

6-2013

Who Educates Teacher Educators About English Language Learners?

Zaline M. Roy-Campbell
Syracuse University, zmroycam@syr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Roy-Campbell, Z. M. (2013). Who Educates Teacher Educators About English Language Learners?. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 52 (3). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol52/iss3/4

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Education and Literacy Studies at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



Who Educates Teacher Educators About English Language Learners?

Zaline M. Roy-Campbell

Abstract

With the increasing numbers of English language learners (ELLs) in schools across the United States, most teachers will have these students in their classrooms in the near future if not already. Due to the wide diversity of ELL students, all classroom teachers must be equipped to work with these students. This study presents the findings of a survey on the preparation of teacher educators in the literacy field for preparing general education English language arts teachers to work with ELL students in their classrooms. Since part of the preparation includes access to academic journals that address the teaching of ELL students, the survey also identified the general education journals which these teacher educators utilize and the coverage of ELL students in these journals. This article considers the implications of these findings for teacher educators and researchers in the literacy field.

Recently a teacher shared with me that while she was working on a graduate degree, the administrator in the school where she worked asked her to teach a high school class of English language learner (ELL) students. The administrator then went on to add that it should not be a lot of work as it would be similar to a study hall. I have heard countless stories of teachers giving ELL students things to color or draw, or worksheets which they could not complete, while proceeding with their lesson for the rest of the class. These classroom teachers did not know what to do with the new ELL students with whom they could not communicate. With the increasing numbers of ELL students in schools across the United States (U.S.) these scenarios may be more common than we would like to admit, as increasing numbers of general education teachers are likely to have ELL students in their classrooms at some point (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008a). Consequently, the need to prepare classroom teachers to effectively work with this population of students is imperative.

Several studies have highlighted the inadequate preparation of general education teachers for teaching ELL students (Abbate-Vaughn, 2007; Curran, 2003; Karabenick, & Noda, 2004; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Olsen & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Roseberry-McKibbin, & Brice, 2005). One of the reasons for this insufficient instruction would appear to be that educators who prepare these teachers do not provide them with this knowledge because they themselves have not received this preparation. Howard's (2006) contention that teachers can't teach what they don't know could also be applicable to teacher educators.

This article focuses on literacy educators, in particular teacher educators who prepare teachers of English Language Arts (ELA). It provides a window into how literacy educators who have not been formally prepared for teaching English language learners (ELL) prepare their students in teacher education programs for working with ELL students. It reports on the findings of a survey about what literacy educators know about working with ELL students, how they have come to know it, and their perceptions of how they prepare students in their programs to meet the literacy needs of ELL students. Additionally, positioning academic journals as a viable resource for preparing teachers for this responsibility, the study identifies journals these educators identified as ones they use in their work and considers the extent to which these journals include articles that address the needs of ELL students.

I begin this article with an overview of the context of the study, the heterogeneity of the expanding English language learner school population, which implicates the conceptual frame of this study. Next, I provide a brief discussion of

literature that addresses the importance of teacher preparation for meeting the needs of ELL students and the inadequacy of general education teachers' preparation for this responsibility. I, then, describe and present the survey findings, with a consideration of academic journals' attendance to the topic of ELLs. Finally, I discuss the implications of the findings for the literacy field.

Overview of the English Language Learner Population

English language learners (ELLs) refer to students who enter schools with a first language other than English and therefore need to increase their proficiency in English in order to meet the academic demands of schools. They are learning English language and developing English literacy skills while using English to access school-based knowledge. Between 1998 and 2009 there was a 51% increase in the number of ELL students in U.S. schools—from 3.5 to 5.3 million—representing about 10% of the student population. In some states the increase was by more than 200% (NCELA, 2011, 2008), as the ELL population has spread in large numbers beyond the six states and major urban areas where the majority of this population has typically resided. In North Carolina, for example, the ELL population increased by 500% between 1993 and 2003 and more than doubled in states such as Colorado, Nevada, Nebraska, Oregon, Georgia, and Indiana (Perkins-Gough, 2007). ELL populations have also spread to Kansas, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming (Flynn & Hill, 2005) as well as other states.

Diverse Backgrounds

English language learners are a linguistically, culturally, and educationally heterogeneous population; currently there are more than 450 languages spoken by English language learners in U.S. schools (Payán & Nettles, 2006). The broad groupings of ELL students include children of: immigrants who have relocated to the U.S. for a variety of reasons; refugees who have fled their countries due to political or economic strife, including war; sojourners, who have come to study or work in the U.S. for a specified period of time; and migrant workers who move from one place to another depending on where the work is located. These important distinctions highlight ELL students' reasons for and related dispositions about being in schools in the U.S. (Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002). There are also differences based on social class, education, and cultural backgrounds and families' differing capacity

to provide academic support for their children at home. Some students have had prior exposure to English as they came from countries where English is spoken as one of the official languages and used as a language of instruction in schools, while others may have studied English as a subject in school. For these students English may not be a new language, but they will have varying degrees of English proficiency. Other students may not have had any prior exposure to English but may be literate and on grade level in their home language. Additionally, some students' languages use the Roman alphabet, and may have words with common etymological origins (termed cognates), so they are able to recognize some English words, while other students' languages (e.g. Chinese and Arabic) employ a different writing system. There are also students whose languages do not have a formalized written form, making it difficult for them to develop literacy in their first language.

Educational Backgrounds

Educational background is a crucial factor, as some students have had schooling in their home country, commensurate with their age, while others may have had interrupted or minimal formal schooling. This latter category—Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE)—present particular challenges for teachers, as these students need additional support and instruction in basic English language skills (Office of English Language Learning & Migrant Education, 2008), and classroom teachers often do not know how to provide the necessary support (DeCapua, Smathers, & Tang, 2009; Freeman et al., 2002).

A persistent grouping—termed long term English Learners—are students who have been in U.S. schools and have received English language support services for more than six years but have not developed proficiency in English as measured by designated language proficiency tests, such as the New York State English Language Assessment Test (NYSELAT) or multi-state assessments such as the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners test (ACCESS for ELLs) which is currently administered in 23 states (WIDA, 2012). Some long term English learners (LTELs) were born in the U.S. or have been in U.S. schools since kindergarten (Menken & Antunez, 2001). The increasing numbers of LTELs in middle and high schools is one indication of the consequences of inadequate attention to the needs of ELL students in elementary schools (Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2011; Menken & Antunez, 2001; Menken & Kleyn, 2010). More than 80% of the ELL students in middle and high schools were

born in the U.S. (NCELA, 2008) and there has been a high rate of academic failure among these students (Calderón, 2007; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

Recognition of this vast heterogeneity of English language learner students in U.S. schools accentuates the complex challenges that general education teachers may face when they have these students in their classrooms. It is predicted that by 2015 the enrollment of English language learner (ELL) students in U.S. schools will reach 10 million and, by 2025, they will comprise more than one quarter of the student population (NCELA, 2007). Educators at the K-12 levels across the U.S. will increasingly encounter students in their classrooms who do not appear to speak any English or who do not have adequate proficiency in English to follow general classroom instruction.

School-Based Services for English Language Learners

Students designated as ELLs are typically identified by an English-language placement test as not being proficient in English. Those who score below a state-designated proficiency level are deemed eligible for English-language instruction and support mandated by the U.S. Department of Education (NCELA, 2006; NCLB, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2005). This support is typically provided by teachers certified to teach English to speakers of other languages (typically referred to as ESL teachers) who either pull these students out of their regular classrooms daily for a specified period (the pull-out model) or push into classrooms where there are ELL students (the inclusion model). In schools with large numbers of ELL students, the pull-out model is more common; however, English language learner students spend most of their school day in general education classrooms, and, as such, their academic success is dependent upon classroom teachers meeting their linguistic and academic needs (Hite & Evans, 2006). The next section considers teacher-education policy regarding ELL students.

Teacher Education Policy

At the policy level, teacher-education programs in the U.S. address the needs of ELL students in a variety of ways. Aside from certification programs that prepare specialized teachers to work with this population, there are five categories of requirements as specified by different states (Ballantyne et al., 2008b, p. 120):

- States with specific coursework or certification requirements for all teachers (4 states: Arizona, California, New York, Florida),

- States where teacher certification standards for all teachers contain reference to the special needs of ELLs (17 states),
- States in transition, which use the standards published by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (7 states),
- States where teacher certification requirements for all teachers contain reference to “language” as an example of diversity (8 states),
- States where there is no requirement that all teachers have expertise or training in working with ELLs (15 states).

From the above information, it is clear that while 70% of the states require some preparation for general education teachers to teach ELL students, only 4 states, less than 8%, have explicit certification requirements for all teachers. This is despite the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education’s (NCATE) stipulation that specific standards be applied to teaching ELL students, including:

- teachers should acquire **pedagogical content knowledge** which addresses ELLs,
- candidates should understand the range in **diversity among ELLs**, and
- the unit should provide **qualified faculty and sufficient resources** to support teachers’ learning about ELLs. (Ballantyne et al., 2008a, p. 12)

The bolded words highlight the importance that the authors ascribed to the specific aspects of these standards.

Since, as the above overview indicates, the actual preparation general education teachers receive for teaching ELL students varies widely across teacher-education programs in the U.S., this study considers how a cross section of literacy educators prepare students in their teacher education programs to work with ELL students. Several studies (Abbate-Vaughn, 2009; Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Roseberry-McKibbin & Brice, 2005) highlight the need for preparation of general education teachers to work with English language learners. Taking these studies into consideration, this article seeks to provide insights from educators in the literacy field into how they are prepared and, in turn, prepare their own students to teach English language learners in general-education classrooms. In this vein, I conducted a survey of literacy educators in a literacy-based organization to ascertain how they approach this issue. My focus is on literacy educators because they prepare elementary and secondary classroom teachers of English Language Arts through their teaching and research. The teachers whom they prepare are charged with teaching all students how to utilize reading and writing, as well as the other literacy skills, to access and produce knowledge across the curriculum. This article examines the results of this survey within the context of what it means to teach

students who are learning English as a new language while learning how to use English to access knowledge in and across the disciplines.

Conceptual Frame

There are a myriad of factors which impact students' development of literacy in schools (Grant & Wong, 2003). This section outlines the theoretical framework which I utilize to study and analyze this issue.

The Cultural Dimension

Drawing on sociocultural theory (Hawkins, 2008; Rogoff, 2003) this study acknowledges that students who come to the classroom with languages other than English bring with them cultural understandings that can impact how they receive instruction from teachers who are not aware of the interplay between language and culture (Farr, Seloni, & Song, 2010). Educators need to identify and draw upon students' existing literacies, or funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 2005), to "open a window to students' multiple language and literacy abilities" (Farr et al., 2010, p. 17) as a means to assist ELL students in developing academic literacy.

Students who attended school regularly in their home country may have a well-defined literacy background in their first language, though not in English, and, as Bernhardt (2003) noted, their cognitive and social literacy processes may differ from that of American students. For example, the literacy-based, cultural understandings they bring to a text in English may elicit from them representations of memory that differ from those assumed by the text or what the teacher expects students to take from the text (Bernhardt, 2003). A teacher who does not recognize this difference can negatively impact ELL students' achievement in developing proficiency in English (Farr et al., 2010). Students must agree to learn from a given teacher (Kohl, 1993) and this assent can be related to how students feel they are perceived by the teacher based on the teacher's engagement, or lack thereof, with the students' culture.

The Linguistic Dimension

Adequacy of the instructional program can also affect the length of time ELL students take to develop English language proficiency in schools (Calderón, 2007; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 2000). General-education teachers' inadequate understanding of the language and literacy progression for ELL students and the frustrations ELL students might experience in performing content-based literacy

tasks can negatively impact students' attitudes and motivations (Roy & Roxas, 2011) and create a barrier to effective instruction for English language learning. These factors may be particularly helpful in understanding the persistent category of long term English learners.

The sociocultural lens dovetails with theories of second-language acquisition and extends Cummins' (2000, 2007) constructs of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) to provide an understanding of what ELL students need in order to successfully navigate schooling. Classroom teachers' attitudes towards ELL students are often based on an inadequate understanding of what it means to learn a new language (Yoon, 2008). When ELL students do not speak in the classroom, teachers who do not have an awareness of second-language acquisition may assume that the students do not understand English have a disability that prevents them from speaking. These teachers may be unaware that students, at varying ages, go through a silent period for up to a year, or more, when learning a new language (Krashen, 1981). During this period, students actively process the language they hear but may be reluctant to speak. Some classroom teachers, though, may interpret this refusal to speak as a language delay (de Jong & Harper, 2005).

Teachers' attitudes towards ELL students which influence the relationship they have with the students (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Pennington & Salas, 2009; Walker, Shafer, & Iiams, 2004; Walker-Dalhouse, Sanders, & Dalhouse, 2009) can impact the students' affective filter (Dulay & Burt, 1977; Pappamihel, 2004). Krashen (1981) has defined the affective filter as the students' level of comfort with the language which can determine whether or not students actively participate in the classroom. The lower the affective filter, the more likely students are to engage in oral communication in the classroom. The silent period that some ELL students experience may be attributed to a high affective filter; although the students may process the input they receive in the classroom, they may be reluctant to respond orally. Through their interactions with ELL students, teachers may inadvertently contribute to this silent period if their classroom is not a welcoming environment for the students (Krashen, 1981). Brown (2003) observed many instances in an elementary classroom where there was a complete absence of interaction or verbal communication between the teacher and the ELL students with the lowest English proficiency.

Alternatively, a teacher may hear the students speaking fluently with their peers outside the classroom and, then, become surprised when the students do not appear to understand the classroom instruction. Unaware of Cummins' (1979,

1981) distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) the teacher may assume students are pretending not to understand or are being inattentive. Furthermore, many teachers believe that ELL students should be able to learn English in two years (Reeves, 2004). They are unaware of the research indicating that ELL students tend to develop language associated with social skills (BICS) in two years or less, while academic language (CALP), which is needed to negotiate classroom instruction, can take seven or more years to develop (Collier, 1995; Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002). Skills linked to academic reasoning, which are often context-reduced and occur in limited time-frames, are an essential part of academic language and must be explicitly taught to ELL students (Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 1996; Cummins & Yee-Fun, 2007; Short & Echevarría, 2004).

The Instructional Dimension

Hawkins (2004) describes classrooms as “complex ecological systems, with multiple, complex and often interdependent components and characteristics that students must negotiate (socially and academically) in order to come to participate” (p. 15). Because ELL students are encountering academic language as a new language while developing proficiency in English, teachers must be aware of the necessity for providing comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985; Krashen & Terrell, 1983) for these students. If ELL students do not understand their teachers’ explanations, they cannot be expected to learn what is being taught (Brown, 2003; Linan-Thompson & Vaughn, 2004). Although this is true for students in general, it becomes even more crucial for ELL students because they do not have the range of vocabulary and background knowledge of many of their native English-speaking peers. Some ELL students have become skilled at waiting until their peers complete the work then copying from them (Brown, 2003), leading the teacher to believe that they have understood the work.

An additional problem impacting comprehensibility may be the teacher’s rate of speech, as many teachers may speak too rapidly for ELL students to understand when they are giving directions or explaining essential concepts related to lessons (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2000). Teachers may also use idioms and other colloquial expressions that are unfamiliar to some ELL students. Since this is the teachers’ natural way of speaking, they may be unaware that ELL students do not understand these colloquialisms or reduced forms of the language, and, in some cases, not cognizant of how much they are using them (Hite & Evans, 2006).

While some teachers may define effective instruction for ELL students as simply ‘good teaching’ (de Jong & Harper, 2005, 2007), this view fails to recognize that teaching English to speakers of other languages is more than a “menu of pedagogical tools” (Harper & de Jong, 2004, p. 157). It requires a deeper understanding of cultural and linguistic dispositions that ELL students bring to the classroom, as well as how students learn an additional language (He, Prater, & Steed, 2011), what de Jong and Harper (2007) refer to as “good teaching plus” (p. 127). The ‘plus’ include the cultural, linguistic and instructional dimensions, outlined above, which frame this study. This theoretical lens provided the orientation for developing the survey and analyzing its findings. The next section considers literacy educators’ perspectives on how they prepare general education teachers for these tasks as well as their own preparation for assisting teachers in this regard.

Description of the Study

The central question of this study is: How do literacy educators prepare general education English language arts (ELA) teachers to teach the ELL students in their classrooms? Two related questions are: 1.) How are literacy educators prepared to provide general education teachers with understandings of how to work with ELL students; and, 2.) To what extent does academic research, as represented in academic journals, provide the opportunity for teacher educators and general-education teachers to gain an understanding of ELL students’ needs? This latter question highlights literacy educators’ role as researchers who publish in refereed journals—which I contend are a venue for presenting information and research-based strategies that address students’ needs. This study drew on two sources of data: 1.) a survey of literacy educators; and 2.) an examination of academic journals which literacy educators identified as those they utilize in their teaching and research.

The Survey

To obtain information from a wide cross section of literacy educators and researchers, I focused on subscribers to the Literacy Research Association (LRA) listserv. Although there are other listservs directed towards literacy educators that could have been included in this study, I selected the LRA listserv as a data source because, as member of that listserv, I have noted that its subscribers, comprising approximately 900 members, address a range of pedagogical and policy issues related to literacy instruction. My observation of the contributions to this site has indicated that many of these educators prepare teachers for general-education classrooms. Since there are increasing numbers of ELL students in these classrooms, I was

curious about how these educators prepare teachers to address the distinct needs of the ELL students apart from the rest of the students in the classroom. My particular focus was educators who had not specialized in bilingual education or teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) since these educators should be knowledgeable about teaching ELL students.

To recruit participants for this study, in a posting to the listserv I explained the purpose of my study and invited members of the listserv to respond to a survey. They could access the survey by clicking on the link included in the listserv posting. Therefore, the sample on which the data are based was self-selected and completely anonymous. Although the responses to the survey were lower than I expected, 50 respondents, they included a wide cross section of literacy educators: 12 full professors, 14 associate professors, 15 assistant professors, 5 adjunct faculty and 4 graduate students. The majority of the respondents, 36, have been teaching for more than 10 years, 20 of these more than 20 years, and only 1 for less than 3 years. Participants prepare teachers for a range of levels, Pre-K to adult, though most of the participants focused on either K-6 (40) or 7-12 (20). Although the number of responses was low, they included a cross section of literacy educators as well as institutions and, as such, I deemed them sufficient to provide a window into how these educators prepare teachers to work with ELL students.

Survey questions. The survey included nine questions. Three questions requested general demographic information: current educational status, number of years teaching, levels on which they focus (e.g., K-6 or 7-12) to determine if the responses represented a cross section of literacy educators. Four open-ended questions were posed to gain an understanding of how these teacher educators address the needs of ELL students in general-education classrooms, including their own education in this area:

1. How do you prepare teacher-education candidates for working with K-12 English language learner students in general-education classrooms?
2. Which academic journals do you use to gain information about working with English language learner students?
3. Which journals do you recommend or select articles from for your students?
4. Where have you received preparation for working with English language learner students?

Two questions attempted to discern the participants' perception of what teachers of ELL students and educators who prepare them need to know:

5. How do you think teacher-education candidates should be prepared for working with K-12 English language learner students in general education classrooms?
6. How can faculty members be prepared for assisting their teacher-education candidates in working with English language learner students?

Question 1 sought information on what educators currently do, programmatically, while question 5 was concerned with how they think teachers should be prepared. Three options were offered with respect to how these educators were prepared: no formal preparation, conferences and/or workshops, other. The 'other' category allowed for respondents to indicate coursework or other sources as part of their own teacher preparation, graduate degree program, or professional development. Recognizing that some faculty members in general-education programs have received very little, if any, formal preparation for working with ELL students, question 6 sought to explore their views on how they and their colleagues could be prepared to assist pre-service and in-service teachers with this responsibility.

The Journal Review

Two questions related to the journals that these respondents use for their own research and understanding, and recommend to their students. These questions were based on the recognition that academic journals are a source of information on research-based practices and conceptual thinking with respect to educational issues. I was particularly interested in identifying common journals which these educators typically utilize and, then, to what extent these journals have included articles pertaining to ELL students.

I examined volumes of the identified journals over a 10 year period, between 2003 and 2012, to ascertain how many of them included articles focusing on ELL students and what topics they address. This 10 year period represents the most recent timeframe during which there was a considerable increase in the number and diversity of ELL students, so one might expect publication of numerous articles concerning this population in literacy and general education journals. I identified the journal articles by keywords in the title, e.g. English language learners, immigrants, linguistically diverse, bilingual.

Findings

Educators' Perspectives

Preparation. The respondents' preparation varied, as indicated in Table 1, with some indicating more than one form of preparation. Only 12% completed degrees in TESOL or Bilingual Education certification programs and 18% had coursework related to ELLs. More than half the respondents (61%) revealed that they had been exposed to issues pertaining to ELL students at conferences or as part of professional development workshops. Some faculty members indicated that they had participated in departmental level professional development sessions and study groups, with 2 indicating instruction in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) models. Several, 16%, indicated they had no preparation, although 2 of these also specified conferences/workshops and 1 noted personal experiences (teaching in the Peace Corps and ongoing tutoring of refugees) as their source of preparation. Independent or professional reading was indicated by 5 of the 17 who stipulated that their preparation was through conferences or workshops, while 12 specified independent reading and research as their source of information about working with this population.

Table 1

| Preparation for Teaching English Language Learners | |
|--|----|
| Type* | n |
| None | 8 |
| Conferences/workshops | 30 |
| Independent Reading/Research | 12 |
| Graduate Degrees in TESOL/Bilingual Ed | 6 |
| Graduate Course work | 9 |

*May include more than one

Methods of Preparing Teachers. Table 2 indicates the various ways in which they prepare and think teachers should be prepared for teaching ELL students. Less than a quarter of the respondents who were not part of TESOL or Bilingual Education Programs stated that their teacher preparation programs required all education majors to do a course or module that provided understandings of issues related to ELL students. Some of the courses they listed were: second

language acquisition, U.S. language policies, teaching ELL students across the curriculum, pedagogical knowledge, and programming for ELL students.

Table 2
Preparation of Teachers for Working with English Language Learners

| Currently Prepared | n | Should Be Prepared | n |
|---------------------------------------|----|--|----|
| Dedicated courses | 6 | Specific courses | 7 |
| Incorporate into existing courses | 20 | Incorporate into methods courses | 43 |
| Include topics that address diversity | 9 | Both specific courses and incorporate into methods courses | 40 |
| Include readings that address ELLs | 7 | Practicum/internship/clinic | 12 |
| Infuse in all classes | 5 | Incorporate strategies in all courses | 3 |
| Practicum/Tutoring ELL students | 4 | Case study | 1 |

Some faculty members (40%) indicated that they include in their ELA methods—or other courses—topics, readings and/or strategies that address ELL students' needs. Some noted that they may spend one or two days on the topic in a whole semester while others indicated that they read a couple of articles and have discussion about the contents. Use of textbooks with explicit emphasis on how to differentiate instruction for ELL students, requiring students to do classroom observations of ELL students, and one-on-one or small-group tutoring of ELL students are other strategies that individual faculty reported utilizing. A few respondents indicated that they infuse information addressing the needs of ELL students throughout their courses. Table 3 provides respondents' comments about how they prepare teachers. Several of them noted that they assign specific readings and assignments, while others indicated that they assign readings from practice-oriented journals that address this topic specifically, or review research-recommended practices. One participant admitted "not enough, but I do my best."

Table 3
Specific Comments on How Educators Prepare Teachers

| |
|---|
| "They [the students] are exposed to the SIOP model for language and content instruction." |
| "We talk about diversity in our class, and a few strategies for working with ELL students, but not in depth." |
| "I raise consciousness about it and talk about it." |
| I teach similar strategies for struggling readers and writers." |
| "I present current research and trends and issues;" |
| "I teach SIOP." |
| "The preparation I offer is very limited. We read a couple of articles from the <i>Reading Teacher</i> and have a discussion about the contents." |

Responding to how faculty members could be prepared for assisting their teacher-education candidates in working with English language learner students, the majority of the respondents (43) stated that information about working with ELL students should be incorporated into methods courses. A few recommended that there be specific courses, while 40 proposed that there should be specific courses as well as incorporation into methods courses. Only 3 suggested that attention to this population be infused through all courses. Nearly half (23) indicated that preparation should be provided through professional development; this response included study groups, courses and workshops. A quarter of the respondents recommended practica, internships, and clinics for offering students hands-on experiences working with ELL students as part of a certification program. Collaboration with other faculty who know about TESOL and mentorships were additional suggestions. Reading articles and research was another recommendation from respondents, with one stating that there needs to be “more research articles on teacher preparation in literacy journals, teacher-education journals” and others specifying: “Encourage more authentic research with students.” and “Education faculty should conduct more research in this area.”

Journals as a source of preparation. Mention of journals as a source of their preparation of teachers along with the finding that some educators engage in independent reading and research as a source of information about ELL students affirms my contention that journal articles are a utilized resource. Participants listed a wide range of journals, including those beyond the literacy field, that they typically use and those that they have recommended to their students. Table 4 lists the specific journals and identified the number of respondents who indicated that they utilize them. The distinction between those used by faculty and researchers versus those they recommended to students was based on the understanding that faculty consult more journals for their personal knowledge and understandings, as well as research, than they recommend to their students in course syllabi. Information gleaned from these references may also be included in course lectures and notes for students. Fewer than five respondents indicated using TESOL and bilingual education journals. I did not examine articles in these journals, as all of the articles address issues of English language learners.

Table 4
Journals Identified by Literacy Teacher Education Faculty

| Journals | Used by Faculty | Recommended to Students |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Reading Teacher | 24 | 24 |
| Reading Research Quarterly | 18 | 6 |
| Language Arts | 17 | 18 |
| Journal of Literacy Research | 16 | 4 |
| Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy | 11 | 10 |
| American Education Research Journal | 9 | 3 |
| Research in the Teaching of English | 6 | 2 |
| Educational Researcher | 3 | 0 |
| English Journal | 1 | 0 |
| Journal of Education | 1 | 1 |
| Journal of Educational Psychology | 1 | 0 |
| Middle School Journal | 1 | 0 |
| Phi Delta Kappan | 1 | 1 |
| Reading Psychology | 1 | 0 |
| Teachers' College Record | 1 | 0 |
| Speech, Learning and Hearing Services | 1 | 0 |
| Theory into Practice | 0 | 1 |
| Voices in the Middle | 0 | 1 |

Journals listed as most commonly utilized were: *Reading Teacher*, *Reading Research Quarterly*, *Language Arts*, and *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, each publishing at least 1 article per year over the 10 year span. All of the identified journals published several articles dealing with English language learners during this time span. Table 5 indicates the number of articles that were published in each journal annually during the ten year period. Whereas some included a single article in specific editions, others had two or more articles in a given edition of the journal. Several journals had special editions devoted to ELLs and included multiple articles. For example, *Educational Leadership*—Volume 66, No. 7, 2009— contained 18 of the articles. There was also a special issue of *Language Arts*—Volume 83, Number 4, 2006—with the theme “Multilingual Kids in the Monolingual World of School,” that contained 6 articles addressing ELL students. This issue also included 2 annotated reading lists for working with multilingual children. *Theory into Practice*—Volume 49, Number 2, 2010— with the theme “Integrating English Language Learners in Content Classes,” included 8 articles, while Volume 48, Number 4, 2009, with the theme “The Policies of Immigrant Education: Multinational Perspectives,” included 9 articles. *Teacher’s College Record* devoted two of its issues to the topic of English language learners, Volume 111, Number 3, 2009, with the theme— Educating immigrant youth: The role of institutions and agency— included seven articles addressing the topic, while Volume 108, Number 11, 2006, included ten articles. Beyond the

special issues of those journals, other volumes of the journal included very few articles during the 10 year span.

Table 5
Number of articles addressing ELLs between 2011-2002

| Journal | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | Total |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Reading Teacher | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 34 |
| Reading Research Quarterly | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 33 |
| Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 32 |
| Language Arts | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6* | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 28 |
| Journal of Literacy Research | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| English Journal | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Research in the Teaching of English | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Literacy Research and Instruction | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Educational Leadership | 1 | 0 | 18* | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 16* | 4 | 0 | 46 |
| Teachers' College Record | 3 | 1 | 11* | 1 | 3 | 12* | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 34 |
| Theory into Practice | 2 | 11* | 9* | 7* | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| Middle School Journal | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| Educational Researcher | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| American Education Research Journal | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

*These volumes of the journals had special issues dedicated to ELLs during the given years.

It is not the intention of this article to review these articles, as this will be done in a future study. This article identifies the wide range of issues addressed. Many offer concrete pedagogical strategies for working with either elementary school or adolescent ELL students or examine strategies, assessment and models through longitudinal, ethnographic, or experimental studies. A few address adult ELLs, working with parents of ELLs, teacher education programs, and professional development for teachers. There were some case studies of ELL students that provide a window into the thinking and behavior of some of these students as they tackle academic tasks. In addition, some articles considered cultural issues, social justice, and policies related to ELL students. Though they were not all literacy related, the articles provided insights into ELL students which could increase general-education teachers' awareness of issues impacting this population in classrooms.

Discussion

Returning to the central question of this article, the findings of this study are twofold. The insights which the survey provides into how literacy-teacher educators prepare teachers for working with ELL suggest that there is a need for more formal preparation for teacher educators to meet the needs of ELL students. This reinforces the existing literature cited on this issue. Costa, McPhail, Smith and Brisk (2005), in their description of a faculty institute in a teacher-education program that sought to infuse scholarship on ELLs, maintained that “Teacher educators need to learn and to assimilate knowledge of language and culture into their disciplines to pass it on to their students” (p .117). Faltis, Arias and Ramírez-Marín (2010) identify competencies secondary school teachers of English language learner students need to be successful with this population. Several other studies have described additional means of preparing teacher education faculty to infuse knowledge about the needs of ELLs throughout their curriculum (Brisk, 2008; Meskill, 2005; Nevárez-La Torre, Sanford-DeShields, Soundy, Leonard, & Woyshner, 2008). Two research-based instructional models that focus on helping general education teachers make content comprehensible to ELL students through strategies developed for teaching English to speakers of other languages are the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), developed by Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2000, 2007) and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), developed by Chamot and O’Malley (1987, 1996). Both models, which could be considered “good teaching plus” (de Jong & Harper, 2007) were indicated by participants as forms of professional development they have received.

In addition, this study highlights academic journals, an important component of teacher educators’ professional life, as one resource for providing knowledge about ELLs to pre-service and other educators. Although the study does not provide empirical evidence of the reach and usage of these journals by teachers and teacher educators, it recognizes that publication in refereed journals is an important component of the work of teacher educators. Since teacher educators are required to conduct research and publish in these journals, this study challenges teacher educators to consider broadening their research questions to include the teaching of ELL students. Literacy educators’ investigations into how the issues they research impact ELL students in general-education classrooms will increase the knowledge base about ELLs as well as increase these educators’ understandings of these issues. These educators could consider the implications of their specific research topics for ELL students in general education classrooms or include ELL students in their research sample as a comparative group. This would provide them with a greater awareness

of the needs of ELL students which they could, in turn, share with their students. One important benefit of this added dimension to literacy educators' research may be an increased understanding of the importance of addressing the needs of ELLs in their teacher education courses.

Publication of this research in a range of academic journals will provide an increased knowledge base for other literacy educators—teachers as well as their students. The paucity of articles in general-education journals addressing the needs of ELL students provides a compelling argument for the need for more articles in these journals. Although there are many such articles in TESOL and Bilingual Education journals, most general educators typically would not go to these journals, so making these articles available in journals they would typically utilize would provide greater awareness of these issues.

Conclusion and Implications

The intent of this article was to place the issue of preparing general education ELA teachers, and by extension the educators who teach them, for meeting the needs of ELL students in their classroom high on the agenda. Although the sample for this study is small and does not specify particular teacher education programs, the study provides a window into teacher educators' preparation for teaching ELL students. It does not seek to generalize but rather to add to those voices that call for more research on the needs of ELL students in general education classrooms conducted by literacy educators outside of the TESOL field.

August and Shanahan (2006) emphasized the need for an “ambitious research agenda” with respect to providing effective instruction for ELL students. One means of addressing the needs of the changing demographics of schools across the United States is for educators and researchers in the literacy field to increase their research and publication of articles in general-education journals about issues of educating ELL students. Further research could examine in greater depth how the question of meeting ELL students' needs is dealt with in specific general-education literacy courses and how it could be done more effectively. There could also be analyses of articles in literacy and other general education journals that address the literacy needs of ELLs so as to identify which topics have been investigated and which require examination. Although the focus of this study was literacy educators and researchers, the implications could be extended to teacher educators in other fields, as this is an issue that impacts all educators, since all teachers are teachers of literacy. These studies would provide focused information for teacher education courses, professional development and other workshops, as well as other sites for

preparing general-education teachers to effectively meet the literacy needs of ELL students in their classrooms. This is a challenge for educators and researchers in the literacy field and beyond to be able to effectively address the changing demographics of schools.



References

- Abbate-Vaughn, J. (2007). Highly qualified teachers for our schools: Developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, culture and community in teacher education* (pp. 175-202). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). Synthesis: Instruction and professional development. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 351-364). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., Levy, J. (2008a). Educating English language learners: *Building teacher capacity*. Vol.1. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from http://www.nclae.gwu.edu/practice/mainstream_teachers.htm.
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., Levy, J. (2008b). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Vol.3. *State requirements for pre-service teachers of ELLs*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <http://www.nclae.gwu.edu/files/uploads/3/EducatingELLsBuildingTeacherCapacityVol3.pdf>
- Bernhardt, E. (2003). Challenges to reading research from a multilingual world. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(1), 112-117.
- Brisk, M. E. (2008). Program and faculty transformation: Enhancing teacher preparation. In M.E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, culture, and community in teacher education* (pp. 249-66). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, C. L. (2003). Who is responsible for English-language learners? A case study for a third-grade classroom. *Academic Exchange Extra* (March). Retrieved from <http://www.unco.edu/AE-Extra/2003/2/Art-2.html>.
- Calderón, M. (2007). Teaching reading to English language learners, grades 6-12: A framework for improving achievement in the content areas. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Calderón, M. & Minaya-Rowe, L. (2011). *Preventing Long-Term ELs: Transforming schools to meet core standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Carrasquillo, A., & Rodriguez, V. (1996). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom*. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(2), 227-249.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA): A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96 (3), 259-273.
- Coady, M., Harper, C. & de Jong, E. (2011). From Preservice to Practice: Mainstream Elementary Teacher Beliefs of Preparation and Efficacy with English Language Learners in the State of Florida, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34, 223-239.

- Collier, V. P. (1995). Promoting academic success for ESL students: Understanding second language acquisition for school. Woodside, NY: Bastos Educational Publications.
- Collier, V. P. & Thomas, W. P. (1989). How quickly can immigrants become proficient in school English? *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 5, 26-38.
- Costa, J., McPhail, G., Smith, J., & Brisk, M. E. (2005). The challenge of infusing the teacher education curriculum with scholarship on English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 104-118.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, No. 19, 121-129.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.). *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A theoretical framework*. (pp. 3-50). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center California State University. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED249773.pdf>
- Cummins, J. (2000). Academic language learning, transformative pedagogy and information technology: towards a critical balance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(3), 537-548.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Cummins, J. & Yee-Fun, E. M. (2007). Academic language: What is it and how do we acquire it? In J. Cummins & C. Davidson (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 797-8100). New York: NY: Springer.
- Curran, M. E. (2003). Linguistic Diversity and Classroom Management, *Theory into Practice*, 42(4), 334-340.
- de Jong, E. J. & Harper, C. (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. (2007). 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). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- DeCapua, A., Smathers, W., & Tang, L. (2009). *Meeting the needs of students with limited or interrupted schooling*. Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan.
- Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1977) Remarks on creativity in language acquisition. In M. Burt, H. Dulay and M. Finnochiaro (Eds.). *Viewpoints on English as a second language* (pp. 95-126). New York, NY: Regents.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2000). *Making Content accessible for English language learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2007). *Making Content accessible for English language learners: The SIOP Model* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Faltis, C., Arias, M. B., & Ramírez-Marín, F. (2010). Identifying Relevant Competencies for Secondary Teachers of English Learners, *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 33(3), 307-328
- Farr, M., Seloni, L. & Song, J. (2010). Ethnolinguistic diversity and education: Language, literacy and culture. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flynn, K. & Hill, J. (2005). *English language learners: A growing population* [policy brief]. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org/PDF/PolicyBriefs/5052PI_PBEnglishLanguageLearners.pdf
- Freeman, D. E., Freeman, Y. S., & Mercuri, S. P. (2002). *Closing the achievement gap: How to reach limited-formal-schooling and long-term English learners*. Chicago: Heinemann.
- Grant, R. & Wong, S. (2003). Barriers to literacy for language minority learners: An argument for change in the literacy education profession. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(5), 386-394.
- Harper, C. & de Jong, E. J. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English-Language Learners, *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(2), 152-162.
- Hawkins, B. (2008) Using Sociocultural Theory to Examine the Context(s) of Language Learning and Teaching. *Working Papers in TESOL Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), Retrieved from <http://journals.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/viewArticle/366/265>.
- Hawkins, M. (2004). Researching English language and literacy development in schools. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3): 14-25.
- He, Y., Prater, K., & Steed, T. (2011): Moving beyond 'just good teaching': ESL professional development for all teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(1), 7-18.
- Hite, C. E. & Evans, L. S. (2006). Mainstream First Grade teachers' understanding of strategies for accommodating the needs of English language learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(2), 89-110.
- Howard, G. (2006). *We Can't Teach What We Don't Know: White Teachers, Multiracial Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Karabenick, S. A., Noda, P. A. C. (2004). Professional development implications of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), 56-75.
- Kohl, H. (1993). I won't learn from you! The role of assent in learning, Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. English Language Teaching series. London, UK: Prentice-Hall.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach - Language acquisition in the classroom*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

- Linan-Thompson, S., & Vaughn, S. (2004). *Research-based methods of reading instruction for English language learners: Grades K-3*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-González, M. (2008). Linguistically Responsive Teacher Education: Preparing Classroom Teachers to Teach English Language Learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59 (4), 361-373.
- Menken, K., & Antunez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Menken, K. & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(4), 399-417.
- Meskill, C. (2005). Infusing English Language Learner Issues Throughout Professional Educator Curricula: The Training All Teachers Project. *Teacher's College Record*, 107(4), 739-756.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (2005). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. In N. González (Ed.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households and classrooms* (pp. 71-88). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- National Clearing House for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) (2006). *What legal obligations do schools have to English language learners (ELLs)?* Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/faqs/view/6>
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA). (2007). *FAQ: Which tests are commonly used to determine English language proficiency?* Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/faq/25tests.htm>.
- National Clearing House for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) (2008). The growing numbers of English language learners. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0708.pdf
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) (2011). "The Growing Numbers of English Learner Students, 1998/99-2008/09," February 2011. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0809.pdf
- Nevárez-La Torre, A. A., Sanford-DeShields, J. S., Soundy, C., Leonard, J. & Woysner, C. (2008). Faculty perspectives on integrating linguistic diversity issues into an urban teacher education program. In M. E. Brisk (Ed.), *Language, culture, and community in teacher education* (pp. 267-312). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, Culture, and Teaching: Critical Perspectives for a New Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2001). *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title IX, General Provisions, Part A Definitions, Section 9101(25)*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg107.html>

- Office of English Language Learning & Migrant Education (2008). *Effective Programs for English language learners (ELL) with Interrupted Formal Education*. Indiana Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/englishlanguagelearning>.
- Olson, K. & Jimenez-Silva, M. (2008). The Campfire Effect: A Preliminary Analysis of Preservice Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching English Language Learners after State-Mandated Endorsement Courses. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 22(3), 246-260.
- Pappamihel, N. E. (2004). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: *Issues in the mainstream classroom*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36, 327-335.
- Payán, R. & Nettles, M. (2006). *Current State of English-Language Learners in the U.S. K-12 Student Population*. Retrieved September 14, 2011 from http://www.ets.org/Media/Conferences_and_Events/pdf/ELLSymposium/ELL_factsheet.pdf
- Pennington, J. & Salas, R. (2009). Examining Teacher dispositions toward linguistically and culturally diverse students. In L. Helman (Ed.), *Literacy development with English learners: Research-based instruction in Grades K-6* (pp. 213-233). New York: Guilford Press.
- Perkins-Gough, D. (2007). Focus on adolescent English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 90-91.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York, NY: Oxford, University Press.
- Reeves, J. (2004). Like everybody else, equalizing educational opportunity for English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 43-66.
- Roseberry-McKibbin, C. & Brice, A. (2005). What's 'Normal,' What's Not: Acquiring English as a Second Language . LD Online. Retrieved from <http://www.ldonline.org/article/5126>
- Roy, L. A. & Roxas, K. C. (2011). Whose deficit is this anyhow? Exploring counter-stories of Somali Bantu refugees' Experiences in "Doing School." *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(3), 521-541.
- Rubenstein-Ávila, E. (2003). Facing reality: English language learners in middle school classes. *English Education*, 35(2), 122-136.
- Short, D. & Echevarría, J., (2004). Promoting academic literacy for English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 8-13.
- Short, D. & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for English language learners*. NY: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/DoubleWork.pdf>.
- Thomas, W. P. and Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California-Santa Cruz. Retrieved from http://repositories.cdlib.org/crede/finalrpts/1_1_final/

- U. S. Department of Education (2005). Limited English Proficiency Plan for Federally Conducted Programs. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/om/docs/programs_lep.doc
- Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Iiams, M. (2004). "Not in My Classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English Language Learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 130-160.
- Walker-Dalhouse, D., Sanders, V., & Dalhouse, A. D. (2009). A university and middle-school partnership: Preservice teachers' attitudes toward ELL students. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48(4), 337-349.
- WIDA (2012). World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment. The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Retrieved from <http://www.wida.us/aboutUs/mission.aspx>
- Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 495-522.

About the Author

Zaline M. Roy-Campbell is Associate Professor in the Department of Reading and Language Arts at Syracuse University. She is Director of the Program for Preparing Teachers of English Language Learners.

