe in the playfulness of language, in its evolving and flexible forms. In a language like English, with its myriad forms and its constant changes over its medium-length history, understanding its flexibility is essential to understanding both its inconsistent spelling and grammar and its global and historical usage. ...the language I considered “mine” in fact belonged to many other people, including those who may know it as a second, third, or fourth language.	equity disposition, awareness
ELA	Now, as a professional, I see code-switching [between registers] as a skill that could bring all students together.	equity, awareness

ELA	I had since experienced learning a second language for myself and meeting people who were fully bilingual or multilingual. My feelings on the value of language had been completely reversed. I envied those who could speak another language or more than their first language. ...ways to understand another human being's perspective on life	value of bilingualism, culture
ELA	[I recognized the] beauty of foreign languages,... magnificence of diversity in language and the cultural ties	beauty of language
SS	Noam Chomsky has shown ways in which the innate structures function and connect us. ... The diversity of language is a beautiful because it shows the capacity of the linguistic areas of the brain to produce unique systems, but these different communication systems also keep cultures separated ... Language, in short, connects us but also divides us, can create equality but also perpetuates social hierarchies.	equity disposition/awareness , sociolinguistic awareness
Science	Students need to feel comfortable using their own language and means of representing what they are observing and what they are thinking, but the words and symbols that we are learning in class are important. They give us a very particular and useful set of tools for representing and exploring reality.	awareness, balance
ELA	I understand that most people do not think this way. Therefore, language is a powerful tool in society. It is the responsibility of educators to ensure that all students are fluent in Standard English and Academic Language and this means that we must teach them explicitly. However, I still have questions about how to teach in a way that honors all language.	Standard English for power, balance, honoring SLES languages
Math	Socially, the Mexican-Americans who I suppose to be generation 1, 1.5 and 2 immigrants were almost completely segregated from the other cliques I saw at my school; <i>I didn't understand why</i> . During college, ...I joined a group in Seattle called the Seattle Spanish Society. Here I found community in a group of immigrants mostly from South America... More than anything else, I found that people find out how to communicate when they need to. <sup>53</sup>	equity, sensitivity, unity
Math	"how do I both teach them English because it'll be important for them both in our society and in the global society; while also valuing the language resources they have?"	balance English and valuing L1

<sup>53</sup> It was difficult to select quotations that adequately demonstrate the equity thinking of this teacher-candidate, who related his experiences in working and struggling to learn Spanish in South America, difficulties with dialects, registers of work versus church, and second-language varieties of Spanish, her/his own included. The overall tone was one of equity as recognizing the reversibility of language learner and native speaker roles, sensitivity to the challenges of second language acquisition, and sense of communal effort in communication and learning.

***Empathy***

The fourth theme was that of empathy, often through “enlightening experiences,” and understanding that culture, perspective and identity are involved with language. Four ELA, four Social Studies and two other teacher candidates wrote along this theme. Examples are found in Table 13, including “[I gained] insight into the struggles that ELs face when they are immersed in world of language they do not understand. It is exhausting and frustrating,” and “communicating with [my wife, who is a SLES] is a daily reminder of the importance of language and of the importance culture plays in defining the meaning of words and phrases.”

This theme involves a strong disposition of caring and identification with SLES that is fundamental in linguistic inclusiveness. For these teacher-candidates, if the disposition is truly strong, we mainly need to develop knowledge and skills toward linguistic inclusiveness. It would also have been a good use of class time to have these teacher-candidates share their experiences.

Table 13. Empathy evidenced in Linguistic Autobiographies

<i>TC's subject-area</i>	<i>Quotation from Linguistic Autobiography</i>	<i>Codes</i>
Science	[Study abroad was] a roller-coaster ride, I felt trapped, a language that made me sound like an idiot, ... I suffered headaches and emotional burn out. ... the better I got at my new language, the more I seemed to understand my own, started to feel like I understood the culture and the world around me in a different way	enlightening experiences, empathy
Math	Some contexts were still difficult: I tried going to church – and the things they talk about in church are different than conversations I’d have in other contexts. ... I found that where people were from or their background made a huge impact on how well we could communicate. I stayed with people from the countryside whose first language was Quechua and then had learned Spanish. I couldn’t understand their Spanish as well, just as they couldn’t understand mine as well.	enlightening experiences
SS	Different cultures will have their own sounds, gestures and even rhetorical strategies because when we are not using language to learn we are often using it to persuade.	culture, social functions of language

SS	I was a military kid, and so we moved all over—the Midwest (Missouri and Kansas), the South (South Carolina, Georgia, Texas), and Germany. [accent was made fun of, felt isolated]	enlightening experiences
SS	My newfound recognition of the expanse of language... reading primary documents from various historical eras, and I had begun acting, and trying out different accents...	enlightening experiences, sociolinguistic awareness
SS	Communicating with [my wife, who is SLES] is a daily reminder of the importance of language and of the importance culture plays in defining the meaning of words and phrases. It's been fun (and hardly at all frustrating!) trying to build the language bridge between us so that we truly understand what the other is saying.	culture, understanding, second language grammar (empathy)
ELA	Not only will [SLES's] knowledge be tested daily, but it will also be a permanent placement. This is not just a "study abroad" where they can leave after a few months.	empathy
ELA	... [I gained] insight into the struggles that ELs face when they are immersed in world of language they do not understand. It is exhausting and frustrating.	empathy
ELA	Over time and exposure to diversity, I came to really understand and appreciate that language use was not a barometer for intelligence, like my father had believed. Without the vital tool language, I could not be successful in that society. It is a gatekeeper.	sociolinguistic awareness
ELA	Different aspects of my identity are now different ways I can communicate with the world. I have multiple elements that make up who I am today, and all of those elements have greatly influenced the way I speak and interact with the people around me. ... Language is personal, and very much tied to your identity.	language and identity

### *Linguistic Awareness*

The final theme captured cases where teacher-candidates showed objective knowledge of language; having had experiences with grammar, having awareness of structure, register or dialect differences, and recognizing the fallibility of language as a tool for communicating. Two ELA teacher-candidates and three others revealed this kind of knowledge, including learning Latin grammar and the structure of words, diagramming sentences, and understanding that African-American English is a dialect. This kind of knowledge can be useful in building positive dispositions and a repertoire of linguistically inclusive teaching practices.

Table 14. Linguistic Awareness evidenced in Linguistic Autobiographies

<i>TC's subject-area</i>	<i>Quotation from Linguistic Autobiography</i>	<i>Codes</i>
SS	<p>I took Latin at a Catholic High school ...and learned a lot about the formation and structure of words. I still recognize cognates to this day, in English and in other languages, and sometimes my hunches are even correct.</p> <p>I became a debater, and learned the registers of professionalism, procedure, and protest. ...</p> <p>I use language in a deferential register when working as a waiter, and academic language when in school or writing papers like this one.</p>	grammar experiences
SS	<p>the thing I remember most clearly about instruction in English class (other than reading novels) is diagramming sentences. While most of my classmates found the diagramming to be boring, I was kind of excited that language could be broken down in that way.</p>	grammar awareness
Science	<p>...the words and symbols that we are learning in class are important. They give us a very particular and useful set of tools for representing and exploring reality.</p> <p>One of the most important things that I take from both science and language is that both are tools that we are using to represent reality and both seem to come up short. We are able to represent partial truths and pieces of a larger picture.</p>	objectivity
ELA	<p>Different ways of speaking the same language each follow sets of rules that can be described.</p>	grammar awareness
ELA	<p>I grew up in a Black neighborhood in [small city], which introduced me to the cadence and language play of hip-hop and African-American Vernacular English (AAVE); summers in Singapore...</p>	dialect awareness

Overall, there is much variation in the dispositions and knowledge relevant to linguistic inclusiveness in these early writings. There is also complex overlap of themes, where some teacher-candidates with contrary dispositions privileging Standard English also showed empathy toward SLES or knowledge of language that would potentially be useful in linguistically inclusive teaching. In short, for some teacher-candidates, linguistic inclusiveness dispositions needed to be engendered in the class, and for some, learning could be focused on a linguistic knowledge base and skills for linguistically inclusive teaching.

### **Summary of teacher-candidates' thinking at the beginning of the course**

The pre-tests and linguistic autobiographies reflect a starting point for the teacher-candidates, or a baseline of what they entered knowing and believing about language (to the extent that the assignments elicited this thinking). A number of teacher-candidates showed linguistic inclusiveness-oriented dispositions of social justice (three teacher-candidates), equity (four), understanding, caring (four), patience (two), and responsibility for supporting language-learning (two) on their pretests in short-answer responses to the question soliciting what they know about language. Evidence of factual and structural knowledge of language was rather scattered for this question on the pre-test, and limited also in the linguistic autobiographies.

In the autobiographies, similar linguistic inclusiveness dispositions were revealed with equity thinking in the writing of eight teacher-candidates and empathy also in eight teacher-candidates' writings. On the other hand, prescriptive tendencies and an emphasis on standard English were also prevalent, each found in six teacher-candidates' autobiographies. While making language expectations explicit is a goal of linguistically inclusive teaching, these autobiographies revealed dispositions of privileging standard English or espousing standard English as part of one's expertise or identity that could stand in the way of linguistically inclusive thinking.

Quite strikingly, more of the ELA teacher-candidates revealed prescriptive dispositions and privileging of standard English in their linguistic autobiographies than discussed their structural or factual knowledge of language (theme: linguistic awareness). Given that they had all had an introductory linguistics class (or Structure of English) prior to taking this class, this pattern is notable. However long prior their linguistics course might have been (one teacher-

candidate mentioned it had been over ten years), it is striking that they took very little from that class, remembered or valued little to use in discussing how and what they had learned about language or formulated their current thinking about language. ELA teacher-candidates did show equity dispositions and empathy (five and four teacher-candidates, respectively), but only two were able to make use of the structural, objective material from their previous linguistics courses in other departments.<sup>54</sup> This is an important finding, given that teacher education researchers have recommended an introductory linguistics course be required of teacher-candidates. If the course is not taught within the context of teacher education, it may be difficult for teacher-candidates to make the intended connections to their teaching ideologies and practices.

Since this course was part of a post-certification ELL endorsement program, it is likely that many of the dispositions relevant to linguistic inclusiveness that teacher-candidates brought with them to the course (empathy and equity-thinking as seen in the autobiographies, and social justice, equity, understanding, caring, patience, and responsibility on the pre-test) might have origins in their certification program and its social justice theme or specifically in the required multicultural education course. That some of this thinking can be applied to language and linguistic minorities is suggestive of both the interdependence of cultural and linguistic responsiveness and the importance of teacher-candidates engaging in linguistic self-reflection. The reflective essays discussed in the next sections allow us additional insights into teacher-candidates' thinking and specific learning from the course that was valuable.

---

<sup>54</sup> If on the same university campus, these courses could have been taken in the English or Linguistics departments. The Linguistics course is structured as a lecture-all class of over 200 students three days per week with two days of small-group "quiz section" with a teaching assistant as instructor. The department has decidedly theoretical leanings, and the course may or may not include second language acquisition. It would normally cover phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and sociolinguistics with a Chomskyan approach. It is expected that courses that would satisfy the same English major graduation requirements would have similar scope, if not the same theoretical framework.

## First Reflection Essay

Teacher-candidates were assigned two reflection essays to be completed during the term whenever a particular topic struck their interest. The assignment was as follows:

In no more than 2 double-spaced pages, reflect on any of the topics discussed in the readings, textbook and classroom (or online discussions) that strikes a chord with you -- as important, useful, relevant, familiar, reminiscent of an experience; new to you, uncomfortable, difficult to grasp, controversial, "deeper" than it seems at first glance; and especially, *applicable* in your work (and discuss *how*). Cite from the readings or give an example and "definition" of a linguistic concept, and discuss your ideas on the topic, how it relates to your teaching, and how you will apply your knowledge of the concept(s). Think of this as a blog entry or use an essay format – be informational. Also feel free to pose questions that you might seek answers to on your own or with colleagues, classmates, students, or your instructor(s).

The reflection essay was to be completed before we began discussing another topic in the next week's class, but perhaps due to the third week's class being cancelled for a workshop or some other external factors, it was necessary to call for the teacher-candidates to submit a reflection on "any topic covered so far" during the sixth week of the course (after the fifth meeting, so that they would have other topics available for the second reflection essay). Topics covered up to that point were: prescriptive versus descriptive grammar, phonetics and phonology, language acquisition theories, stages and factors, semantics, language in social context (pragmatics, sociolinguistics (U.S. dialects), cultural linguistics), and morphology.

The first reflections touched on many of the areas that had been discussed in class to that point, including phonology, morphology (including vocabulary acquisition, word families and word-types), dialects, and pragmatics, and referring to readings in anthropological linguistics and Nagy and Anderson's (1984) study ultimately asserting that vocabulary must be "taught" through morphology and encouragement of free reading. Some teacher-candidates expressed a growing understanding of the unconsciousness of much linguistic knowledge. Other topics were reminiscent of the linguistic autobiographies, with teacher-candidates using new knowledge from

our class to inform their thinking on prescriptive grammar rules, register, power in language use, and bilingualism.

Two teacher-candidates who referenced morphology, however, relied heavily on learning from outside our class that emphasized the teaching of Latin and Greek roots. One wrote:

“I learned that teaching Latin and Greek roots might be the best way to teach vocabulary and to promote an environment of word consciousness in my future classroom. ... Teaching Latin and Greek roots enables students to decode new words upon encountering them, supports awareness of word families, and teaches students about morphology. I find the practice to be very empowering; ... Reading this research cemented my belief in this practice.” -- ELA teacher-candidate

The methods these teacher-candidates referenced, however, were directly contradicted by our supplemental morphology reading, Nagy and Anderson (1984), who report findings that studying Latin and Greek roots did *not* lead to gains in vocabulary and reading comprehension. Their main assertion is that vocabulary acquisition is best aided by instruction in basic English derivational morphology and encouragement of free reading, given that approximately 78% of the words encountered in school reading materials consists of derived forms. It would seem that some teacher-candidates were, at this point, finding support in our class discussions for pre-existing beliefs. A similar case was the ELA teacher-candidate who made a connection between the dialect history of U.S. English discussed in our textbook, Denham and Lobeck (2013), and Standard English rules or prescriptivism. This was a holdover from this teacher-candidate's pre-test where she/he recognized African-American English as an equally rich and complex dialect based partly on her/his childhood in a predominantly African-American neighborhood. S/he did, however, relate dialects to the teaching of Standard English in suggesting that knowing where prescriptive rules come from might help students to remember them. Another ELA teacher-candidate who mentioned teaching Greek and Latin roots and failed to note Nagy and

Anderson's (1984) observations, did draw from our course readings to inform the morphology instruction s/he was doing with SLES (using the concept of *bound* roots).

Three teacher-candidates' main focus for the reflection was in the area of language use or pragmatics. An ELA teacher-candidate, making use of both prior knowledge and new concepts, pointed out that pragmatic rules are subconsciously known (new or reinforced learning), and that teachers must scaffold practice using the appropriate language for each type of audience. (The emphasis on *audience* is from outside our class.) One SS teacher-candidate noted students' use of a conversational *register* in writing and suggested that "by noting it myself and by illustrating how and when to use each type of register, I can provide a strong model for the students to follow." A math teacher-candidate appreciated that "immigrant kids in particular haven't yet learned the *scripts* that adults know. They bring an earnestness and knowledge about language, culture and the world that I know nothing about" (emphasis added).

Most teacher-candidates drew from more than one topic in linguistics to formulate their thoughts, such as the ELA teacher-candidate who was thinking about "what is concrete and what is open to variation" in language, or, what is open to manipulation and what is unconscious. This teacher-candidate compared phonology as well as closed word-classes such as prepositions, which are not consciously manipulable, to jargon, slang, acronyms and other newly created words and closed by pondering "what we, as a society, consider to be words, which ones we value, and why... ." This reflection referenced phonology, morphology, sociolinguistics and the unconsciousness of language.

Indeed, themes were difficult to generalize, as teacher-candidates touched on diverse topics and showed variable engagement and development toward linguistic inclusiveness. Clearly some knowledge and experience with language was informing both pre-existing beliefs

and insights of value for linguistically inclusive dispositions. Again, collaborative discussion of these reflections might have been a valuable exercise.

Though a grand summary is not forthcoming, representative excerpts from four more teacher-candidates' reflections are presented in Table 15 along with the exemplified topics (codes). These varied reflections were especially thoughtful, probing issues of how secondary subject teachers need to engage in language teaching, how interpretations of language are inevitably biased and imperfect, how prevalent myths about languages promulgate prejudice and exclude objective conversation, and how the unconscious nature of language knowledge can play a profound role in learning through a second language. Especially insightful portions are italicized. These reflection essays show the power of specific articles, anecdotes, or even singular concepts, such as that of the phoneme, to spark deeper thinking about language and how it affects learning and virtually all of our human interactions, or perhaps, to make abstract recognition of the importance of language more personal and concrete.

Table 15. Diverse linguistic insights from first reflection essays

<i>TC's subject-area</i>	<i>Quotation from first reflection essay</i>	<i>Codes</i>
SS	I have been extremely excited while reading about morphology because the implications for instruction are huge. I am increasingly trying to learn as many techniques to teach language acquisition as possible and to know that I can teach these morphology rules that will allow students to teach themselves new words is encouraging. ... I will also have to use methods that will inspire them to read more. <i>This is extremely important because as secondary teachers we may not think that we have to teach a lot of the skills these students need.</i>	morphology, vocabulary acquisition, Nagy & Anderson (1984), explicit language teaching, responsibility

SS	<p>But the true heart of the article I read [Wilce, 2012] wasn't about how the intents and purposes of language can be bandied about at will by masters of grammar. What really matters about the article I read is that language itself—<i>not just words, but language</i>—can be used by those who possess its mastery to support existing power structures and oppress those without a similar command of the grammar. ... <i>But how many of us were able to communicate exactly the author's intentions in each of our respective articles? [our analyses were inevitably] based on our own set of experiences.</i></p> <p>... <i>Will we be able to recognize socio-linguistic dilemmas when they appear in our own classroom?</i></p>	<p>Wilce (2012), Language as power, inevitability of perspective (postpositivism)</p>
Science	<p>Pullum's essay on "The Great Eskimo Vocabulary Hoax" made me think about the other ways similar to this that <i>folklore about language is used as a way to bolster existing policies and support existing prejudices</i>. Pullum gives numerous examples of the way that this tale of the Eskimo language moves throughout the popular discourse without anyone ever looking for actual evidence or questioning their assumptions. It seems like the anecdote does nothing to further any linguistic discourse but <i>rather serves as a vehicle to essentialize a group of people outside of our culture</i>. ... <i>[this and other common, prejudicial language myths] is unfortunate not only because it perpetuates oppression and marginalization of people, but also because it decreases the ability for meaningful discourse around actual research and real findings</i>.</p>	<p>Great Eskimo Vocab. Hoax (Pullum, 1991), prejudice, lack of objective views on language</p>
SS	<p>One topic that has been particularly significant for me in my understanding of language in this course so far has been the discussion of phonemes. ...it eventually struck me that the vowel in my name is a phoneme that does not exist in [this student's first language]. This helped me to understand the student's confusion in an entirely different light. ... <i>Trying to understand and remember a word that you cannot pronounce or even say in your own mind is extremely difficult, and could have a significant impact on student learning</i>.</p>	<p>Phonology, unconsciousness of language and effects on learning, awareness of the task of second language acquisition</p>

### Second Reflection Essay

The second reflection was due three weeks after the first, also to be written on any topic covered, but different from the teacher-candidate's first reflection. The second reflection essays revealed deeper engagement with a smaller number of topics more easily grouped into themes. The most commonly discussed themes were that of discipline-specific language, and, especially

among ELA teacher-candidates, the explicit teaching of some topic in linguistics, such as morphology, syntax or pragmatics. One SS teacher-candidate wrote about her/his learning from the language sketch assignment (in which teacher-candidates individually researched and reported on the basic structure (phonology, morphology and syntax), plus pragmatic and cultural usages if time allowed, of a local language of their choice).

Five ELA teacher-candidates and one SS teacher-candidate discussed the need to provide explicit language instruction. It is not surprising that ELA specialists would be contemplating the teaching of language, but these teacher-candidates did refer to concepts from our class in most cases, concepts that were seemingly new or seen in a new light. Three mentioned that syntax instruction was necessary, especially to prepare students to work with academic language structures. One also mentioned pragmatics instruction, and one ELA teacher-candidate and the SS teacher-candidate discussed morphological instruction. Another ELA teacher-candidate mentioned making explicit the “mysteries of language” and also recognized the importance of *attention to form* in second language acquisition, citing a supplementary reading, Scarcella (2002), and referring to the *noticing hypothesis* discussed in Lightbown and Spada (2006).

Several teacher-candidates reflected on disciplinary language as described in supplementary readings by Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) and others writing about specific disciplines (Chen, 2008; Fang, 2005; Schleppegrell, 2007; Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003; Schleppegrell et al., 2004). Two teacher-candidates, one in ELA and one in SS, referred to the complex syntactic structure of academic writing. The SS teacher-candidate referred to the syntactic concept of *recursion*, or embedding of phrases or clauses, and proposed that a lesson about “when to say ‘when’” could be useful for students to practice “being succinct” versus

making sentences complex in their writing, and also prepare them to work with academic texts. The ELA teacher-candidate did not feel that all students need to know how to diagram a complex sentence or understand every syntax rule, but that understanding basic structural concepts and identifying parts of sentences, such as *subject*, *predicate*, parts of speech, and *dependent* and *independent clauses*, would help students come to understand the variety of ways in which sentences can be structured, which in turn helps with understanding complex academic texts.

Two others expressed concerns that the functional language analysis method of Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) would be too complex and time-consuming to engage in with their students, but one said that it would be “a valuable way for teachers to evaluate and adapt the texts that they are asking ELLs to read.” The other felt that instruction on how academic texts are structured to create meaning would be useful for students and that a common understanding of how to talk about language is essential when it comes to developing strong writers and readers.

These comments reveal an appreciation not only for the functional analysis method, but also these teacher-candidates’ understanding of the structures of academic texts and the need to lead students in decomposing or decoding them. It is also interesting that the SS teacher-candidate (among these two) was thinking of *adapting* texts for students using something like functional linguistic analysis or basic syntactic concepts. This teacher-candidate also felt that some aspects of the analysis method might be modified or simplified as a tool for students’ independent use in “breaking down dense academically-written texts” and, especially, “densely or archaically-written primary source [historical] documents.”

Finally, science and math teacher-candidates were intrigued to learn about the peculiarities of language usage in their respective fields. The science teacher-candidate had taken for granted her/his own facility with scientific language, but had come to recognize that

everyday language is also variable between groups of people (sociolinguistically), and that it may be “just as obscure as scientific language to students who may have very different ways of using English.” Aware of the impact of language use differences, the teacher-candidate keenly concludes, “this means that within the need to allow students to use their everyday English to express meaning in class, there is a need to plan for the time and space for students and teachers to co-construct a classroom language, which can be used to scaffold the acquisition of the academic language of science.”

The math teacher-candidate combined attributes of the language of math from our class readings and from another class source to create a list based on which “the biggest boon” to her/his teaching was deemed to be *awareness*. This teacher-candidate gave several examples of student errors that could be understood as mathematical conceptual errors *or* as language errors, given an awareness of potential linguistic differences and of students’ linguistic backgrounds and possible understandings.

Coming later in the term and soon after the discussion of functional linguistic analysis and disciplinary language, it is not surprising that these second reflections showed deeper understandings of cross-linguistic and cross-discipline language structures, more engagement with linguistic concepts, and a wide interest in functional and disciplinary language analysis. It makes sense that secondary teacher-candidates would be drawn to studies related to their specializations and struck to learn of the particularity of language patterns they took for granted but are expert in. Disciplinary language may also have seemed more clearly in the realm of topics they could or should address in their classroom teaching; much more so than phonemes or

even word families, however enlightening the concepts may be. That is, disciplinary language studies were both personally relevant and directly applicable to their teaching.

Teacher-candidates also would have completed their language sketches before writing these reflections, gaining an appreciation of how languages can be structured, with similarities and differences with respect to English, and of the demands of learning a second language. One teacher-candidate sympathized that second language acquisition is obviously a greater task than learning *about* another language as they did for their sketches. Inductive learning from this project might account for the deeper thinking and knowledge of structure evidenced in the second reflections with respect to the first reflections written three weeks prior, even in cases where the language sketch was not referred to specifically.

In any case, it is evident, and informative for the design of teacher education, that disciplinary language and explicit teaching of morphology and syntax were themes that resonated with the teacher-candidates by the time these reflections were due toward the end of the course. These reflections revealed quite impressive dispositions of engaging with language and language teaching and the beginnings of knowledge and a repertoire of practices for addressing language in the classroom.

### **Final Essays**

A “Final Essay” was assigned in the form of a seminar paper. The description of the assignment was as follows:

This final essay is a personal reflection on your learning in the course. What areas did you find most useful and applicable? What areas are still difficult? What tools do you feel you have gained? Cite from at least 3 readings, your previous reflections, your language sketch, classroom discussions, etc., to put together your own paper explaining what you will take from this class, how you will apply it in your teaching, and what your next steps are in learning and improving your teaching. (from the syllabus)

The four to six-page final paper was due a week after the last class meeting, during a busy time when teacher-candidates were wrapping up the program, and very likely, eager to move on to jobs, job search and other life concerns. This factor might help to balance the positivity bias that assigned work inevitably has. That is, because the essay was to be graded, teacher-candidates might exaggerate the topics they enjoyed and learned from, giving a more positive representation of their experiences than is true for them. On the other hand, they would also need to allot only a certain amount of time and energy to the writing, leading them to be more selective in what they would write about, more closely reflecting what they *most* enjoyed and learned from and tempering any exaggerated positivity. (It is also possible to assess their learning based on the content, wording and exemplification of concepts in the essay.)

Because of the format and scope of the assignment, in many cases, the final essays were redundant on the reflections and linguistic autobiographies. In these cases, the same themes arose, such as one ELA teacher-candidate whose linguistic autobiography and final essay both focused on students' cultural and linguistic identities, and one SS teacher-candidate who was continually enlightened and sensitized to SLES language learning challenges and first language funds of knowledge by examples of how complex but unconscious linguistic knowledge is. The former reflects little new learning from our class, based on the ELA candidate's linguistic autobiographic content and what s/he must have learned in prior multicultural education training. The latter, SS teacher-candidate's writing, on the other hand, showed that the course material was novel and striking, informing a new linguistically inclusive disposition. Only two teacher-candidates, both in ELA, showed minimal engagement with concepts from the course, and emphasized sociocultural understandings and more general sympathetic dispositions that could have been gained through other courses and experiences.

As to particular areas of learning, every main linguistics topic introduced in the class was mentioned in the final essays of at least three teacher-candidates; phonetics (vocal tract and articulation), phonology (phonemes, tone and intonation), morphology (word-formation processes such as clipping, affixation and root words; morphology and vocabulary acquisition), syntax (cross-linguistic morphological typology and morpho-syntactic differences), semantics, sociolinguistics (register, dialects, African-American English; covert prestige or identity, Standard English, and power dynamics), pragmatics (illocutionary force, politeness, honorifics, formality, cultural influences on language usage and pragmatics), disciplinary language and functional linguistic analysis, second language acquisition (main learning theories, individual differences contributing to second language learning), prescriptive grammar and its role in schools and teaching. In addition, teacher-candidates' essays reflected a general sense of linguistic structure, its complexity, cross-linguistic variation and its unconscious nature for native speakers; the role of language in the schools, in cultures, and in students' conceptualizations of themselves and social structures; and personal concern for students' language development and socialization.

In addition to these gained insights from across the major topics, there were eight themes that stood out in multiple teacher-candidates' writing: the language sketch assignment as a valuable activity, a sense of empathy, intentions to explicitly teach aspects of language, and five themes which overlap with the structural topics of the course: pragmatics, academic and disciplinary language, teaching English morphology, second language acquisition, and prescriptive grammar.

### *Language sketch assignment*

The language sketch assignment, which was to research and write a five-page paper outlining the basic structure of a language, its phonology, morphology and syntax, was mentioned in the final essays of seven teacher-candidates (three ELA, and four SS, one Science and one Math). In researching her/his selected language, one ELA teacher-candidate encountered explanations of dialect differences in the language that motivated a deeper understanding that Standard English is but a dialect, not better nor worse than another. Others wrote that the sketch assignment put the linguistic concepts into context and solidified their learning, “opened their eyes” to complex variations across languages, offered insights into SLES students’ assets and funds of knowledge, helped them to think from the perspective of SLES, and empowered them to do similar research as needed to understand and serve SLES students. One ELA teacher-candidate said that the sketch was “definitely the most eye-opening and worthwhile experience in the last few months, and quite possibly in my entire teaching preparation program.”

I have not seen the language sketch assigned in other linguistics classes, but it seems to be a powerful learning activity, even when undertaken individually as was the case in this class. (In other classes, I assigned the language sketch as a group assignment and presentation.) Teacher-candidates in all classes where it was assigned expressed some frustration at the lack of time they had to complete the assignment and at how much more there was to learn about their chosen languages, but the frustration is generally offset in retrospect when they succeed in the assignment, see others’ efforts, and realize the value of the exercise in both having learned about a language and learned how to learn about a language. The language sketch can only be assigned, however, once a foundational knowledge is established in phonology, morphology and syntax, or in the areas required for the sketch assignment. The assignment provides inductive and

experiential learning that empowers teacher-candidates in learning about languages and sensitizes them to the task of learning (proficiency in) a second language.

*Disciplinary language and functional linguistic analysis*

Among the linguistic topics that arose as themes, disciplinary language and the functional linguistic analysis method of Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) was included in the final essays of eleven of the fourteen teacher-candidates. Many, including ELA teacher-candidates, expressed concern that the text analysis process might be too complex and time-consuming to be practical as such in class with students, but one expressed intentions to use it as a tool in selecting and preparing texts for teaching, and several mentioned simplified methods or similar ideas of analyzing complex academic or disciplinary texts for their deeper or hidden meanings, teaching students a way to access, interact with, and make meaning from academic texts, and helping them to be better readers. Others were impressed to have learned about the structural characteristics of text in their own disciplines or across the diverse disciplines (Chen, 2008; Fang, 2005; Schleppegrell, 2007; Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003; Schleppegrell et al., 2004). Social Studies teacher-candidates mentioned examining ways in which texts might exoticize particular cultures and contribute to CLM students' feelings of alienation (or identity as outsider), and ways in which history texts "show only one ethnic or cultural group as being the arbiters of important events ...albeit by omission." One teacher-candidate recognized the academic language of science as "a particular language that needs to be acquired by students" and this recognition as "perhaps the most important concept ...taken from linguistics at this point." S/he intends to provide students practice in the use of this language and to teach more than just vocabulary, and recognizes that the authoritative tone of science texts may be "culturally challenging" to many students.

Disciplinary language is one area where secondary teachers might have been expected to become engaged with linguistic thinking because in this area, teacher-candidates' expertise with respect to language is acknowledged. They are fluent and yet rarely conscious about the language of their fields. Consequently, they can identify with a responsibility to teach the language of their fields and with methods of integrating language with content teaching. Teacher-candidates moved beyond the familiar considerations of teaching specialized disciplinary *vocabulary* and seemed genuinely interested in clarifying the language use patterns that are customary in texts in their fields and the ways of thinking that they embody. This area was somewhat less engaging for ELA teacher-candidates, partly because the functional linguistic analysis literature for secondary ELA is not forthcoming. No one mentioned in the final essay nor in reflection narratives, nor in class discussion, the functional linguistic analysis of a poem (Chen, 2008) that was the selected reading for ELA teacher-candidates. All but three ELA candidates mentioned functional analysis or disciplinary language in their final essays, however.

In some ways, functional linguistic analysis as a way of engaging with the deeper meanings of texts correlates with another of the main learnings that teacher-candidates wrote about, that of pragmatics.

### ***Pragmatics***

The next most often-cited topic was pragmatics and cultural influences on language use. Teacher-candidates seemed to be encountering the ideas and analysis of pragmatics, as it unfurled in our class, for the first time. They were interested to be thinking about deeper meanings of what is communicated, referring to illocutionary force and speech acts; "intent, attitudes or beliefs;" honorifics, politeness, and presuppositions; cultural ideas and expectations; power; customary uses of language. Teacher-candidates also spoke of teaching the pragmatics of

different registers and basic language use customs. One SS teacher-candidate wrote, “I feel that simply being fully cognizant of the diversity and possibilities of pragmatics will help me to create a more accessible classroom for all students.” Another teacher-candidate said that an awareness of pragmatics provides a necessary foundation for reflective teaching.

Pragmatics is not always taught in introductory linguistics classes taught through (theoretically-oriented) linguistics departments, so even ELA teacher-candidates who had a previous linguistics course may not have studied pragmatic concepts prior to our course.

Though they were not all mentioned alongside discussion of pragmatics, the supplemental readings on anthropological linguistics, or, cultural influences on language use patterns and pragmatics (Heath, 1982; Philips, 2012; Sohn, 1983; Wilce, 2012) very likely fed into teacher-candidates’ recognition of cross-cultural differences in pragmatics and the relevance of language use in the classroom.

Interestingly, given the extent to which cultural thinking would have been prominent and seemingly more accessible for teacher-candidates, given the sociocultural and social justice penchant and the presence of multicultural education in the college of education, the apparent novelty and inaccessibility of pragmatics for teacher-candidates was all the more striking. In other words, while they had been educated to be *culturally* aware and reflective, they had not been aware of the cultural and pragmatic force of *language* use and expectations. On the other hand, when exposed, they could easily appreciate the implications. This emphasizes how linguistic inclusiveness contributes to multicultural education though it also may rely on its foundation in the teacher education program.

***Other topics: morphology, second language acquisition and prescriptive grammar***

Three other areas of linguistics were cited as areas of focal learning for teacher-candidates: morphology, second language acquisition and prescriptive grammar.

Under the theme of morphology, teacher-candidates referred to feeling enlightened by learning about English word structures and cross-linguistic typology and having intentions to use or teach morphology to aid students' vocabulary acquisition and predict challenges of SLES students. One ELA teacher-candidate said "examining polysynthetic languages like Lushootseed or agglutinating languages like Korean helped to reveal other ways a student might understand the construction of ideas," and a SS teacher-candidate found benefit in learning that English words are derived through compounding, clipping, acronyms and other formations and not only affixation. Three ELA teacher-candidates were thinking about the potentialities of teaching about word structure, roots and common affixes. Their comments are most expressive:

[I have] a growing sense that explicitly teaching the various pieces and processes of affixation, including both derivational and inflectional morphemes, is an important part of ELL instructional methodology .

Teaching Latin and Greek roots, then, effectively covers more total words than traditional vocabulary instruction, and teach skills such as analysis and inference.<sup>55</sup>

... excellent resource found through teaching morphology. When I learned that the current Common Core State Standards only discuss the overt teaching of Latin and Greek roots until 8<sup>th</sup> grade, I was shocked. There is such a valuable resource in teaching students to watch for key affixes and roots that will serve them well in not only expanding their vocabulary, but also in dramatically improving their reading comprehension skills. Surely continuing to teach such relevant reading aids could only be beneficial, *especially* for students who are new to the country and still learning the language.

---

<sup>55</sup> Unfortunately, this teacher-candidate remained focused on Latin and Greek roots and failed to acknowledge Nagy and Anderson's findings (as mentioned earlier). It is possible that this teacher-candidate had not completed that reading, and the point was not, in fact, discussed in class. This teacher-candidate *had* learned about the benefits of morphological awareness and of learning *patterns* in language as opposed to memorizing vocabulary.

Seven teacher-candidates referred to readings from Lightbown and Spada (2006) on second language acquisition theories and individual characteristics that are factors in second language learning. Teacher-candidates referred to employing behaviorist, cognitivist or other theory-based strategies in working with different students, how the theories address student learning patterns (input processing, restructuring and backsliding), or factors that might influence the success of an instructional idea to compare and contrast first and second language structures with students (factors such as first language proficiency, motivation, personality, beliefs, peer group affiliation). Along the most common theme, one SS teacher-candidate considered the theories to be a “toolkit of sorts by which I can attempt to reach students in a variety of different ways.” While the quick overview of theories and factors, alongside myths discussed by the assigned reading from Samway and McKeon (2002) could have been more confusing than helpful, teacher-candidates were able to recognize that theories do not account for all cases or provide all necessary answers. They were also well-prepared to accept that there would be individual differences in second language learning and to have specific factors discussed even briefly as in Lightbown and Spada (2006). Overall, even this brief and “inconclusive” study of second language acquisition was informative and stimulating enough for several teacher-candidates to reflect on and use to inform their teaching approaches, showing active engagement with the theories as part of a knowledge base for linguistically inclusive teaching practices.

A last linguistic topic selected for reflection by five teacher-candidates was prescriptive grammar or Standard English, a topic introduced on the first day of class and reiterated in the discussion of sociolinguistics. While recognizing that “Standard English is merely a dialect...and that [students’] ability to code-switch into an alternative casual or culturally significant dialect is not ‘bad,’” as one teacher-candidate wrote, these teacher-candidates

expressed intentions to teach prescriptive forms and encourage or model “code-switching” between registers. One ELA teacher-candidate wrote that the terminology (“prescriptive” versus “descriptive” grammar) would play a role in her/his teaching as well as the concepts and practice. Another expressed that most important for students was knowing when to use such structures and for what purposes.

These are not new learnings, however, nor were teacher-candidates’ concepts of *register* and of “code-switching” registers newly learned in this course.<sup>56</sup> Prescriptive grammar and Standard English were common themes in the linguistic autobiographies written at the beginning of the term. Interestingly, in the linguistic autobiographies, several teacher-candidates wrote about prescriptive grammar errors as irksome, some teacher-candidates had a narrow conceptualization of “grammar” as a normative concept, and several emphasized the social power of knowing Standard English, while the attitude expressed in the final essays was one of acknowledging students’ own languages as equally valid as well as the sociolinguistic importance of standard language forms. They also emphasized that, as teachers, they would scaffold the acquisition of those forms through explicit naming of “registers,” teacher modeling, and time to practice them. Teacher-candidates referred to either prescriptive grammar or Standard English as but one of many equally “good” dialects, and one that students should be taught how and when to use. They referred to modeling and teaching prescriptive forms in order that all students have access to the socially recognized norms, and to teaching students how to “code-switch” between registers or between Standard English and other speech varieties in order to validate students’ language forms and knowledge.

---

<sup>56</sup> Students used this terminology before it would have been introduced in our class; some usage is exemplified in quotations from the linguistic autobiographies. This terminology must come from another course.

Readings about the importance of teaching standard forms for equity and equal access to educational and social capital, such as Delpit's writings (Delpit, 1995a, 1995c), were not included in this particular class. Teacher-candidates would only have read the discussion of descriptive versus prescriptive grammar and fundamental equality of all language forms from the Denham and Lobeck (2013) textbook for our class, so it is notable that although they maintain some instincts about "correct grammar usage," they also recognize the instincts as emotional and subjective, and situate them in a social justice agenda.

It is difficult to ascertain to what extent this course affected these teacher-candidates' ultimate approaches to prescriptive grammar or ideas of teaching it; since some of the terminology came from elsewhere, so might their conceptualizations have. Fewer teacher-candidates wrote along this theme for the final essay than for the early linguistic autobiography, as well. Only three ELA and one SS teacher-candidate carried the theme over from the linguistic autobiography to the final essay. The SS teacher-candidate had other, more prominent themes in her/his final essay, mentioning the importance of developing students' metalinguistic knowledge, acknowledging individual factors affecting second language acquisition, and using functional linguistic analysis as a means for students to interact with texts.

Five ELA and two SS teacher-candidates who had written in the linguistic autobiography about prescriptivist tendencies, a personal aptitude or sense of ownership, a narrow conceptualization of "grammar," or the power of Standard English excluded the topic from their final essays in favor of other learning. This latter group seems to illustrate a common perception of language and grammar *before* exposure to more complex issues and conceptualizations of language such as those presented in our class, and I interpret this as a developing disposition that is compatible with linguistic inclusiveness.

### *Socio-cultural sensitivity and linguistic empathy*

The last two themes that arose in the final essays are dispositions or awarenesses, as opposed to topics in linguistics. Nine teacher-candidates expressed empathy or sensitivity to the “intense demands on students as second language learners” or recognized the role of culture, identity or affective aspects of students’ learning and the importance of teachers’ affirmation. One ELA teacher-candidate carried over her/his main linguistic autobiography theme of language and identity, expressing an understanding of the potential for culturally-bound miscommunication and the need for the space and language to address miscommunication as well as a plan to establish “a discourse that includes diversity in the content... [and where] students feel a part of the environment rather than an outsider.” A SS teacher-candidate referred back to the concept of teachers as “agents of socialization” (Fillmore & Snow, 2002) from the first day of class, the danger of (texts) exoticizing particular cultural groups<sup>57</sup> and the importance of empowering students in building “international identities.” A science teacher-candidate recognized how the language of science “embodies a particularly white, western viewpoint” and ways of constructing knowledge that “deprivilege the experiences of many cultures and ways of knowing.” A SS teacher-candidate hopes to “provide my students with affirmation, support and engagement through focusing on how we use language in our classroom,” and another reports, “the most important thing this ELL program and this linguistics class have done has been to heighten my sensitivity to the importance of language in the endeavor of teaching and learning...this class has served to make me more generous with ELLs.”

Attribution of valuable dispositions of empathy demonstrated in the final essay to this particular class must be tempered with recognition that, as the last quoted teacher-candidate

---

<sup>57</sup> This concept stemmed at least in part from a comment I had made on a previous paper from this student (suggesting the dangers of exoticizing cultures or people different from oneself).

indicates, these teacher-candidates were enrolled in an intensive ELL endorsement program that included three other classes and a practicum involving designated-ELL students. This disposition cannot be attributed *solely* to learnings from our class. Furthermore, similar dispositions of what I called social justice, equity, understanding, caring, patience and responsibility were evidenced on the pre-test and dispositions of “empathy” by ten teacher-candidates in the linguistic autobiographies. On the other hand, comments from the pre-tests (as in Table 5) are substantively less-developed and those from the linguistic autobiographies (Table 13) much more personally-focused than the expressions of empathy and understanding expressed in the final essays (cited above). Teacher-candidates’ expressions of empathy and sensitivity in the final essays were more centered on language, reflective of linguistic awareness and less general than in previous assignments as well. If these dispositions were not necessarily new, they were at least strengthened over the course of the ELL endorsement program.

***Linguistic awareness, empowerment, and intentions for explicit instruction***

The last theme that arose in several teacher-candidates’ final essays was evidence of linguistic awareness or discussion of the explicit teaching of language or linguistic concepts. Six ELA and five other teacher-candidates touched on this topic. The words of several teacher-candidates powerfully demonstrate profound awareness, intentionality and sense of engagement and responsibility for teaching language. Because a summary is inadequate, excerpts from the essays are presented in the following table (Table 16). In all, these comments demonstrate knowledge and dispositions that are fundamental to linguistic inclusiveness, beyond multicultural education and linguistic sensitivity. That is, teacher-candidates writing in this theme address the inclusion of a language focus in the classroom and illustrate intentionality, a sense of empowerment or capability, and a sense of responsibility and earnestness about doing so.

They mention promoting bilingualism and development of literacy in students' first languages, the necessity of metalinguistic knowledge and thinking in support of second language acquisition and in the improvement of writing, how explicit teaching of grammatical and metalinguistic concepts is a scaffold for all students but especially for learning academic registers or second language, and they mentioned how a focus on language can engender positive attitudes, engagement, motivation, and a sense of empowerment concerning language in students.

Table 16. Linguistic awareness and intentions for explicit teaching from final essays

At the start of this course, I was thinking about language a lot, but hadn't yet encountered the "aha!"s that accompany seeing the things I was thinking about named; and I hadn't yet placed those thoughts in the context of teaching, generally; or in teaching math and literacy specifically. I didn't realize on a conscious level the particular *challenges that ELL students faced in learning academic registers*, and so didn't yet know *my specific responsibility to teach those things*. ... my academic work in linguistics has given me greater clarity, organization and insight in my thoughts about language and in *how I will explicitly use it, talk about it, and teach it*. I hope to provide my students with *affirmation, support, and engagement through focusing on how we use language in our classroom*.

– Math teacher-candidate

Rather than being an additional confusion (too much to take in), *intentional, explicit instruction surrounding linguistics and the rules for how language works would actually be the best equipment to not only talk about their language, but also develop critical thinking skills, improved reading comprehension, and transform writing over time*.

– ELA teacher-candidate

...to have a sense of how English has developed over time, and how it is different from other languages in terms of its sounds, structures, and semantics, will *help me in turn to better help my students understand these aspects of English*. ...Most importantly, *students will have a greater sense that improvement with English is within their reach if they can recognize that they are dealing with a system with certain rules*.

– SS teacher-candidate

In conclusion, this course has equipped me with both *strategies and stances to better support English Language Learners and struggling readers* in my classroom. Because I am so much

more aware about the linguistic features of English and academic language, I can more easily *scaffold lessons* and one-on-one help to promote academic language development. ... *I plan to be a lifelong learner of language and continue to gain awareness of my own language use and assumptions.* I hope also that I can *model this for students and inspire them to be voracious about language.*

– ELA teacher-candidate

Perhaps most importantly however, this course inspired me to *promote bilingualism and bi-literacy for ELL students and for myself.* ...*develop metalinguistic awareness* along with becoming more fluent in their home language. ...Looking forward, I want to learn more *strategies for promoting learning of and literacy in L1.* I have noticed that many of my students are not literate or even fluent in their home languages. I find this extremely troubling.

– ELA teacher-candidate

I think the biggest take away for me from this course is *the invisibility that many of the subtleties of language have for native speakers.* This is a critical realization for me moving forward in my thinking about teaching ELLs, since *I cannot support students in learning something that I myself do not have a framework for consciously thinking about.*

– SS teacher-candidate

...enhance the ideas students have about how languages work. ... Therefore, it is evident that *the forms of language need to be taught in order for second language acquisition.*

... This particular reading [Lightbown and Spada (2006)] helped me understand the *significance of metalinguistic awareness* of second language. – ELA teacher-candidate

...it is necessary for teachers of ELLs to *make what is transparent for most native speakers fully visible to language learners.*

-- ELA teacher-candidate

I find it is most *important for teachers to have a foundation of the linguistic features of English (and the languages one's students might speak) so they can better instruct students.* I've found knowing where sounds are located in the mouth to be very helpful to students. ...Knowing that Chinese is an isolating language taught me that Chinese-speaking students might have trouble putting their ideas into order in order-dependent English. Examining polysynthetic languages like Lushootseed or agglutinating languages like Korean *helped to reveal other ways a student might understand the construction of ideas.*

– ELA teacher-candidate

To be truly effective a teacher needs to try and *engender a love of language and of learning about language in his students* so that they'll continue to seek out new knowledge even after they leave his classroom. I will seek to *engender some linguistic meta-cognition in my students, both mainstream and ELL.* ... if I can tap into their funds of knowledge about the native language and get them excited about comparing and contrasting ...

– SS teacher-candidate

### **Summary of final essays**

The final essays demonstrated an array of topics that resounded with teacher-candidates, areas of learning, levels of engagement, developing dispositions, and intentions for practice. Every major linguistics topic was referred to by at least three teacher-candidates, with pragmatics, morphology, and second language acquisition among the most often cited as key learning, and prescriptive grammar/standard English emphasized somewhat less often. By far the most often discussed (by eleven teacher-candidates) was disciplinary and academic language and functional analysis of text. In addition, nine teacher-candidates expressed empathy for students and deeper understanding of the enormity of the task of second language (and second dialect) learning. Eleven expressed intentions to make language explicit and to teach grammatical forms and register differences, and to use their knowledge to scaffold student language learning but also to build positive attitudes toward language and bilingualism. Teacher-candidates writing in this theme address the inclusion of a language focus in the classroom and illustrate intentionality, a sense of empowerment or capability, and a sense of responsibility and earnestness about doing so.

### **Course evaluations**

The final data source was that of university-based, anonymous course evaluations. The student evaluations include a machine-scannable survey of ratings on multiple criteria (such as “Instructor’s interest in whether students learned,” “Reasonableness of assigned work,” and “Relevance and usefulness of course content”) as well as a questionnaire for handwritten responses to four questions: 1) Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? 2) What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning? 3) What aspects of this class detracted from your learning? 4) What suggestions do you have for improving the class? Both forms were completed anonymously on the last day of class (after final presentations and

before the post-test) and delivered to me only after the class had ended and grades were submitted. Curious about potential differences in take-up between teacher-candidates of different disciplines, I asked students to indicate on the handwritten forms whether they were ELA teacher-candidates or not;<sup>58</sup> only 2 teacher-candidates indicated that they were ELA teacher-candidates. Four themes were identified in the teacher-candidates' evaluations: the amount of work and breadth of topics, the difficulty and relevance of readings and exercises, connections to instructional practice, and the basic relevance of the class and particular topics.

The clearest theme, from the scannable form and from written comments, was that teacher-candidates felt there was too much work assigned. Eight teacher-candidates bemoaned the workload on the handwritten response sheets. It was clear from comments and classroom participation that teacher-candidates' energies were divided between the basic linguistics textbook readings and exercises, which were time-consuming and "busywork" for some teacher-candidates, and supplemental readings, which were published articles and thus difficult for some. One teacher-candidate appreciated the exercises and two said that they liked the textbook readings, while one said the textbook "was very technical" (and that s/he wanted more obvious connections to teaching practice). Seven teacher-candidates mentioned supplemental readings as contributing to their learning, with five specifically mentioning the disciplinary readings in systemic functional linguistics, and one appreciating Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) and Nagy and Anderson (1984) for being "about teaching practices."

Another theme along the same lines was that there was great breadth of topics covered, some said at the expense of depth (though one felt there was "thorough exploration of topics"),

---

<sup>58</sup> I did not intend for students to indicate their specific subject-area, as that would undermine anonymity of the evaluations (for me) since there was only one science teacher-candidate and one math teacher-candidate.

and some said the breadth left teacher-candidates confused or overwhelmed at times. Other teacher-candidates said the topic was fascinating, and that there was “lots of great information.”

Six teacher-candidates reportedly struggled with connecting linguistic knowledge to their teaching practices, methods, and earlier teacher education program learning, and they had expected this focus from the course. Two teacher-candidates said they would have preferred a teacher-/methods-oriented textbook.

According to the scannable forms’ summary, teacher-candidates’ evaluation of the relevance and usefulness of course content were divided, with seven teacher-candidates rating it Fair, Poor or Very Poor and seven teacher-candidates rating it Good, Very Good or Excellent. Nine teacher-candidates felt the *overall* content of the course was Good or Very Good, while 4 felt it was Fair and one, Poor. Similarly, “quality of problems or questions raised by instructor” was rated at 3.5, or between Good and Very Good, with nine rating it at Good or better, four at Fair and one at Poor.

On the written forms, an ELA teacher-candidate said “a basic linguistic knowledge is helpful for educators to be aware of,” while another (of unknown specialization) suggested “less linguistics, maybe more practical teaching,” echoing the methods orientation but also devaluing the linguistics content. Others reported gaining a framework for concepts that were previously only vague or intuitive, empathy for the challenges facing SLES, and practice in questioning one’s own assumptions about language. All but one teacher-candidate said “yes” to the question of whether or not the class was intellectually stimulating. That one teacher-candidate said it was too difficult to connect linguistics concepts to practical issues of teaching.

Other valued learning came from the language sketch project (one teacher-candidate) and from morphology and phonology (one teacher-candidate). Quite interestingly, two ELA teacher-

candidates mentioned that although they had taken a linguistics course previously, this course helped solidify linguistic concepts; one said that taking the course while working with SLES in the practicum was beneficial.

In general, though the workload, breadth and methods-orientation themes were prevalent, teacher-candidates' views expressed on the evaluations were quite varied and difficult to generalize. Some felt the textbook and exercises were poorly-matched for the course, while others found them engaging and enlightening. Similarly for breadth and depth, some would have like a limited breadth for better depth, while others expressed satisfaction with the depth across topics. It is notable that the desire for more methodological approaches or connections came out here more than it had in other exercises such as the pre-test, and also that it came up as an expectation for this course, given that they were enrolled in a simultaneous ELL Methods course. One last consideration is that teacher-candidates were generous or appreciative in their ratings of my enthusiasm, knowledge, and interest in whether or not they learned, while the organization and content of the course along with "reasonableness of assigned work," were areas where teacher-candidates expressed notable frustration. Along with themes of methods, breadth and workload, these ratings also complicate the task of critiquing the relevance and effectiveness of course content and the goals for the course.

### **Discussion of findings**

To generalize and draw conclusions from the findings and voices reported above, I break down the task into a discussion of the case study of teacher-candidate learning in the class followed by a critique of the curriculum, discussion of trustworthiness and generalizability, and then revisions and considerations for next steps in developing linguistically inclusive teachers.

The case study is qualitative in nature and involves looking at what was learned and gained in this particular course, making use of the teacher-candidates' writings and drawing conclusions about their learning through interpretations of their words and ideas. In critiquing the curriculum, I discuss the structure of the syllabus, learning activities and topics that teacher-candidates responded to, and also overarching concerns such as the tailoring of linguistic inclusiveness (LI) education for ELA versus other disciplinary specialist teacher-candidates and how the curriculum reflects methods and foundations of LI teaching. The discussion of the validity of the study re-situates the course in its larger context and examines what learning necessarily comes from a course such as this as opposed to other courses and contexts. Finally, I hazard some ideas on how best to design and implement LI education based on the study of this course.

#### **Case study: what was learned and gained**

As a qualitative case study, I make use here of teacher-candidates' expressions of their learning and my interpretations and comparisons across teacher-candidates/students in this course and others from my prior experiences. Recalling the codes and themes from the various written assignments, the main themes of what teacher-candidates gained from the course are depth of understanding and a framework that empowers intentional, inquiry-oriented and inclusive dispositions, while variation in the learning was also evident.

#### ***Variation***

As teacher-candidates entered the course, there was notable variation in the dispositions and knowledge relevant to linguistic inclusiveness, and of course this carried through the course to varied learning outcomes. In equal numbers, some teacher-candidates showed a privileging of standard English and an identification with language ability at the beginning, while many showed empathy toward SLES and dispositions likened to social justice, equity-mindedness,

caring, patience toward SLES, and even expressions of responsibility for teaching the language and discourse expected in the classroom. While these latter dispositions reflect a strong foundation in social justice and multicultural education as applied to linguistic minorities (or specifically SLES), prescriptive tendencies and an emphasis on standard English on the other hand were also prevalent in the autobiographies, each found in six teacher-candidates' writing. This subjective affinity for standard English resembles a deficit view of CLD students or an institutionalized linguistic prejudice that must be interrogated in order for teacher-candidates to develop linguistically inclusive practices and be able to challenge linguistic hegemonies in the course and, more importantly, in their teaching contexts.

This entering variation suggests that for some teacher-candidates, a course such as this should foster interrogation of linguistic hegemony and reflection on one's own privileged positionality even beyond the linguistic autobiography, while for others, the coursework could focus on a linguistic knowledge base and skills for linguistically inclusive teaching. A question considered below is to what extent a single class can accomplish both or accommodate the varying learning needs, or, from a different perspective, how these needs are best met in an overarching framework of linguistically inclusive teacher education.

### ***From prescription to access***

Though discussion of prescriptive grammar persisted into the first reflections (during week 5) of some teacher-candidates, far fewer reflected the same hegemonic thinking or narrow view of language in their final essays. Those who did make reference to norms of language use in the later writings showed an awareness of the hegemony, expressed intentions to integrate student voices and language, and professed an eagerness to provide access to the prestige and academic forms to all their students in an effort to support their academic success. Many more

also referred to making language form and meanings explicit, engaging students in talking about language and building metalinguistic knowledge, integrating students' language, building pride and encouraging literacy in SLES students' first languages, and empowering students' critical thinking, language, and content learning. As an overall trend, then, teacher-candidates who focused on teaching standard language forms moved from a rigid understanding of grammar and how they were expected to teach "language" (prescriptive rules and "correct grammar"), despite their culturally responsive dispositions, to a more informed view of language variation and how the teaching of standard English can be situated in anti-hegemonic practice.

***From caring to empathy, culturally responsive to linguistically responsive***

Growth can also be seen in the area of linguistically responsive dispositions. Though many showed culturally responsive dispositions of empathy and caring for CLM students and even some sense of responsibility to scaffold SLES language learning on their pre-tests and in their linguistic autobiographies, the empathy revealed in their final essays of nine teacher-candidates revealed a better understanding of language variation (including disciplinary language use patterns) and second language acquisition that informs a true empathy as opposed to sympathy or caring.

Teacher-candidates' final essays referred to the "intense demands on students as second language learners," the role of culture, identity, and affective aspects of students' learning and the importance of teachers' affirmation, and how language of science "deprivilege[s] the experiences of many cultures and ways of knowing." One reflected on the role of teachers as *agents of socialization* (Fillmore & Snow, 2002), and a personal goal of empowering international identities in her/his students. Teacher-candidates' expressions of empathy in the

final essays were reflective of an awareness of language that was missing in their pre-course writings.

Since this course was part of an post-certification ELL endorsement program, it is likely that many of the dispositions relevant to linguistic inclusiveness that teacher-candidates brought with them to the course (empathy and equity-thinking as seen in the autobiographies, and social justice, equity, understanding, caring, patience, and responsibility on the pre-test) have origins in teacher-candidates' certification program and its social justice theme or specifically in the required multicultural education course. That some of this thinking can be applied to language and linguistic minorities is suggestive of both the interdependence of cultural and linguistic responsiveness and the importance of teacher-candidates engaging in linguistic self-reflection. There is also evidence that knowledge of language and the experiences of this course reinforced and strengthened their responsive dispositions by informing them. If these dispositions were not necessarily newly formed, they were at least strengthened over the course of the ELL endorsement program and informed by certain learnings from our class.

### ***Empowerment and a framework for inquiry***

Two more closely related themes arise concerning what was gained in the course: empowerment and a framework for inquiry. Inevitably some knowledge of language was gained by most teacher-candidates (or solidified for ELA teacher-candidates who had had a linguistics course before), and evidence of this knowledge and awareness is found in their reflection essays, final essays, and post-tests. But it is important to consider what purpose this knowledge serves. Teacher-candidates demonstrated miscellaneous and factoid-like knowledge of language and some knowledge of structure on the pre-test in fact, and it could be said that the knowledge revealed on the post-tests in response to the same prompt was more general and could be

described as *awareness* of language differences or knowledge about second language acquisition and sociolinguistics. Is this an improvement? A disposition evident on the post-test pinpoints the *purpose* of this new knowledge and awareness: the disposition of curiosity and inquiry. With this concept in mind, an overarching theme becomes apparent across the teacher-candidates' writings, one of a knowledge framework that gives teacher-candidates a sense of empowerment to engage in linguistically inclusive practices. This is the ultimate goal of the language awareness curriculum.

The inquiry disposition and intentions to continue learning were evidenced on the post-test as teacher-candidates wanting to learn more languages, wanting to learn more about certain languages and certain types of language, wanting to know how to learn languages more easily, what causes difficulties and differences in second language learning, and so on. The eagerness to continue learning about language is evident when these responses are compared to pre-test responses to the same question, "what do you want to learn about language?" which were largely focused on practical issues of scaffolding second language: how to help with academic conventions(e.g. verb agreement, prepositions,...), how to build on L1 strengths, how to encourage students to engage with their own English learning process, and how to use language to create a positive learning environment. While these scaffolding and culturally responsive learning goals from the pre-test are equally valuable aspects of linguistically inclusive teaching, the post-test answers reveal an engagement with language and language-learning concepts, and they hint at the intention and empowerment to continue learning about the languages and language-learning of their CLD students.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> It would be interesting to analyze why the methods-oriented learning goals changed or differed between the pre- and post-tests. It could be that they were satisfied by learning from their ELL methods course, but it could also be that they came to recognize enough about language to focus on language for this directed question. A more in-depth study of the learning of individual teacher-candidates would be useful in clarifying this issue.

When asked directly about their intentions for continued learning or application of linguistic knowledge in the final essays, eleven teacher-candidates' responses showed intention and empowerment through the theme of "explicit attention to language in the classroom." Teacher-candidates discussed promoting bilingualism and development of literacy in students' first languages, the necessity of metalinguistic knowledge in support of second language acquisition and the improvement of writing, how explicit teaching of grammatical and metalinguistic concepts is a scaffold for all students but especially for learning academic registers or second language, and how a focus on language can engender positive attitudes, engagement, motivation, and a sense of language-learning capability in students. These teacher-candidate ideas show understandings, eagerness and a sense of ability to act on their linguistic learning and engage students in language and metalinguistic learning.

Their discussions illustrate intentionality and a sense of empowerment that is reflected in other themes and writings as well. In writing about her/his learning of pragmatics on the final essay, one SS teacher-candidate wrote, "I feel that simply being fully cognizant of the diversity and possibilities of pragmatics will help me to create a more accessible classroom for all students." This statement reflects how even a simple knowledge base in linguistics fosters a sense of capability and intention. This teacher-candidate recognized that there was no need to memorize facts or terminology or become expert in analyzing structures to be able to support CLD students. Simply becoming aware of language structure and variation supports being cognizant and reflective which are crucial and principal linguistic inclusiveness practices. Another teacher-candidate also recognized that awareness provides a necessary foundation for reflective teaching. As positivist as linguistic studies may seem to be, a fundamental goal of this course for linguistic inclusiveness is in fact to raise awareness of the vast potential for variation

(and perspective and positionality) in all areas of language; to interrogate singular understandings of language and develop openness to difference. This awareness is the knowledge base and the framework for inquiry and empowerment for linguistically inclusive practices. As explained by one teacher-candidate, quoted above, “I cannot support students in learning something that I myself do not have a framework for consciously thinking about.” Teacher-candidates gained a framework for being cognizant and reflective and for an inquiry approach to language diversity.

Others wrote in the final essays that the language sketch assignment had empowered them to research students’ home languages and backgrounds to understand and serve them better. One SS teacher-candidate considered the theories of second language acquisition to be a “toolkit” s/he can use to think about modifying instruction to reach students in a variety ways. Even within the empathy theme in the final essays, there is evidence of empowerment and intentionality for linguistic inclusiveness where a SS teacher-candidate plans to “provide my students with affirmation, support and engagement through focusing on how we use language in our classroom.” All these and many other references to learning and plans for teaching indicate a gained sense of intention and ability to include language in their teaching ideologies, practices and interactions with students. As discussed below, only a longitudinal study that includes observations in these teacher-candidates’ eventual classrooms could assess whether they are truly willing and able to follow up on these stated intentions, but it is a notable result of this case study that teacher-candidates developed at least an intentionality toward linguistically inclusive teaching. Far from simply seeking strategies or methods, as some were on the pre-test, three teacher-candidates’ responses on the post-test are especially striking in their empowerment and intention: one ELA teacher-candidate was pleased to know that “there are specific things we can

do to scaffold academic language,” suggesting intentions to engage critically in scaffolding methods; one SS teacher-candidate wanted to know “a simpler method [than Fang and Schleppegrell’s (2010) functional analysis] to help students understand academic language,” suggesting recognition of her/his role in doing teaching academic language; and a science teacher-candidate reported he was himself “working on figuring out best areas of language structure to focus on incorporating into my classroom.” Though only one teacher-candidate used the term “empowered” in her/his writing, teacher-candidates’ reflections on their new awarenesses, and especially the eleven teacher-candidates who wrote about their intentions to include explicit attention to language in the classroom, demonstrate a sense of empowerment that can be attributed to learning from our class. This theme is powerfully demonstrated in the teacher-candidate statements from Table 16, two of which are repeated here:

To be truly effective, a teacher needs to try and engender a love of language and of learning about language in his students so that they’ll continue to seek out new knowledge even after they leave his classroom. I will seek to engender some linguistic meta-cognition in my students, both mainstream and ELL ... tap into their funds of knowledge about the native language and get them excited about comparing and contrasting ...  
– SS teacher-candidate

I plan to be a lifelong learner of language and continue to gain awareness of my own language use and assumptions. I hope also that I can model this for students and inspire them to be voracious about language.  
– ELA teacher-candidate

Throughout the reflections, post-tests, and especially the final essays, there was ample evidence of teacher-candidates learning, and this learning was in line with linguistic inclusiveness orientations of empathy, intention and inquiry, and a knowledge base as empowerment and as a framework for continued reflection and learning. Of course, not all teacher-candidates equally showed development of linguistic inclusiveness, however. Across all assignments, where no clear codes or themes could be identified in the teacher-candidate’s

writing, there was no option but to exclude that writing from the data. For the most part, this happened rarely, but there were two final essays that were especially lacking in engagement with ideas from the course, and as discussed above, there were cases where teacher-candidates used superficial understandings of course material to reinforce their existing beliefs. This study cannot assess in depth what works for *all* teacher-candidates or why some teacher-candidates are able to connect with the material and develop linguistically inclusive thinking better than others. What we do find, however, is that a basic knowledge base, exposure, and practice in metalinguistic thinking across a variety of linguistic topics, even as imperfect as the course may have been and given its specific timing and intensity, can be a valuable part of teacher-candidates' linguistic inclusiveness education. In the next section, I examine how the curriculum contributed to this development.

### **Curriculum critique: what aspects contributed to learning**

The case study approach above reveals a variety of learning evident in the writings of teacher-candidates and shows that a knowledge base in linguistic thought can engender important dispositions of linguistic inclusiveness such as intentionality, reflection, and cognizance about classroom language. In this section, I more closely critique the curriculum to determine which topics were most informative and beneficial and consider how linguistically inclusive teacher education should be organized and structured. I discuss the “amount of work” issue with this specific class and consider how else the curriculum could be distributed, taking into account specific topics and assignments that teacher-candidates found valuable and also the learning needs of teacher-candidates from different specializations.

### ***Depth, breadth and topics to include***

In designing a curriculum such as this and in determining how to integrate linguistic awareness or LI education into teacher education, a main concern is the optimal breadth and depth of linguistic study. How much “factual” knowledge, linguistic analysis, exposure to cases and experiential learning, is needed to develop the important dispositions and applicable knowledge and skills? Which topics are most important or have the greatest impact in the development of linguistic inclusiveness?

As mentioned in the findings, every main linguistics topic was mentioned in the final essays as relevant to the learning of at least three teacher-candidates: phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, second language acquisition, and functional linguistic analysis. Phonetics is missing here, but “knowing where the sounds are made” was mentioned as helpful in one ELA teacher-candidate’s first reflection paper. Morphology was cited as important in multiple teacher-candidates’ writings, where they envisioned ways of integrating morphological concepts and awareness in classroom teaching, using it to raise awareness and guide students in approaching complex texts as well as in learning vocabulary. Morphology was seen as *applicable* in their teaching, as one teacher-candidate characterized the Nagy and Anderson (1984) reading. Syntactic concepts entered into teacher-candidates’ thinking about helping students access academic text, reading, and writing, along with functional analysis, and ELA teacher-candidates expressed frustration that students would not know fundamental concepts such as parts of speech in order to pursue higher-level learning (such as the functional linguistic analysis and discussion of texts). Semantics concepts were sometimes conflated with pragmatics when mentioned, but semantic awareness would seem to be needed to support morphological and functional text analysis and understandings and to truly

engage with diverse understandings, meaning, and learning in the classroom. That is, exploration of semantic concepts does seem to underlie teacher-candidates' thinking in other areas.

It is widely held that a knowledge base and time spent thinking about sociolinguistics and second language acquisition are fundamental to linguistically responsive teaching in today's diverse classrooms (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Valdés et al., 2005; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). From sociolinguistics, knowledge of dialectal variation, the role of language in identity (and identity in language use), register and intraspeaker variation and the development of students' linguistic repertoires is essential. And knowledge of second language acquisition theories and individual learning factors provides a toolkit, as one teacher-candidate referred to it, for designing linguistically inclusive instruction. Teacher-candidates' writings show that they connected with these areas as well.

The most impactful learning, according to references in the teacher-candidates' writings, was from functional linguistic analysis and discussions of academic and especially of subject-area language patterns. These topics were bound to resonate with secondary teacher-candidates who had spent their formative years specializing in a chosen field, adding a teaching certificate only afterwards and ELL endorsement (and this class) only after that. New understandings of disciplinary language patterns brought them to recognize that they were indeed expert in their areas so much that they had mastered a skill they hadn't known they had mastered: subject-area language. Furthermore, since disciplinary language patterns are discipline-specific, they clearly fall under the purview of specialists to address and teach in their classrooms. Teacher-candidates may have felt that they had not only a responsibility to teach the language of their fields, but a thus the freedom to make time in class to do so despite other demands and pressures. For any

number of reasons, disciplinary and academic language are clearly relevant and beneficial concepts in secondary teachers' language awareness education.

The three remaining topics of pragmatics, phonology, and anthropological linguistics also contributed to teacher-candidates' learning in important ways and merit inclusion in teachers' language awareness education. Pragmatics was a major theme in teacher-candidates' writings in both reflection papers and the final essay. The pragmatics concepts provide an accessible route to thinking about the meanings behind language use in various cultures and social contexts and from different social positions and identities; how the same utterance can mean different things in different contexts and how we more or less unconsciously choose how to phrase our meanings for appropriate social impact, *if we have the linguistic repertoire and metalinguistic awareness to do so*. Pragmatics is thus linked to semantic and sociolinguistic concepts as well as cultural and anthropological linguistics and second language acquisition. In thinking about how meanings are phrased and how the intended illocutionary meaning is not always communicated, teacher-candidates began to think about how pragmatic awareness might be acquired in first and second languages and in different cultures and contexts. Recall the teacher-candidates who expressed that this awareness of pragmatic structure and interpretation and its potential variation gave them a basis for cognizance and reflection on their usage and assumptions about language. This is the cognizance and reflection that is needed, at all levels of language structure and communication, as linguistically inclusive knowledge and dispositions of inquiry, understanding, flexibility, and inclusion. Pragmatics not only was a relevant and informative topic in itself, but also served to establish this valuable reflection and cognizance.

Phonology and anthropological linguistics were cited less often and more vaguely than other topics, but each led to a critical realization for a teacher-candidate, suggesting these topics

also have value in the curriculum. The critical realization from phonology, similar to that newfound cognizance that another teacher-candidate derived from pragmatic understandings as discussed earlier, centered on the concept of phoneme. This SS teacher-candidate recalled a time when a SLES student he worked with struggled to say his last name, which was, in fact, a common, one-syllable verb in English, seemingly simple. He had been surprised at the students' trouble with his simple name. When this teacher-candidate came to understand the concept of phonemes as "the sounds we are aware of" from the time we are infants, based on the ambient-*cum*-native language, he came to a critical understanding of the psychological reality and educational impact of one's phonemic knowledge: the student could not say his name because it contains a phoneme non-existent in the student's native language. That means that students may struggle with hearing, distinguishing, remembering, and spelling, reading, and writing any number of words that have unfamiliar phonemes. Larger than that, this teacher-candidate came to recognize, through this one concept and its connection to a personal experience, the enormous influence our first language can have on our thinking and learning. This is profound learning and profoundly important learning for linguistic inclusiveness. It is the potential for this type of profound learning that makes phonology (and phonetics to some extent and as a contrastive concept) a valuable topic of study in teacher education.

A similar critical learning arose for another SS teacher-candidate in the anthropological linguistics jigsaw reading activity. This teacher-candidate was assigned to a group that would read and present to the class an article about a trial in Bangladesh, where Bangla language structure was used to frame an image of the victim of an attack as co-responsible in a mutual fight, by repeatedly using a reciprocal verb form (i.e., *attack-each-other* instead of *be attacked*) (Wilce, 2012). Obviously struck by the injustice, this teacher-candidate became very engaged in

his group discussion and carried over his thinking in his first reflection essay. His thinking reveals critical realization about the power of language, about language power and perspective, and a developing linguistic awareness and empowerment to be reflective. An excerpt of his reflection essay is repeated here:

But the true heart of the article I read [Wilce, 2012] wasn't about how the intents and purposes of language can be bandied about at will by masters of grammar. What really matters about the article I read is that language itself—not just words, but language—can be used by those who possess its mastery to support existing power structures and oppress those without a similar command of the grammar. ... *But how many of us were able to communicate exactly the author's intentions in each of our respective articles? [our analyses were inevitably] based on our own set of experiences. ... Will we be able to recognize socio-linguistic dilemmas when they appear in our own classroom?*

A variety of topics, thus, led to “a-ha” moments, or critical realizations for different teacher-candidates (phonology, pragmatics, anthropological linguistics), some topics are obviously fundamental to linguistically inclusive teaching (semantics, sociolinguistics and second language acquisition), and some were deemed especially relevant or applicable by teacher-candidates themselves (disciplinary and academic language, functional analysis, syntax, and morphology). In the end, *all* topics covered fall under at least one of these categories. All major topics were valuable in some way, even though they were greatly pared down compared to a traditional introductory linguistics course.

While all topics may be relevant to teacher education for ELL endorsement (the context of this specific course), the breadth and depth of content appropriate for this as a singular class is less certain. The theme of the class's breadth, depth and “amount of work” arose on the teacher-candidates' course evaluations. The scannable forms showed that teacher-candidates felt too much work was required of them in the course, but this could be a matter of reducing the number or length of assignments. Reading assignments were also extensive in this particular course. In

general introductory linguistics courses, readings are not normally assigned beyond the basic textbook, whereas in many graduate level courses readings are drawn from journals as opposed to a textbook. This class required both types of readings. Students had weekly reading and exercises from the linguistics textbook in addition to one or two supplemental readings for discussion. While 50 pages of reading per week is not too much for a graduate level course, it is too much for a course embedded in an intensive endorsement program such as this that included two other courses and a practicum. The goals of the curriculum – or of linguistic inclusiveness education – exceed the time allotted for this particular class, but were only clumsily pared for this particular class. The balance of types of reading must be considered with respect to the program type and also the learning needs of the teacher-candidate students.

For example, the basic linguistics textbook readings and exercises were considered “busywork” by some teacher-candidates, while one found the textbook “very technical” and wanted more obvious connections to teaching practice, and yet others wrote on the course evaluations that they benefited from the textbook readings and exercises. Supplemental readings, which were published articles, were reportedly difficult for some, but seven teacher-candidates said they had contributed to their learning, with five specifically mentioning the disciplinary readings in systemic functional linguistics, and one appreciating Fang and Schleppegrell (2010) and Nagy and Anderson (1984) for being “about teaching practices.” These comments and the diverse topics discussed in the final essays suggest that, speaking of the group as a whole, there is value in most of the content covered, but that teacher-candidates were overwhelmed with the overall workload in a program of this intensity.

While there was benefit found in each topic, teacher-candidates expressed varied opinions on the overall breadth and depth of the course content. Some felt there was great

breadth of topics covered, which some found overwhelming at times. Some said the breadth came at the expense of depth, but one felt there was “thorough exploration of topics.” Other teacher-candidates said the topic was fascinating, and that there was “lots of great information.”

Individual learning needs and goals are expected to vary in any class, but I would impressionistically agree that, while all topics were valuable and the overall breadth and depth were appropriate for teacher-candidates’ linguistic inclusiveness education, “too much work” resulted, especially from the attempt to cover two layers of content, both descriptive basics from the textbook and applied case study from the supplemental readings. Teacher-candidates’ writings showed that learning derived from both types of thinking, however, so both are valuable components of linguistic inclusiveness education.

One solution to the workload problem is to allow more time for language awareness curriculum in the teachers’ education program by creating two or more classes out of this one, or by distributing the material throughout courses in a coherent programmatic theme of linguistic inclusiveness. Another is to take into account the prior experiences of the teacher-candidates, such as linguistics classes that ELA teacher-candidates may have taken previously, and create separate courses for teacher-candidates at the different “levels.” These concerns of how to structure the linguistic inclusiveness curriculum within specific contexts are discussed in the next section.

### ***Structure of the curriculum***

One solution to the overwork problem this class encountered is to restructure the syllabus readings or assignments. Some teacher-candidates recommended more time to discuss the readings, and in the end, we did not spend time discussing the textbook exercises either, which diminished their effectiveness as well. In similar courses with longer class periods, time can be

allotted more generously to these kinds of discussions, group work and student presentations, for example, all of which are effective learning activities. It was also mentioned above that teacher-candidates might have gained important insights from sharing their autobiographies and reflection essays with each other. There are multiple ways to structure a syllabus to organize the class time and select the most effective assignments. As to use of class time, it is difficult to identify a single best use of class time such as discussion, group work or lecture, given that the course was offered late in the evening after hours spent in another class. These particular teacher-candidates engaged only moderately well in group discussions, often getting off-task in their discussions and regularly taking more time than allotted to organize their brief posters or presentations, which are otherwise and normally beneficial activities.

### *Assignments*

Among other assignments, I stand by the value of the textbook exercises as inductive learning about the structure and complexity of language and practice in thinking reflectively about one's own knowledge and assumptions about language. (Memorization, terminology and abstract analysis exercises were not assigned.) I have had some success in other classes using the exercises during lecture to demonstrate key concepts or assigning them in brief periods of in-class groupwork. This particular class period was too brief to do that, so they were assigned as homework. For the exercises to be of value, however, time must be spent discussing them or, minimally, making sure teacher-candidates understood the point of each.

Because the evaluations were anonymous and most teacher-candidates did not indicate their specialization, it is impossible to know for certain, but likely that it was more often the ELA teacher-candidates who felt the textbook exercises to be busywork since they had done similar work before. On the other hand, other-discipline teacher-candidates might have felt they were

disconnected from their content areas; that is, they might not have used the exercises to build knowledge or question their assumptions about language as was intended as foundational learning and instead found the exercises to be unrelated to larger questions. The two types of learning should be better integrated if both are deemed beneficial, but it is likely that the exercises, textbook readings, and basic linguistic concepts are more valuable learning for non-ELA teacher-candidates, and that ELA teacher-candidates are better prepared to engage in discussions of “higher level” topics and supplemental readings.

The reflective essays are also an effective means of both valuing teacher-candidates’ perspectives on the material and engaging teacher-candidates in metacognition about the material and their own learning. These reflection papers were to be no less than 2 pages long, however, since only two were assigned, and that led to some obvious attempts to “fluff-up” the paper by adding redundant or meaningless content that detracted from the main point and truthful reflection. Reflection on one’s learning is central in constructivist views of learning, and reflection on one’s thinking about language is fundamental to developing linguistically inclusiveness dispositions, just as it is for cultural responsiveness (Gay, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). In an ideal case, reflections would be entirely student-led and monitored, but failing that, some degree of flexibility can be added to perhaps a weekly reflection, so that reflection is clearly expected to be consistent and regular, but the content and length of each writing can be unspecified to allow for inevitable variation in engagement with different topics. The seminar paper is also a valuable approach to a final paper in a course such as this as it is also reflective, metacognitive, and self-directed.

It is somewhat surprising that the teacher-candidates’ most valued assignment was the language sketch. This assignment involved choosing a local language (one spoken by SLES

students in the district, though an exception was made for one teacher-candidate to study an indigenous language of the area that was no longer spoken) and then researching the basics of that language's phonology, morphology and syntax. Teacher-candidates were to provide the phoneme inventory, exemplify the morphological typology (isolating, fusional, agglutinating, or polysynthetic), and discuss the basic word order and any other syntactic patterns they found interesting. For this particular class, the language sketch was submitted as an individual paper of no more than six pages. In other classes where it was assigned, teacher-candidates researched in groups and either presented a slide presentation to the class or took turns presenting a group poster. The shared presentations in the other classes were greatly enjoyed by teacher-candidates, but similarly in this class for secondary teachers, teacher-candidates reported that the language sketch assignment was extremely valuable. It was a theme of teacher-candidate learning in the final essays occurring in seven teacher-candidates' writing, and references were also made in some of the reflection papers.<sup>60</sup> A truly difficult task after only brief discussion of phonology, morphology and syntax concepts, the exercise nevertheless made those concepts concrete for teacher-candidates and resulted in powerful learning. Teacher-candidates reported feeling empowered to learn about students' language backgrounds as needed and motivated to learn more about the languages they had chosen for the assignment. One teacher-candidate encountered the concept of dialects in her/his chosen language, prompting a deeper understanding that dialects (of English) differ structurally but are each systematic and structured, and the social relevance is on a separate plane; the prestige (and prejudice) of one dialect over another is a socio-political construction that is inaccessible and irrelevant to an outsider studying the language. Again, the language sketch put conceptual learning into a concrete context, and

---

<sup>60</sup> In the other classes, elementary teacher-candidates also spoke about the value of the language sketch assignment, which they did in groups, and of the opportunity to hear other groups' sketches.

since the sketch was an individual assignment, the learning was self-led and inductive. Teacher-candidates also reported that the sketch assignment clarified concepts of SLES students' assets and funds of knowledge and helped them to think from the perspective of SLES. Quite strikingly, one ELA teacher-candidate said that the sketch was "definitely the most eye-opening and worthwhile experience in the last few months, and quite possibly in my entire teaching preparation program." This is especially a striking comment from a teacher-candidate whose final essay showed relatively little engagement in other aspects of the course and who likely found much of the course content (textbook and exercises) redundant given the particular linguistics course s/he had previously taken.<sup>61</sup>

### ***ELA versus other specialist learning needs***

The major assignments, the linguistic autobiographies, reflection papers, language sketches, and final essays, were thus reasonable and effective learning activities, while the textbook readings and exercises, along with this ELA teacher-candidate's comment bring into question the organization of the learning for teacher-candidates in ELA versus other specializations. Given their focus on language and previous experience, ELA teacher-candidates bring quite different knowledge and perspectives to a linguistic inclusiveness course from science, math, and social studies teacher-candidates.

Many more of the ELA teacher-candidates revealed prescriptive dispositions (five teacher-candidates) and privileging of standard English (four teacher-candidates) in their linguistic autobiographies than discussed their structural or factual knowledge of language (two teacher-candidates), even though they would have taken either an introductory linguistics course

---

<sup>61</sup> The linguistics course this teacher-candidate had taken was one that I had taught in the same department and for which I had also previously been a teaching assistant with a variety of professors. I am familiar with the traditional content and structure of that course, and recognize that many of the basic structural and even sociolinguistics concepts were similar between that course and the one discussed here. This redundancy for ELA teacher-candidates is a matter for serious consideration, and is further discussed below.

or *Structure of English* (and potentially other courses in sociolinguistics, discourse, genre and so on) for their undergraduate degree. Their writing showed a sense of personal aptitude for “correct grammar” and a personal identification as expert or talented that might have been challenged, though necessarily so, by the examination of English peculiarities and imperfections, so to speak, as well as the interrogation of the hegemonic status of English and of prescriptive or standard English. This interrogation, positive views of other languages and varieties, and constant reflection are essential for linguistic inclusiveness. If ELA teacher-candidates come to a course such as this identifying as English language experts, the course must be carefully organized and managed to develop that identity while integrating linguistically inclusive dispositions and practices. Perhaps by giving them leadership roles in the course or alternative assignments, English specialists can be guided to value all they know about language while learning how to be open to and to learn about other aspects of language (dialects, acquisition, functional linguistics, pragmatics) and about other languages.

Furthermore, that so few ELA demonstrated structural or sociolinguistic awareness in their autobiographies and reflections suggests that their prior linguistics courses were not adequately contextualized or had perspectives conflicting both with the teacher-candidates’ concurrent focus on English language and with linguistic inclusiveness as needed in their teacher education. Courses taken in a linguistics department may have emphasized theoretical and analytical methods as opposed to practical applications or everyday examples that would fit with teaching and linguistic inclusiveness, and they may have emphasized cross-linguistic comparisons as opposed to the English structure and history that eventual ELA teacher-candidates might have been more interested in at that time in their studies as English majors. A course on the structure and/or sociolinguistics of English, on the other hand, would certainly not

emphasize cross-linguistic comparisons and second language acquisition in ways important for linguistic inclusiveness. In addition, while all ELA teacher-candidates would have taken one such course, one teacher-candidate mentioned it had been over ten years prior to our class. These considerations and the ELA's writings suggest that a targeted course such as the one proposed is indeed needed to develop ELA teacher-candidates' linguistic inclusiveness dispositions and applicable knowledge and skills, and that the introductory linguistics course that teacher education researchers have recommended may be inadequate if not offered by their teacher education program. If the course is not taught within the context of teacher education, teacher-candidates may have difficulty using it to inform their teaching ideologies and practices.

One might still argue that this course simply was redundant for ELA teacher-candidates given their prior courses. More ELA teacher-candidates maintained prescriptive tendencies and a privileging of English, even if they developed some empathy concerning second language acquisition. Indeed, the two teacher-candidates who showed the least engagement with course content in their final essays (and with throughout the class in general) were ELA teacher-candidates. As a general trend, the ELA teacher-candidates were less responsive to linguistic and linguistically inclusive concepts, though they would have been more informed, than their non-ELA classmates. Because ELA teacher-candidates would have brought to the class some degree of familiarity with basic linguistic concepts that science, math and social studies teacher-candidates were unlikely to have, it is not surprising that most of the critical realizations inspired by linguistic concepts were demonstrated by non-ELA-specialist teacher-candidates. This suggests that different approaches may be needed for ELA teacher-candidates and the others to develop linguistically inclusive dispositions and practices. Various aspects of the curriculum are

important, however, if they can be appropriately contextualized for ELA teacher-candidates. Statements by two ELA teacher-candidates confirm this conclusion: one that stated on the written course evaluations that although she had taken a linguistics course previously, this course helped solidify linguistics concepts; another said that taking the course while working with SLES in the practicum was beneficial.

### **Contributions and limitations of the study**

This study demonstrates the potential for developing teacher-candidates linguistically inclusive dispositions and gaining a knowledge base for corollary practices in a single course and sheds light on specific concepts and learning activities that do so. It is not without limitations, however, and the findings must be considered in the context of the case study and details of the specific course to evaluate their validity and generalizability.

### ***Other factors***

While pleased about the positive outcomes, where teacher-candidates developed goals of providing access to high quality content and to linguistic capital, informed and deepened empathy, and especially the empowerment to support an inquiry stance and further learning, we must be careful about what this development is attributed to. Several aspects of the context and contextualization of the class temper interpretation of the findings.

First, the generalizability of the findings is limited by the contextualization of the course, that is, that it was embedded in an ELL endorsement program that immediately followed teacher-candidates' certification. Similar results may not ensue for a class taught at the beginning of a general teacher education program, where the learning is more foundational and cannot benefit from past courses and simultaneous practicum teaching, for example. The simultaneous courses

and teacher-candidates individual background experiences necessarily contributed to the effects of the course.

Secondly, though this course was not elective within the ELL endorsement program, teacher-candidates had chosen to enter the program in the first place, perhaps bringing with them a degree of intention and culturally and linguistically responsive orientations. The results are also attributed to teacher-candidates' positive intentions at the outset. This factor's effects are measured by the linguistic autobiographies and by the pre-test and its comparison with the post-test. Ultimately however, teacher-candidates comments about their intentions and learning, especially in the final essays, represent the *potential* of linguistic inclusiveness teacher education. It is up to the reader to judge whether or not similar results could be expected from a similar course taught in another context.

Third, because this study employed no experimental controls or comparison group, teacher-candidates' development might be understood to represent the culmination of learning over the four classes and the teaching practicum that comprised the ELL endorsement program context as well as learning from previous courses and from outside their schooling. On the other hand, teacher-candidates' writings referred to specific linguistic concepts or class activities and how they connected to other experiences, such as the connection between the concept of phoneme and the anecdote of a student struggling with a name, or the reading about linguistic framing inciting thoughts about the inevitability of perspective in language. To the extent that teacher-candidates made such references and connections, the outcomes can be attributed to this particular class.

### ***Data trustworthiness***

The *trustworthiness* of the study stems from specific examples from teacher-candidates' writings, which draws attention to the data itself. It was mentioned above in discussing the study design that data would consist of writings that teacher-candidates would submit as coursework. Since the writings were to be graded, teacher-candidates might have an inclination to exaggerate positive outcomes and attitudes. This bias in the data is mitigated by my interpretations of their learning (through accurate and informed reference to linguistic concepts for example), which is in turn judged by the reader through evaluation of the teacher-candidates' writing excerpts and the codes I assigned to them.

In addition, because the codes were generalized into *themes* of teacher-candidates' learning, the study did not provide details of individuals' learning and development (or lack) and its complexity, including seeming-contradictions where an ELA teacher-candidate showed both prescriptivism and the equity disposition of valuing bilingualism, for example, on her first reflection. Because this was a case study of the course, the results were reported in aggregate. Another valuable study could have focused on individual's learning and even on variation, and in that way might have provided insights into the underlying causes of teacher-candidates' take-up or resistance, as not all teacher-candidates made statements as powerful and as reflective of learning and dispositions of linguistic inclusiveness as others. Such a study would require much more detailed information and interaction with individual teacher-candidates, however, which was beyond the IRB limitations of this study.

### ***Intention versus action***

Finally, while a number of teacher-candidates reported a sense of empowerment and intentions to engage in linguistically inclusive practices, having intentions is not the same as

truly having the capacity to act on those intentions. Only a longitudinal study could examine how teacher-candidates enact linguistic inclusiveness in their eventual classrooms. It would be informative to observe these teacher-candidates not only during their induction periods, but further into their careers and professional development to evaluate their linguistic inclusiveness and whether it can be traced to this course, or, how this course may have contributed and informed their practices. Another option is to compare teachers who have and who have not had a similar course, but this is less ideal due to other confounding factors, including, most importantly, their immediate teaching contexts. Such studies may reveal that additional training and practice are necessary or desirable for teachers to enact linguistically inclusive teaching, or that better or different integration with other teacher education courses is needed. In addition, teachers may find it difficult to enact linguistic inclusiveness in the work context due to the school culture and the demands and limitations placed on them. These and other questions would be greatly informed by more direct and longitudinal interactions with teacher-candidates/teachers in a study with fewer procedural limitations.

### **Questions for future studies**

Future studies should also address questions of whether or not *all* the topics must be covered in such a class or whether phonology alone, for example, suffices to demonstrate objective and structural views of language. Also, how should this course be integrated with others in the same program in terms of cross-reference and program culture? Some, even ELA, teacher-candidates entered with trepidation about “linguistics” – where did this come from, and what does it mean for the integration of this course with others in the development of professional identities? And did this attitude affect learning outcomes? Lastly, how do similar classes fare in other contexts, and what is the ideal contextualization of this learning in a teacher

education program, for different subject area specialists? This study cannot answer these questions, but contributes to the research in these areas and to future studies that might provide additional insights.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

After situating this study in historical, demographic, political and research contexts in Chapter 2 and establishing the theoretical perspectives and framework of linguistically inclusive teaching in Chapter 3, I have proposed a curriculum for teacher education in linguistically inclusive teaching and discussed its intentions and potentialities in detail in Chapter 4 and presented a case study of teacher-candidate learning in one instantiation of that curriculum in Chapter 5. The basic results of that study and some considerations for supplementary studies were discussed in Chapter 5 as well, but some of them are taken up again in this conclusion of the overall study of linguistic inclusiveness as teacher education for cultural and linguistic diversity. I also extend the discussion of the particular course to programmatic considerations of how it should be integrated into particular teacher education program types and discuss its potential for enactment in the larger sociopolitical and professional contexts and potentials for providing equitable education for culturally and linguistically diverse and minority students. Future research considerations here are more broadly encompassing of teacher and student learning and of multicultural and social justice goals.

### **Results of the case study and curriculum critique**

In simple terms, the results of the case study show that a course in basic structural, socio-cultural and applied linguistics contributes to the development of dispositions and a knowledge base for linguistically inclusive teaching. Through previous coursework and experiences, many teacher-candidates came to the linguistic inclusiveness class with basic sympathetic and caring culturally responsive dispositions toward CLD students, but their learning in the course, as evidenced in their reflective writings, led to deeper understandings of language complexity, variation, and acquisition that allowed them to develop a more informed empathy. For some, the

privileging of Standard English that they brought to the class was turned to an understanding of their role in providing access to norms for those students whose first discourses differ. And most importantly, though not all teacher-candidates responded as strongly to the course, a number of teacher-candidates (eleven of fourteen) reported intentions to integrate attention to language in their classroom teaching as a means for students to access content and a way to deepen and diversify all students' understandings. This reveals a sense of willingness and empowerment to continue to engage with language and linguistic diversity, instead of being intimidated as some reported at the beginning of the class.

These positive dispositions and intentions can be attributed to a number of topics and learning activities from the class. The language sketch, research into the basic structure of a chosen language, was cited by some teacher-candidates as an especially enlightening and empowering exercise in learning about local languages and understanding the challenges of second language acquisition. The latter realization also came for another teacher-candidate through connecting the concept of *phoneme* to a personal experience with a SLES student. Disciplinary language and functional language analysis had great impact on many teacher-candidates' thinking about their role in their students' language development and access to content. Knowledge of second language acquisition was cited as a toolkit for adapting instructional practices to learner needs, but all major linguistics topics from the class were cited in the teacher-candidates' reflections about their learning, and in less obvious and more indirect ways, also contributed to a knowledge base that empowered teacher-candidates toward linguistically inclusive teaching and thinking.

Overall, the proposed and enacted linguistic inclusiveness curriculum has the potential to build dispositions and knowledge intended for linguistically inclusive teaching as a contribution

to multicultural education and a response to the current reality of linguistic diversity and an increasingly multilingual society. There are several additional considerations due, however, concerning the implementation of this particular curriculum and linguistic inclusiveness teacher education (LITE) and methods of ensuring its effectiveness in advancing linguistically inclusive teaching in the schools.

### **Implementing linguistic inclusiveness teacher education**

As a limited and specific case study, however successful, this study raises questions for how the course and larger theme of linguistic inclusiveness teacher education should be envisioned and enacted in other contexts. How does this course fit into teacher education programs in terms of its conceptualization as foundational knowledge and its links to methods and practices? This particular course content or workload in the given context was overwhelming to some teacher-candidates, suggesting more time should be dedicated to linguistic inclusiveness teacher education, given that most all topics contributed to teacher-candidates' learning. In addition, linguistically inclusive teaching is intended for general teacher education, not only as part of an optional endorsement. How might the curriculum be structured within a teacher education program (TEP), as opposed to an endorsement program? It will also be important to consider the differential needs of elementary and secondary teacher-candidates and of ELA versus other subject-area specialist teacher-candidates. Consideration must be given to the integration of a linguistic inclusiveness theme or vision, or at least a supportive culture, across the teacher education program, requiring the commitment and vision of the faculty and perhaps even faculty development initiatives (Athaneses & de Oliveira, 2011; Brisk, 2008b; Bunch, 2010; Gort et al., 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

## **Linguistic inclusiveness foundations and methods**

A major question about the design of the linguistic inclusiveness curriculum is its timing during a teacher education program and its conceptualization as a foundations or methods-oriented course, or, the question of how to integrate linguistic inclusiveness foundations, as in the proposed curriculum, and linguistic inclusiveness methods. To some extent, the question is related to program-wide and teacher-candidates' own conceptualizations of teachers as professionals or as technicians (Bartolomé, 1994; Nieto, 2005b; Zeichner, 2003, 2006) and of the goals of teacher education in general. The view of teachers also shapes expectations for learning and thus the structure of these curricula.

In a view of teachers as technicians, teacher education need only provide methods and strategies for instruction, and since curricula are selected for their ultimate classes, teachers need only follow the prescribed content, activities, and even script (Zeichner, 2003, 2006; Zeichner & Hutchinson, 2008). This view would lead teacher-candidates to expect a course preparing them for ELL certification to focus on approved methods and strategies for helping SLES students access content, such as scaffolding instruction by using visual aids to demonstrate and clarify classroom language (e.g. Echevarria et al., 2012; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). It would also coincide with an understanding that a science teacher's only duty is to cover the science content, not to scaffold instruction for CLD students or take responsibility for supporting their language development. Teaching in this way also seems to allow for less student engagement and less constructivist methodology. This view of teachers is incompatible with linguistic inclusiveness.

A vision of teachers as professionals sees teaching as dynamic and flexible interaction with students who contribute to the learning and teachers who help students to connect new knowledge to their prior knowledge and experience in a constructivist understanding of learning

(Labaree, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; Zeichner, 2003 and others). Teachers must therefore be educated and have a knowledge base they can use in thinking on-the-spot about communication and learning interactions in the classroom. Linguistic inclusiveness takes this view of teachers, and linguistically inclusive teaching requires a knowledge base in language structure, acquisition, and variation that empowers teachers to be reflective about the language of their classrooms and their communications with students, to be aware of potential differences in understandings and usages of language, and to make language explicit and guide students in discussion and analysis of language when needed. Linguistically inclusive teachers take an active role in including all students in constructivist meaning-making, and therefore have a responsibility to contribute to CLD students' language development. A curriculum in linguistic inclusiveness, in this view, should provide a solid knowledge base and instill dispositions of equity and social justice for CLD students and of inquiry about students' language and understanding.

The view of teachers as thinking professionals, however, does not preclude the existence of methods courses in LITE. The methods versus "foundations" dichotomy in teacher education courses is long-standing and ubiquitous (Grossman et al., 2009), where foundations courses provide conceptual and theoretical knowledge, such as courses in the history and philosophy of education, developmental psychology, early literacy, or multicultural education, and methods classes are specialized for each discipline (and grade band), such as elementary math methods and focus more closely on practices, strategies, and concrete teaching "moves." In this model, foundations courses would normally be taken before methods courses. What kind or kinds of courses are needed for linguistic inclusiveness, and how was this course envisioned to fit into the dichotomy?

Throughout the discussion, I have referred to the goals of establishing a foundational knowledge of language structure, acquisition, and variation as well as particular dispositions toward language and CLD students, which situates this curriculum squarely in the role of a foundations course. This contrasts with the methodological approaches such as CALLA and SIOP discussed in Chapter 2 where I mentioned that those models seem to equip teacher-candidates with no reasoning for the strategies and methods and no foundational theory or knowledge to help teacher-candidates learn or remember the methods or thoughtfully apply and modify them in the classroom. The curriculum for this course was designed to set a foundation for thinking about these kinds of methods, applying them critically, and even devising new methods as needed to meet the needs of diverse students. It is not a methodology in itself, but is a foundations course.

It was thus surprising that on the pre-tests taken at the beginning of the course, and reiterated on some of the final course evaluations, teacher-candidates reported that they (had) expected to learn teaching methods. This expectation is all the more surprising given that the ELL endorsement program in which the class was situated included a methods course which was even named such. It is also surprising that teacher-candidates would be focused on methods after completing the particular teacher education program in the same college of education, as it emphasizes constructivist learning and a strong education for teachers to be reflective professionals.

Some number of teacher-candidates in this class and in the elementary teacher education classes I taught during the next term revealed methods-oriented thinking on the pre-test question about what they hoped to learn in the class. This methods orientation on the pre-test likely stems from practical thinking about upcoming work realities (especially for the two cohort-based ELL

endorsement groups in their last term of courses), from immediately previous courses in their teacher education programs (the later ones likely being methods-oriented) and it not being clear that the course was a foundations course, and from a general lack of understanding of what language and linguistics is and how a foundation can inform their teaching. This practical or practice-oriented thinking is reasonable, of course, and foremost in some of the secondary teacher-candidates' minds, pointing to the need for programmatic consideration of the timing and situation of this content and learning in larger teacher education programs, about the framing of the material as foundation or methods, and about the learning activities as theoretical discussions versus practice-based activities and who might best lead those kinds of learning.<sup>62</sup>

Of course not all teacher-candidates had these expectations or learning goals or made them explicit, but perhaps there was sense that a foundations course was out-of-place for these particular teacher-candidates. Recall that the course I taught was one of three courses comprising an ELL endorsement program (along with a teaching practicum) that immediately followed their teacher certification program. These teacher-candidates had chosen to *add* an endorsement, though they were already certified to teach and thus educated and prepared as much as was required. Though they had opted to take the program to learn how to best teach SLES students, it is possible that a course on basic linguistic foundations felt like foundations courses they had taken some time prior and like they were being asked to start again with “early” foundations studies. There is no simple solution to the issue of foundations courses in an add-on endorsement program except to clearly proclaim a foundational goal (see footnote 62).

---

<sup>62</sup> An interesting aside, in the cohort-based elementary course, which was offered as a foundations class alongside an immigration and culture-based foundations course *before* Methods, Assessment and practicum courses, a student mentioned that while it was hard to put into words exactly what was being learned, s/he was confident that it was greatly informing her/his teaching. Additionally, a student from the mixed class mentioned on two occasions that s/he was making connections to *previous* classes (“so *this* is what they were talking about!”) and that s/he wished the class had been offered earlier in the teacher education program.

Not all linguistic inclusiveness education need necessarily be in foundations courses nor in one single course. Concerning the latter point, recall that the workload was overwhelming for a number of teacher-candidates, as were some of the readings and the overall amount of content for some. It was mentioned that even this foundational content might be best spread out over more than one class. A second course might be beneficial specifically focusing on second language acquisition, cultural linguistics, and sociolinguistics.<sup>63</sup> One course or two, basic understandings of language structure, acquisition, and variation are clearly foundational knowledge, also encouraging fundamental dispositions alongside cultural responsiveness and multicultural education courses. Education in sheltering and scaffolding methods and in functional linguistic analysis of text (and corollary methods for doing the analysis with students) might also be part of a larger linguistic inclusiveness program theme that could be included in methods-oriented courses or themes.

The structure envisioned for linguistic inclusiveness includes a foundations course such as the one examined here (as one or two courses) with concepts reiterated and additional topics integrated throughout the teacher education curriculum. Recalling that, according to the course evaluations, six students reportedly struggled with connecting linguistic knowledge to their teaching practices, methods, and earlier teacher education program learning, it seems that the course would have been more effective if it were better integrated into the immediate program or taken earlier as a foundations course. In this particular case, lack of integration is due in part to my adjunct position with respect to the program as well, and in part to the add-on endorsement situation of the course, but it underscores the importance of integrating linguistic inclusiveness education across the teacher education program and teachers' development of professional

---

<sup>63</sup> The course I taught is officially named "Multilingualistic socialization and development," reflecting a focus on these topics where the basic structural topics were to be covered either in another course or more quickly and outside of class time.

identities. Continued consideration should be given to what might be the optimal introduction of *three* components of a linguistic inclusiveness curriculum: basic linguistic structural knowledge, areas that would seem to rely on that basic knowledge such as sociolinguistics, acquisition, and disciplinary language analysis, and more direct methods and practices of linguistic inclusiveness. Integration of these three learning areas requires teacher education faculties' preparation, intention, and vision for doing so (Athaneses & de Oliviera, 2011; Gort et al., 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

### **General teacher education, not endorsement**

On a related point, linguistic inclusiveness as proposed here is ultimately a learning goal for general teacher education programs, and not only for ELL endorsement or ESL specialists. The discussion in Chapter 2 established the *demographic imperative* for linguistic inclusiveness in general teacher education: that while the overwhelming majority of teachers remains white and monolingual (English speakers), the number of CLM students<sup>64</sup> continues to rapidly rise, the US population continues to diversify, and all students must therefore be prepared to communicate and cooperate with peers from diverse backgrounds and perspectives (Banks et al., 2005). When linguistic inclusiveness teacher education is integrated into general teacher education programs, the foundations course or courses can be scheduled early in the program, concepts continually integrated into other courses such as developmental psychology, multicultural education and methods-oriented courses, and connections consistently made to practice, ideology, and professional identity.

### **Elementary and Secondary Educators**

Linguistically inclusive teaching and its integration is equally relevant to elementary and secondary teacher-candidates, but will have somewhat different foci in “advanced topics” and

---

<sup>64</sup> Nieto (2005b) calls them “new majority” students.

some differences in learning goals. Concepts of sociolinguistic identity and academic language are especially relevant for secondary teacher-candidates (though not irrelevant for elementary teacher-candidates), while the relationships between phonetics, phonology and orthography on one hand, early language development and the differences between bilingual first language acquisition and childhood second language acquisition on the other, for example, are especially relevant for elementary educators. Basic structural concepts, including semantics, pragmatics, and functional linguistics, are universally relevant. Here the focus has been on secondary educators, but I have had very positive responses from elementary teacher-candidates in other similar classes, and many concepts are conceptually relevant in elementary teaching.

### **ELA and other subject area teacher-candidates**

Similarly, linguistic inclusiveness education is as important for ELA teacher-candidates as for those in math, science, and social studies.<sup>65</sup> How structural knowledge should be presented and integrated into the teacher education program of ELA teacher-candidates as opposed to the others is a topic for continued consideration, given that ELA teacher-candidates take a required linguistics or structure of language course as part of their undergraduate degree programs. Recall that that course did not instill anti-hegemonic, linguistically inclusive dispositions in some teacher-candidates in the case study, however, but allowed them to privilege prescriptive English. Nor did it provide lasting understanding of language structure, at least as evidenced by teacher-candidates' responses to the pre-test question "what do you know about language," or make it into their linguistic autobiographies as influencing their thinking about language. The value of that undergraduate class for ELA teacher-candidates' linguistic

---

<sup>65</sup> Of concern for another study is the LI preparation of world language teachers. There were none in the class study here, so discussion would be speculative, but it is of note that, unlike the other teacher-candidates, they would obviously have experience in learning a second language, as well as foundational education in language structure as part of their undergraduate studies, providing significant resources for LI insights, knowledge and dispositions. Their teaching contexts will also differ.

inclusiveness is seriously brought into question. Two teacher candidates also concluded that our course was beneficial in the context of ELL endorsement and the teaching practicum. In sum, while certain concepts and activities from the course were redundant for some ELA teacher-candidates, the linguistic inclusiveness focus and situation of the course in teacher education were important for ELA learning.

As for other subject-area teacher-candidates, they were more likely to have profound and critical learnings stemming from structural concepts in linguistics and to value learning how their discipline's language differed from other areas and from everyday, casual language. Math, science, and social studies teacher-candidates showed excitement, appreciation and benefit from learning about language, while ELA teacher-candidates' linguistic inclusiveness learning must be carefully contextualized to be effective.

### **Integration, program commitment, vision, and faculty development**

Linguistic inclusiveness education is thus important for all teacher-candidates and ideally spans and interconnects foundations and methods courses, being integrated across the general teacher education program. In these ways it would begin to resemble the vision based on the curriculum in Chapter 4 and the theoretical considerations in Chapter 3, with connections to multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, and social justice teacher education. This extended linguistic inclusiveness education and incorporation across courses requires a program-wide commitment and a shared vision of linguistic inclusiveness and its role in the program (Athaneses & de Oliveira, 2011), just as others have discussed for culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and for social justice teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Without faculty commitment and a program vision, linguistic inclusiveness will be relegated to add-on status as part of an optional endorsement or a

single, isolated class, taught by a single isolated faculty member or an even less-integrated adjunct instructor. Marginalization of linguistic inclusiveness precludes the incorporation of linguistically inclusive thinking and practices in teacher-candidates' formation, their pedagogical ideologies, identities, and repertoires, and defeats the purpose of the class and the effort.

Successful LITE will be a program-wide theme and will include linguistic and pedagogical foundations (including developmental, philosophical, and historical) as well as methodological and practical learning.

Because language studies have been marginalized for the last few decades (Fillmore & Snow, 2002), it is likely that teacher education faculty will need to research and study some of the main topics of the linguistic inclusiveness curriculum itself as well as teacher education in these areas and to collaborate in learning and discussion in order to come to an understanding of linguistic inclusiveness teacher education, its potential for social justice and equitable education for CLD students, and how it might be integrated into their program vision and curricula (Athaneses & de Oliviera, 2011; Gort et al., 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Some teacher education faculty have engaged in such faculty development and collaborations for linguistic responsiveness, but because it is such a new concept, there are still few examples of linguistically responsive teaching, linguistic responsiveness or inclusiveness teacher education, and faculty development along these similar lines that can serve as models for the development of linguistic inclusiveness teacher education (but see Athaneses & de Oliviera, 2011; Gort et al., 2011). The discussion here, the case study, and the curriculum in Chapter 4 are intended to contribute to the research into how linguistic inclusiveness teacher education might be implemented and to what effect.

## **Ensuring enactment of linguistically inclusive teaching**

This study is only a single example of how linguistic inclusiveness teacher education might “work.” Teacher-candidates’ dispositions, intentions, and empowerment for inquiry and inclusiveness were evident in many of their writings, but besides stemming from but one case study with a variety of limitations and particularities, stated intentions do not entail enactment. Eleven teacher-candidates wrote in their final essays of their intentions to explicitly teach aspects of language and integrate language in their teaching, and six wrote on the same theme for the second reflection essay. One teacher-candidate specifically mentioned feeling empowered, and several wrote about a responsibility to teach language and scaffold instruction for SLES students, including one who mentioned advocating with other teachers. Especially because the data comes from coursework, intentions may always be exaggerated. Furthermore, this course did not provide direct links to LI practices or experience in those practices and methods, though the ELL Methods course and teaching practicum might have done so. In any case, a variety of factors will enter into whether or not teachers enact LIT (or any other pedagogy), even when they have stated goals and some amount of preparation.

### **Longitudinal studies needed**

A longitudinal study that followed these educators into their classrooms, observed their work and allowed for interviews and further teacher reflection could shed more light on the ways in which LI might be implemented by teachers who had completed this course (or similar). Cochran-Smith’s (2009) study of social justice teacher education is a prime example of the kind of study needed for LITE and for this curriculum specifically. For her study, she interviewed and observed teacher-candidates-then-teachers throughout the year of pre-service social justice teacher education and into their first year of teaching. This allowed her to assess their

conceptualizations, ideologies, and enactment of social justice teaching. Using interviews as well as observations also allowed triangulation and validation of findings. A similar study of the development and performance of LITE would be very enlightening.

A comparative case study of teacher-candidates who had and had not had LITE is another option for learning about teacher learning and take-up of LI, but because contexts (of the teacher education with and without LITE and of ultimate teaching positions) inevitably differ, these studies will also be limited in their ability to evaluate LITE curricula and approaches.

Any further study of teachers' enactment of LIT, however, would be valuable in developing a knowledge base of LIT practices and in investigating how teachers learn or devise these practices. No doubt some number of such studies exist, such as Kaje's (2009) comparative case study of the exemplary instructional strategies of two teachers for working with CLD students. Kaje's study included analysis of the teachers' attention to academic language development and included data on SLES students' learning.

Because the current study involved a course that was part of an ELL endorsement program, it is not a true test of LITE *as envisioned*, that is, integrated in to a general teacher education program. As part of an ELL endorsement program, it was optional and late in teacher-candidates' preparation. Effects of the course were likely limited by its non-integration with other, *formative* teacher development, and the positive outcomes could partly be attributed to teacher-candidates' existing dispositions as evidenced in their decision to enroll in the program.<sup>66</sup> These contextual effects are important to consider, especially in designing a comparative case study of teachers who have or have not had LITE. This type of program provides venues for observing teacher-candidates' development of LIT strategies where they are able to use the

---

<sup>66</sup> That is, teacher-candidates would likely have entered into the ELL endorsement program with somewhat inclusive and culturally responsive intentions.

language knowledge to (mutually) inform discussion and learning in their methods and assessment classes and their interactions in the practicum with SLES and CLD students. Of course the effects of the multiple LITE experiences would be interlaced and mutually reinforcing, so the effects of a single class would be difficult to determine.

### **Induction support and professional development for in-service teachers**

Any longitudinal studies of the eventual outcomes of the LI class or program, and indeed LITE in general, must also take into account the challenges of the induction period. The first years of teaching are especially challenging while new teachers are adapting to the work environment, culture of the school, and workload, and being responsible for classroom management, curricula, and myriad other concerns. In this particular case, the LITE, that is, the endorsement program, was intensive, but short, so time was limited for the pre-service teachers to develop LI ideologies *and practices* that could carry over into the first year or years of teaching with any automaticity or expertise. LI, then, would be something these teachers would have to consciously and constantly think about in their lesson planning and in interactions with students during the first years of teaching, and this additional burden among burdens of adaptation and development, along with the lack of practice and experience might yield less impressive results of LITE. A longitudinal study would shed light on how LITE might eventually carry over into practice and of general trajectories in the development of LIT.

For LI to become standard practice in the field, LITE must subsume the induction period, providing extended opportunities for collaboration and continued learning and growth. Especially because the proposed curriculum is but a *foundation* for LI, which also involves an inquiry approach to the languages and understandings of individual students, it is intended to be long-term collaborative learning. The next step in developing the curriculum is to devise sites

and methods for long-term, collaborative learning communities, involving new and experienced linguistically inclusive teachers, who can share their experiences, approaches, and teaching materials, and university faculty and other (e.g. district) professionals who can share recent research, clarify concepts and so on. Again, because language studies are so foreign to so many teachers and generally limited and marginalized in education and society, there is a great deal of learning that LITE might include. Teachers' input and exchange of ideas is essential both in the conceptualization of LI (e.g. constructivist learning and inclusion of multiple language understandings) and in its development as a common pedagogy.

LITE should also be extended to in-service teachers through concerted professional development, professional learning communities, and endorsement opportunities. If the "old guard" does not have opportunities to update and learn about LI, they cannot be expected to engage in it, contribute to its development, encourage and mentor it in new teachers, or necessarily even accept it as an effective and valuable pedagogy. LIT requires continual learning through interactions with CLD students and the adaptation of traditional teaching practices, and this learning and effort mustn't be stymied in new linguistically inclusive teachers by mentors and senior teachers who don't support it. Instead, that colleague support can be built by providing opportunities for senior teachers to extend their pedagogical knowledge base and dispositions with LI professional development and school- or district-based communities of learning.

It does seem that the beginnings of LITE are in place, given the ELL endorsement opportunities that exist. Endorsement programs that include courses like the one proposed here provide a knowledge base for continued LI, inquiry, and learning alongside the more common methods training (which is offered in professional development workshops as well). Another

next-step in developing LIT is to devise means of engaging in-service teachers with the knowledge base of language structure, acquisition, and variation with more flexibility and less financial burden than university-based endorsement programs perhaps, but in meaningful and effective ways.

### **Limitations of political contexts**

Other reasons that teachers may struggle to enact their LI intentions in the classroom stem from the current general US and local political contexts of education and teaching. Prevailing views of teachers as technicians and emphasis on accountability, scripted teaching, and methods over teachers' knowledge and discretion (as discussed by Zeichner, 2003; Zeichner, 2006; Zeichner & Hutchinson, 2008) contradict the view of teachers that linguistic inclusiveness promotes and depends on. If teachers are swayed by these views or are not prepared to confront them, their LIT will be at risk of suppression from within and without. Linguistic inclusiveness requires teachers to take a dynamic, flexible, and reflective approach to working with diverse students and learning materials and activities that incorporates individual students' thinking about and through language. LIT may be stifled by contradictory expectations and pressures to conform to prescribed non-LI teaching methods. Similar pressures may come from local school cultures, policies, traditions, and accountability structures, as well as from senior colleagues and administrators.

On one hand, one can argue that much of LIT is realized through attitudes and through subtle teaching strategies and interactions with CLD students. LIT includes minor adaptations such as using other-language greetings, concepts, and signage in the classroom, encouraging SLES to use their first languages when they need to and for comparison of ideas and language structures in classroom discussions. It also involves "just good teaching" (de Jong & Harper,

2005, 2008) such as soliciting students' understandings and interpretations of lesson content (and language), combined with a knowledge base that allows them to predict, understand, and reflect on challenging language patterns and areas of potential miscommunication or misunderstanding in order to better promote students' learning.

On the other hand, preparing linguistically inclusive teachers will likely have to go beyond the basic LI knowledge base and developing LI dispositions, practices and even ideologies (Nieto, 2005b). It will have to include awareness of larger political contexts of educating CLM students (de Jong & Harper, 2008; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005) and of teaching and education in general. For this reason, LITE must be espoused by the teacher education faculty, embedded in teacher development, and integrated with paradigms of multicultural education and social justice teacher education so that LI becomes part of teacher professional identity and ideology and so that teachers' abilities to challenge linguistic prejudice, whether institutionalized or interpersonal, hegemonies, and marginalization of minorities are developed along with their multicultural and social justice capabilities. It is for these reasons that LI depends on these foregoing and overarching frameworks.

### **Future directions**

Of course most of these are matters for continuing research because LI and LITE, as well as linguistic responsiveness (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008), are new concepts, and even relatively long-standing paradigms of multicultural education and social justice teacher education are still fighting against the demeaning and oppressive views of education and CLD students in the political and social –and educational – arenas. The theoretical potential of LIT suggests many questions for immediate and long-term future research.

In addition to case studies of the effects of individual classes like the one examined here, the development of LITE can be informed by more detailed analyses of pre- and in-service teacher learning in LITE *programs*, including the endorsement programs that exist. What topics, concepts and learning activities contribute to LI dispositions, awareness, applicable knowledge, ideologies and practices? This study contributes in this area and suggests that basic knowledge of language structure, acquisition and variation can contribute to empathetic and inclusive dispositions, a sense of inquiry, and empowerment to continue learning and to include language in teaching and engage CLM students in and for quality learning.

Further consideration, observation, and longitudinal studies of linguistically inclusive teachers will help to enumerate LI practices that can be developed as part of LITE as well. Next questions concern how teachers who have completed LITE (in various forms) do and do not engage in LIT in their eventual classrooms and what factors promote or prevent LIT. Some ideas were discussed above, but future research will clarify the realities and suggest remedies and areas for improvement of LITE. Further development of linguistically inclusive pedagogy will also come from professional learning communities and the exchanges they allow between interested parties, all of which should be studied and shared in the larger learning communities of teacher education and LI education and research. These studies should also address the specific components (concepts topics, learning activities, courses, and other experiences) of LITE programs and the experiences of teachers in determining how teaching is improved by LITE and by teachers' concepts and development of LI.

When a baseline understanding of enacted LIT is established, studies should be undertaken of its effects on students—not limited to the standard test-based achievement of CLM students, but to include effects on all students socially, academically, and linguistically and

metalinguistically. Especially interesting are the potential connections between the metalinguistic awareness that LIT can help to develop in students and learning in other areas including but not limited to literacy skills (where correlations have been found) and critical thinking. Can LIT truly encourage heritage and first language maintenance and improved English language development? Can LIT be considered facilitation of critical thinking?

Most importantly, linguistically inclusive teaching has great promise, which only its successful implementation and future studies can confirm, for challenging the hegemony of English and of standard varieties (of any language), for encouraging heritage language pride and multilingual societies, and for contributing to equitable and socially just education for all students.

## References

- Abbate-Vaughn, J. (2008). Highly Qualified Teachers for our Schools. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, Culture and Community in Teacher Education* (pp. 175-202). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Achugar, M., Schleppegrell, M. J., & Oteiza, T. (2007). Engaging Teachers in Language Analysis: A Functional Linguistics Approach to Reflective Literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(2), 8-24.
- Aitchison, J. (1996). *The seeds of speech: Language origin and evolution*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Almond, D. (2013). Children and language: Taalk propa? Hadaway wi ye. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/feb/08/taalk-proper>
- Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses : negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, N.J.; Urbana, Ill.: L. Erlbaum Associates, ; National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ardila-Rey, A. (2008). Language, Culture, Policy and Standards in Teacher Preparation: Lessons from Research and Model Practices Addressing the Needs of CLD Children and Their Teachers. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, Culture and Community in Teacher Education* (pp. 331-352). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Athaneses, S. K., & de Oliviera, L. C. (2011). Toward Program-Wide Coherence in Preparing Teachers to Teach and Advocate for English Language Learners. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators*. New York: Routledge.
- Au, K. H.-p. (1980a). Cultural Congruence in the Social Organization of a Reading Lesson with Hawaiian Students.
- Au, K. H.-P. (1980b). Participation Structures in a Reading Lesson with Hawaiian Children: Analysis of a Culturally Appropriate Instructional Event. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 11(2), 91-115.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children : a research agenda*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners : report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum  
Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Baca, L., & Escamilla, K. (2002). Educating teachers about language. In C. T. Adger, C. Snow & D. Christian (Eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know about Language* (pp. 71-84). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics,
- Delta Systems Co. Inc.
- Banks, C. A. M., & Banks, J. A. (1995). Equity Pedagogy: An Essential Component of Multicultural Education. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 151-158.
- Banks, J. A. (1988). *Multicultural education : theory and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. In C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 3-24). New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education : foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Banks, J. A. (2004a). Multicultural Education: Characteristics and Goals In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education : issues and perspectives* (Sixth ed., pp. 3-29). Hoboken, N.J.: Hoboken, N.J. : Wiley.
- Banks, J. A. (2004b). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. In C. A. M. Banks & J. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (Second ed., pp. 3-24). New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2013). Multicultural Education: Goals and Dimensions Retrieved June 15, 2013, 2013, from <http://education.washington.edu/cme/view.htm>
- Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York; London: Macmillan Pub. ; Prentice Hall International.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L. C., Richert, A., Zeichner, K. M., LePage, P., . . . McDonald, w. M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: what teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 126-168). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Barry, A. K. (2002). *Linguistic Perspectives on Language and Education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Bartolomé, L. I. (1994). Beyond the Methods Fetish: Toward a Humanizing Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 173-194.
- Bartolomé, L. I. (2000). Democratizing bilingualism: The role of critical teacher education. In Z. F. Beykont (Ed.), *Lifting Every Voice: Pedagogy and politics of bilingualism* (pp. 167-188). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering Research on Teachers' Professional Identity. *Teaching & Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 20(2), 107-128.
- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Nagy, W., & Carlisle, J. (2010). Growth in Phonological, Orthographic, and Morphological Awareness in Grades 1 to 6. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 39(2), 141-163.
- Biber, D. (1986). Spoken and Written Textual Dimensions in English: Resolving the Contradictory Findings. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America*, 62(2), 384-414.
- Bloor, M., & Wood, F. (2006). *Keywords in qualitative methods : a vocabulary of research concepts*. London; Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Boyer, J. B. (1993). Culturally-sensitive instruction: an Essential component of education for diversity. *Catalyst for Change*, 22(3), 5-8.
- Bransford, J., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. e. (2000). *How people learn : brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Brisk, M. E. (2008a). *Language, culture, and community in teacher education*. New York: L. Erlbaum Associates.

- Brisk, M. E. (2008b). Program and Faculty Transformation: Enhancing Teacher Preparation. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, Culture and Community in Teacher Education* (pp. 249-266). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, R. (1973). *A First Language: The early stages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, S., & Attardo, S. (2005). *Understanding language structure, interaction, and variation : an introduction to applied linguistics and sociolinguistics for nonspecialists*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, A. Jarvella & W. Levelt (Eds.), *The Child's Conception of Language*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Bruner, J. S., & Watson, R. (1983). *Child's talk : learning to use language*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Bunch, G. C. (2010). Preparing Mainstream Secondary Content-Area Teachers to Facilitate English Language Learners' Development of Academic Language. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 109(2), 351-383.
- Burkholder, Z. (2010). From "Wops and Dagoes and Hunkies" to "Caucasian": Changing Racial Discourse in American Classrooms during World War II. *History of Education Quarterly*, 50(3), 324-358.
- Campano, G., & Ghiso, M. P. (2011). Immigrant Students as Cosmopolitan Intellectuals. In S. A. Wolf, K. Coats, P. A. Enciso & C. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of research on children's and young adult literature*. New York: Routledge.
- Carlisle, J. F. (2000). Awareness of the structure and meaning of morphologically complex words: Impact on reading. *Reading and Writing*, 12(3-4), 169-190. doi: 10.1023/a:1008131926604
- Carlisle, J. F. (2010). Effects of instruction in morphological awareness on literacy achievement: An integrative review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(4), 464-487. doi: 10.1598/rrq.45.4.5
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, & Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: teachers for the 21st century: the report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, May 1986*. Washington, D.C.: The Forum.
- Carnegie Foundation. (2007). *Teachers for a New Era Prospectus*. New York: Carnegie Foundation.
- Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2011). The Results of the National Heritage Language Survey: Implications for teaching, curriculum design and professional development. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(1), 40-64.
- Cazden, C., & Leggett, E. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Recommendations for achieving Lau remedies II. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie & K. H.-P. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 69-86). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). The elaboration of sociolinguistic competence: implications for teacher education. In J. E. Alatis, C. A. Straehle, B. Gallenberger & M. Ronkin (Eds.), *Linguistics in the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Aspects* (pp. 699-710). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). On the Use of Selected Grammatical Features in Academic Writing. In M. J. Schleppegrell & C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages* (pp. 143-158). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chamot, A. U., O'Malley, J. M., & National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, W. D. C. (1986). *A Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: An ESL Content-Based Curriculum*.
- Chang, P., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2011). Taking an Effective Authorial Stance in Academic Writing: Making the Linguistic Resources Explicit for L2 Writers in the Social Sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(3), 140-151.
- Chen, H.-q. (2008). Appreciation of Hardy's Poem "Neutral Tones" from the Point of View of Functional Analysis. *Online Submission*.
- Chenhansa, S., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (1998). Linguistic Features of Middle School Environmental Education Texts. *Environmental Education Research, 4*(1), 53-66.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). *Lectures on government and binding : the Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris Publications.
- Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1968). *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Christie, F., & Maton, K. (2011). *Disciplinary : functional linguistics and sociological perspectives*. London; New York: Continuum Intl Pub Group ;.
- Clayton, C., Barnhardt, R., & Brisk, M. E. (2008). Language, Culture and Identity. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, Culture, and Community in Teacher Education* (pp. 21-46). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cleary, L. M., & Linn, M. D. (1993). *Linguistics for teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road : race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). The AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education: Context and Goals. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 37-68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 249-305.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and Just Teaching: The Case for Social Justice in Teacher Education. *American Journal of Education, 115*(3), 347-377.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2012). Common Core State Standards. <http://www.corestandards.org/>.
- Corson, D. (1997). The Learning and Use of Academic English Words. *Language Learning, 47*(4), 671-718.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners : language diversity in the classroom*. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Cummins, J. (1979a). Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependence, the Optimum Age Question and Some Other Matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* (Vol. No. 19): Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto Bilingual Education Project.
- Cummins, J. (1979b). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19*, 121-129.
- Cummins, J. (1999). *BICS and CALP: Clarifying the Distinction*.

- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy : bilingual children in the crossfire*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. C. (2005). *A good teacher in every classroom : preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve*. (0787974668 9780787974664). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: what teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing Mainstream Teachers for English-Language Learners: Is Being a Good Teacher Good Enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101-124.
- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2008). ESL is Good Teaching "plus": Preparing Standard Curriculum Teachers for All Learners. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, Culture and Community in Teacher Education* (pp. 127-148). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2011). "Accommodating Diversity" : Pre-service teachers' views on effective practices for English learners. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms : a resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55-72). New York: Routledge.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory : an introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Delpit, L. D. (1992). Acquisition of Literate Discourse: Bowing before the Master? *Theory Into Practice*, 31(4), 296-302.
- Delpit, L. D. (1995a). *Language Diversity and Learning Other People's Children; cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Delpit, L. D. (1995b). *Other people's children : cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press : Distributed by W.W. Norton.
- Delpit, L. D. (1995c). *The Politics of Teaching Literate Discourse Other People's Children; cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Denham, K., & Lobeck, A. (2010a). *Linguistics at school : language awareness in primary and secondary education*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Denham, K., & Lobeck, A. (2010b). *Linguistics for Everyone; an Introduction*. Boston, MA: Michael Wadsworth and CENGAGE Learning.
- Denham, K., & Lobeck, A. (2013). *Linguistics for Everyone; an Introduction* (Second ed.). Boston, MA: Michael Wadsworth and CENGAGE Learning.
- Dewey, J. (1990). *The school and society ; and, The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewitz, P., & International Reading Association. (2010). *A History of Core Reading Programs The essential guide to selecting and using core reading programs*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.
- Echevarria, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Canges, R., & Francis, D. (2011). Using the SIOP Model to Promote the Acquisition of Language and Science Concepts with English Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34(3), 334-351.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners : the SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners : the SIOP model*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2012). *Making content comprehensible for English learners : the SIOP® model*. Boston: Pearson.
- Ethnologue (online). (2013). Ethnologue: Languages of the world. Retrieved November 2013, from SIL International Publications <http://www.ethnologue.com/>
- Faltis, C., Valdés, G., & Education, N. S. f. t. S. o. (2010). *Education, immigrant students, refugee students, and English learners*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Fang, Z. (2005). Scientific Literacy: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Perspective. *Science Education*, 89(2), 335-347.
- Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2010). Disciplinary Literacies across Content Areas: Supporting Secondary Reading through Functional Language Analysis. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(7), 587-597.
- Fang, Z., Schleppegrell, M. J., & Cox, B. E. (2006). Understanding the Language Demands of Schooling: Nouns in Academic Registers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(3), 247-273.
- Fang, Z., Schleppegrell, M. J., & Lukin, A. (2008). *Reading in secondary content areas : a language-based pedagogy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Field, F. W. (2011). *Bilingualism in the USA : the case of the Chicano-Latino community*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Company.
- Fillmore, L. W. (1991). When Learning a Second Language Means Losing the First. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6(3), 323-347.
- Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2002). What Teachers Need to Know About Language. In C. Temple Adger, C. E. Snow & D. Christian (Eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know About Language*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co. Inc.
- Finegan, E. (2004). *Language : its structure and use*. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Fraser, J. W. (2007). *Preparing America's Teachers; A History*. New York: London: Teachers College Press, Teachers College Columbia University.
- Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. *Language Teaching*, 35, 1-13.
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2004). *Essential linguistics : what you need to know to teach reading, ESL, spelling, phonics, and grammar*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2011). *Between worlds : access to second language acquisition* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (2009). *Academic language for English language learners and struggling readers : how to help students succeed across content areas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (D. Macedo, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2003). *An introduction to language* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle, a part of Thomson Corporation.
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). Listening to Teachers of English Language Learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE  
Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning  
California University-San Diego Linguistic Minority Research Institute.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching : theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for Culturally Responsive Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Gay, G. (2004). Beyond Brown: Promoting Equality Through Multicultural Education. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 19(3), 193-216.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching : theory, research, and practice* (Second ed.). New York: Teachers College.
- Gebhard, M., Harman, R., & Seger, W. (2007). Reclaiming Recess: Learning the Language of Persuasion. *Language Arts*, 84(5), 419-430.
- Gebhard, M., Willett, J., Jimenez, J. P., & Piedra, A. (2011). Systemic Functional Linguistics, Teachers' Professional Development, and ELLs' Academic Literacy Practices. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms : a resource for teacher educators* (pp. 91-110). New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. (2002). Language, Literacy and Discourse. In M. J. Schleppegrell & C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages : meaning with power*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies : ideology in discourses*. London New York: Routledge.
- Genesee, F., & Nicoladis, E. (2007). Bilingual First Language Acquisition. In E. Hoff & M. Shatz (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Development* (pp. 324-342). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Genesee, F., Paradis, J., & Crago, M. (2004a). Bilingual First Language Acquisition *Dual Language Development and Disorders: a handbook on bilingualism and second language learning*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.
- Genesee, F., Paradis, J., & Crago, M. (2004b). Second language acquisition in children *Dual language development and disorders: a handbook on bilingualism and second language learning* (pp. 117-153). Baltimore, MD: Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Gibbons, P. (1993). *Learning to learn in a second language*. Portsmouth, NH : Newtown, NSW: Heinemann  
Primary English Teaching Association.
- 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 : students, teachers and researchers*. London New York: Continuum.
- Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking : learning in the challenge zone*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals : toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers : an introduction*. Boston, Mass.; Montreal: Pearson.
- Goldenberg, C. N., & Coleman, R. (2010). *Promoting academic achievement among English learners : a guide to the research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gollnick, D. M. (2002). Incorporating linguistic knowledge in standards for teacher performance. In C. T. Adger, C. Snow & D. Christian (Eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know about Language* (pp. 103-112). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics, Delta Systems Co. Inc.

- Gomez, K., Sherer, J., Herman, P., Gomez, L., White Zywica, J., & Williams, A. (2010). Supporting Meaningful Science Learning: Reading and Writing Science. In A. J. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Science Education as a Pathway to Teaching Language Literacy* (pp. 93-121). Boston: Sense Publishers.
- Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: a psychological guessing game. In F. Golasch (Ed.), *Language and Literacy: the collected works of Kenneth S. Goodman* (Vol. 1: Process, theory, research). London: Routledge.
- Gordon, T. (2012). *The Educator's Guide to Linguistics*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Gort, M., Glenn, W. J., & Settlage, J. (2011). Toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education: the impact of a faculty learning community on two teacher educators. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A resource for teacher educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grant, C. A., & Ladson-Billings, G. (1997). *Dictionary of multicultural education*. Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx Press.
- Graves, M. F. (2006). *The vocabulary book : learning & instruction*. New York; Newark, DE; Urbana, IL: Teacher's College Press ; International Reading Assoc. ; NCTE.
- Green, L., McCutchen, D., Schwiebert, C., Quinlan, T., Eva-Wood, A., & Juelis, J. (2003). Morphological Development in Children's Writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 752-761. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.752
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining Teaching, Re-Imagining Teacher Education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 273-289.
- Grossman, P., & Loeb, S. (2008). *Alternative Routes to Teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hakuta, K. (2011). Educating Language Minority Students and Affirming Their Equal Rights: Research and Practical Perspectives. *Educational Researcher*, 40(4), 163-174.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1977). *Learning how to mean : explorations in the development of language*. New York: Elsevier.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: E. Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hassan, R. (1989). *Language, Context, and Text: aspects of language in a socialsemiotic perspective*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing Teachers for Changing World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. New York and Ontario, Canada: Teachers College Columbia University and Ontario Principal's Council.
- Harklau, L. (1994). ESL versus Mainstream Classes: Contrasting L2 Learning Environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 241-272.
- Hawkins, M. (2011a). Dialogic Determination: Constructing a Social Justice Discourse in Language Teacher Education. In M. Hawkins (Ed.), *Social Justice Language Teacher Education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hawkins, M. (Ed.). (2011b). *Social justice language teacher education*. Bristol, U.K: Multilingual matters.

- Hayes, C., & Juarez, B. (2012). There Is No Culturally Responsive Teaching Spoken Here: A Critical Race Perspective. *Democracy & Education*, 20(1).
- Heath, S. B. (1982). Questioning at Home and at School: A Comparative Study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling* (pp. 102-131). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Heath, S. B. (2000). Linguistics in the Study of Language in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(1), 49-59.
- Herschensohn, J. (1998). Universal Grammar and the critical age. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21(04), 611-612. doi: doi:10.1017/S0140525X98211289
- Hollins, E. (1982). The Marva Collins story revisited: Implications for regular classroom instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33, 37-40.
- Holmes, G. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education : a report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI (201 Erickson Hall, East Lansing 48824-1034): Holmes Group.
- Ibrahim, A. E. K. M. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and Hip Hop, Race, Gender, Identity, and the Politics of ESL Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 349-369.
- Jacob, E., & Jordan, C. (1987). Moving to Dialogue. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 259-261.
- Johnson, K. E. (2006). The Sociocultural Turn and Its Challenges for Second Language Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 40(1), 235-257.
- Jones, C., & Shorter-Gooden, K. (2003). *Shifting : the double lives of Black women in America*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Jordan, C. (1985). Translating Culture: From Ethnographic Information to Educational Program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 16(2), 104-123.
- Juarez, B. G., Smith, D. T., & Hayes, C. (2008). Social Justice Means Just Us White People: The Diversity Paradox in Teacher Education. *Democracy & Education*, 17(3), 20-25.
- Justice, P. W. (2001). *Relevant linguistics : an introduction to the structure and use of English for teachers*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Kaestle, C. F., & Foner, E. (1983). *Pillars of the republic : common schools and American society, 1780-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Kaje, E. S. (2009). *More than just good teaching : teachers engaging culturally and linguistically diverse learners with content and language in mainstream classrooms*. PhD dissertation, University of Washington, 2009.
- Kirby, J. R., Deacon, S. H., Bowers, P. N., Izenberg, L., Wade-Woolley, L., & Parrila, R. (2012). Children's morphological awareness and reading ability. *Reading and Writing*, 25(2), 389-410. doi: 10.1007/s11145-010-9276-5
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2005). Differences in Language Skills: Heritage language learner subgroups and foreign language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(iv), 563-581.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities : children in America's schools*. New York: Crown Pub.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kuhl, P. K., Stevens, E., Hayashi, A., Deguchi, T., Kiritani, S., & Iverson, P. (2006). Infants show a facilitation effect for native language phonetic perception between 6 and 12 months. *Developmental Science*, 9, F13-F21.
- Labaree, D. (2004). Teacher ed. in the present: The peculiar problem of preparing teachers. In D. Labaree (Ed.), *The trouble with Ed Schools* (pp. 39-61). New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan : the journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Cognitive versus Generative Linguistics: how commitments influence results. *Language and Communication*, 11(1/2), 53-62.
- Lampert, M. (2000). Knowing Teaching: The Intersection of Research on Teaching and Qualitative Research. In B. M. Brizuela, J. P. Steward, R. G. Carrillo & J. G. Berger (Eds.), *Acts of inquiry in qualitative research* (pp. 61-72). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning : legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. (1993). Signifying as a scaffold to literary interpretation: The pedagogical implications of a form of African-American discourse *NCTE Research Report*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lee, J. S. (2010). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy for Immigrant Children and English Language Learners. [Article]. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Teachers College, Columbia University)*, 109(2), 453-473.
- Levine, A., & Education Schools, P. (2006). *Educating School Teachers: Education Schools Project*.
- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education : a user's guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. M. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford [england]; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lomawaima, K. T. (1994). *They called it prairie light : the story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lucas, T. (2011a). Language, Schooling, and the Preparation of Teachers for Linguistic Diversity. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms : a resource for teacher educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lucas, T. (2011b). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms : a resource for teacher educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic diversity of mainstream classrooms. In S. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd ed., pp. 606-636). New York: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2010). The Missing Piece in Teacher Education: The Preparation of Linguistically Responsive Teachers. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 109(2), 297-318.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A Framework for Preparing Linguistically Responsive Teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms : a resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55-72). New York: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically Responsive Teacher Education: Preparing Classroom Teachers to Teach English Language Learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361-373.

- MacDonald, V.-M. (2004). *Latino education in the United States : a narrated history from 1513-2000*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (2012). A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication. In L. Monaghan, J. E. Goodman & J. M. Robinson (Eds.), *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Marinova-Todd, S. H., Marshall, D. B., & Snow, C. E. (2000). Three Misconceptions about Age and L2 Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 9-34.
- Mayer, R. E. (1992). Cognition and instruction: Their historic meeting within educational psychology. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 405-412.
- McCutchen, D., Green, L., & Abbott, R. D. (2008). Children's morphological knowledge: Links to literacy. *Reading Psychology*, 29(4), 289-314. doi: 10.1080/02702710801982050
- McCutchen, D., Logan, B., & Biangardi-Orpe, U. (2009). Making Meaning: Children's Sensitivity to Morphological Information during Word Reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 360-376.
- 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: Strategies for K-12 mainstream teachers* (pp. 87-102). White Plains, NY: Longman: Pearson.
- McKeon, D. (1994). Language, Culture and Schooling. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating Second Language Children*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Minami, M., & Ovando, C. J. (1995). Language issues in multicultural contexts. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Minami, M., & Ovando, C. J. (2004). Language issues in multicultural contexts. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Moll, L. C., & et al. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(1), 132-141.
- Monmaney, T. (2013, May 2013). America by the numbers. *Smithsonian*, 44, 48-49.
- Nagy, W., & Anderson, R. C. (1984). How Many Words Are There in Printed School English? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(3), 304-330.
- Nagy, W., Berninger, V., Abbott, R., Vaughan, K., & Vermeulen, K. (2003). Relationship of Morphology and Other Language Skills to Literacy Skills in At-Risk Second-Grade Readers and At-Risk Fourth-Grade Writers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 730-742. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.730
- Nagy, W., Berninger, V. W., & Abbott, R. D. (2006). Contributions of Morphology Beyond Phonology to Literacy Outcomes of Upper Elementary and Middle-School Students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 134-147.
- Nieto, S. (2005a). Public Education in the Twentieth Century and Beyond: High Hopes, Broken Promises, and an Uncertain Future. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(1), 43-64.
- Nieto, S. (2005b). Schools for a New Majority: The Role of Teacher Education in Hard Times. *The New Educator*, 1(1), 27-43. doi: 10.1080/15476880490447797
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing Perspectives on Good Language Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2), 307-322.

- O'Grady, W., Archibald, J., Aronoff, M., & Rees-Miller, J. (2010). *Contemporary linguistics: an introduction* (6th ed.). Boston, New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- O'Neil, W. (2010). Bringing linguistics into the school curriculum: not one less. In K. Denham & A. Lobeck (Eds.), *Linguistics at School* (pp. 24-34). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, F., & Riley, K. (2000). *Linguistics for non-linguists : a primer with exercises*. Boston [etc.]: Allyn and Bacon.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. (1993). *Reading, writing & learning in ESL : a resource book for K-8 teachers*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL : a resource book for K-12 teachers*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Peregoy, S. F., Boyle, O., & Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2013). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL : a resource book for teaching K-12 English learners* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Philips, S. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. John & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of Language in the Classroom* (pp. 370-394). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Philips, S. (2012). Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom. In L. Monaghan, J. E. Goodman & J. M. Robinson (Eds.), *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings* (Second ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Piaget, J. (1980). *To Understand is to invent : the future of education*. Harmondsworth; New York: Penguin Books.
- Polat, N. p. d. e., & Mahalingappa, L. (2013). Pre- and in-service teachers' beliefs about ELLs in content area classes: a case for inclusion, responsibility, and instructional support. [Article]. *Teaching Education*, 24(1), 58-83. doi: 10.1080/10476210.2012.713930
- Polinsky, M., & Kagan, O. (2007). Heritage languages: In the "wild" and in the classroom. *Languages and Linguistics Compass*, 1, 368-395.
- Power, B. M., & Shagoury, R. (2002). *Language development : a reader for teachers*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill.
- Pullum, G. K. (1991). *The great Eskimo vocabulary hoax, and other irreverent essays on the study of language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pullum, G. K. (2013). Stopping to Appreciate Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/linguafranca/2013/01/10/stopping-to-consider-language-acquisition/>
- Richardson, V. (2002). Teacher Knowledge About Language. In C. Temple Adger, C. Snow & D. Christian (Eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know About Language*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Robinson, J. P., Rivers, W., & Brecht, R. (2006). Demographic and sociopolitical predictors of American attitudes towards foreign language policy. *Language Policy*, 5(4), 421-442.
- Ross, D. D. (1988). An Introduction to Curriculum Criticism. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education : focus and methods*. London; New York: Falmer Press.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (2009). A Language Graveyard? The Evolution of Language Competencies, Preferences and Use Among Young Adult Children of Immigrants. In T. G. Wiley, J. S. Lee & R. Rumberger (Eds.), *The Education of Language Minority Immigrants in the United States* (pp. 35-71).

- Samway, K. D., & McKeon, D. (2002). Myths about acquiring a second language. In B. M. Power & R. S. Hubbard (Eds.), *Language Development: a reader for teachers*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Savage, J. F. (1973). *Linguistics for teachers : selected readings*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Scarcella, R. (2002). Some Key Factors affecting English Learners' Development of Advanced Literacy. In M. Schleppegrell & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power* (pp. 209-226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Scarcella, R. (2003). *Accelerating Academic English: a focus on the English learner*. Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine.
- Schifini, A. (1985). *Sheltered English* Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Office of Education.
- Schleppegrell, M., & Colombi, C. (2002). *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages : meaning with power*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: a functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2007). The Linguistic Challenges of Mathematics Teaching and Learning: A Research Review. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23(2), 139-159.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2013). The Role of Metalanguage in Supporting Academic Language Development. *Language Learning*, 63, 153-170. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00742.x
- Schleppegrell, M. J., & Achugar, M. (2003). Learning Language and Learning History: A Functional Linguistics Approach. *TESOL Journal*, 12(2), 21-27.
- Schleppegrell, M. J., Achugar, M., & Oteiza, T. (2004). The Grammar of History: Enhancing Content-Based Instruction through a Functional Focus on Language. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 38(1), 67-93.
- Schleppegrell, M. J., & Colombi, C. (2002). *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Sekhon, N. (1999). A birthright rearticulated; the politics of bilingual education. *The New York Law Review*, 74, 1407-1450.
- Sherman, R. R., & Webb, R. B. (1988). *Qualitative research in education : focus and methods*. London; New York: Falmer Press.
- Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing Academic Language in English Language Learners through Sheltered Instruction. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 46(2), 334-361.
- Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). Double The Work: Challenges And Solutions To Acquiring Language And Academic Literacy For Adolescent English Language Learners– A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, D.C.
- Sibold, C. (2011). Building English Language Learners' Academic Vocabulary: Strategies and Tips. *Multicultural Education*, 18(2), 24-28.
- Silver, R. E., & Lwin, S. M. (Eds.). (2013). *Language in Education*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

- Snow, C. (1983). Literacy and Language: Relationships during the preschool years. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53, 165-189.
- Sohn, H.-M. (1983). Intercultural Communication in Cognitive Values: Americans and Koreans. *Language and Linguistics [Eoneo wa Eoneohak]*, 9(12), 93-136.
- Steiner, D. M., & Rozen, S. D. (2004). Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: an analysis of syllabi from a sample of America's schools of education. In F. M. Hess, A. Rotherham & K. Walsh (Eds.), *A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom?: appraising old answers and new ideas* (pp. 119-148). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Stevens, L. P. (2008). Educational Policy and Linguistic Diversity: a critical analysis of teacher certification requirements. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, Culture and Community in Teacher Education* (pp. 315-330). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Strazny, P. (Ed.). (2005). *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. New York, NY: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Stritikus, T., & Varghese, M. M. (2007). Language Diversity and Schooling. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives. 6th Edition*: Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlehofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Terrazas, A., Batalova, J., & Fan, V. (Producer). (2007). Frequently requested statistics on immigrants in the United States. Retrieved from [www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?id=649](http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?id=649)
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading Inclusive ELL: Social Justice Leadership for English Language Learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(4), 646-688.
- Tserdanelis, G., & Wong, W. Y. P. E. (2004). *The Language Files: Materials for and introduction to Language and Linguistics* (9th ed.). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Tyler, A., & Nagy, W. (1989). The acquisition of English derivational morphology. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 28(6), 649-667. doi: 10.1016/0749-596x(89)90002-8
- Understanding Language Group. (2013). Understanding Language : Language, Literacy and Learning in the Content Areas Retrieved Nov. 19, 2013, 2013, from <http://ell.stanford.edu/>
- United States Census 2010. (2013). Minority Census Participation, from <http://www.census.gov/2010census/mediacenter/awareness/minority-census.php>
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. Ranard & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Perserving a national resource*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Valdés, G., Bunch, G., Snow, C., & Lee, C. (2005). Enhancing the Development of Students' Language(s). In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (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., & Castellon, M. (2011). English Language Learners in American Schools. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: a resource for teacher educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Varghese, M. M. (2004). Professional Development for Bilingual Teachers in the United States: A Site for Articulating and Contesting Professional Roles. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 7(2-3), 222-237.

- Varghese, M. M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing Language Teacher Identity: Three Perspectives and Beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 4(1), 21-44.
- Varghese, M. M., & Stritikus, T. (2005). 'Nadie me dijo (Nobody Told Me)': Language Policy Negotiation and Implications for Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education* *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(1), 73-87.
- Vavrus, M. J. (2002). *Transforming the multicultural education of teachers : theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Vavrus, M. J. (2012a). *Diversity--a contested concept: paper presented at the Center for Multicultural Education 20 Year Anniversary Celebration & Book Launch of the Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. Center for Multicultural Education University of Washington. Seattle, WA. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452218533>
- Vavrus, M. J. (2012b). Diversity: A Contested Concept (Perspectives in Education). *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. SAGE Publications, Inc. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), (pp. 668-677). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Verplaetse, L. S., & Migliacci, N. (2008). *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners : a handbook of research-informed practices*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Villegas, A. M. (1991). *Culturally Responsive Pedagogy for the 1990s and Beyond. Trends and Issues Paper No. 6*. Washington D. C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Villegas, A. M. (2009). Diversity and teacher education. In S. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teacher education* (3rd Edition ed., pp. 551-558). New York: Routledge.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002a). *Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers: A Coherent Approach. SUNY Series, Teacher Preparation and Development*.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002b). Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers: Rethinking the Curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The Culturally Responsive Teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28-33.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2011). Preparing Classroom Teachers for English Language Learners; The Policy Context. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: a resource for teacher educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. F. (2004). Diversifying the Teacher Workforce: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 103(1), 70-104.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and language (E. Hanfman & G. Vakar, Trans.). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological proesses*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Walqui, A., & Van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners : a pedagogy of promise*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Walsh, K. (2004). A Candidate-Centered Model for Teacher Preparation and Licensure. In F. M. Hess, A. Rotherham & K. Walsh (Eds.), *A qualified teacher in every classroom?; appraising old answers and new ideas* (pp. 223-254). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

- Washington Professional Educator Standards Board (Producer). (2008). WEST-E Sample Test Questions: English Language Learners. Retrieved from <http://www.west.nesinc.com/index.asp>
- Wilce, J. (2012). The Grammar of Politics and the Politics of Grammar: From Bangladesh to the United States. In L. Monaghan, J. E. Goodman & J. M. Robinson (Eds.), *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings* (pp. 141-151). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*(2), 89-100.
- Yates, R., & Muchisky, D. (2003). On Reconceptualizing Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(1), 135-146.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record*, *105*(3), 490-519.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying Teacher Education: the report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 737-759). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2006). Different conceptions of teacher expertise and teacher education in the USA. *Education Research and Perspectives*, *33*(2), 60-79.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2012). *Two visions of teaching and teacher education for the twenty-first century (manuscript)*. Seattle, University of Washington.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Flessner, R. (2009). Educating teachers for social justice. In K. M. Zeichner (Ed.), *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice* (pp. 24-43). New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Hutchinson, E. A. (2008). The development of alternative certification policies and programs in the United States. In P. Grossman & S. Loeb (Eds.), *Alternative Routes to Teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education* (pp. 15-30). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.