Linguistically Responsive Teacher Education

Preparing Classroom Teachers to Teach English Language Learners

Tamara Lucas
Ana María Villegas
Margaret Freedson-Gonzalez
Montclair State University

Students who speak languages other than English are a growing presence in U.S. schools. As a result, many mainstream classroom teachers are finding that they have English language learners in their classes. Unfortunately, most mainstream classroom teachers have had little or no preparation for providing the types of assistance that such learners need to successfully learn academic content and skills through English while developing proficiency in English. In this article, the authors identify a small set of principles that can serve as the linguistic foundation for the teaching of English language learners in mainstream classes. The authors then outline linguistically responsive pedagogical practices that flow directly from those principles. They conclude with concrete suggestions for how teacher education programs can incorporate the knowledge and skills that will prepare all preservice teachers to be linguistically responsive.

Keywords: *English language learners; linguistic diversity; teacher education*

Across the United States—in small Midwestern towns and rural areas, in the Southeast, as well as in coastal metropolitan areas—classroom teachers are increasingly seeing English language learners (ELLs)[1] in their classes. In 2003, 18.7% of 5- to 17-year-olds in this country spoke a language other than English, up from 8.5% in 1979 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005). Between 1990 and 2000, the enrollment of students with limited proficiency in English increased by 105%, compared to a much lower 12% overall enrollment gain (Kindler, 2002). Whereas some of these students are able to participate in mainstream classes, many face a daunting challenge in learning academic content and skills through English while still developing proficiency in English. Yet, most mainstream classroom teachers are not sufficiently prepared to provide the types of assistance that ELLs need to successfully meet this challenge. At present, the majority of teachers have had little or no professional development for teaching ELLs (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2002); few have taken a course focused on issues related to ELLs (Menken & Antunez, 2001); and most do not have the experiential knowledge that comes from being proficient in a second language (Zehler et al., 2003). It is not surprising, then, that the majority of teachers report that they do not feel prepared to teach ELLs (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1999).

In response to the growing presence of ELLs in preK–12 schools, a number of recent articles and books have examined ways to adapt mainstream teacher education to prepare all teachers to teach ELLs (e.g., Brisk, 2007; Valdés, Bunch, Snow, & Lee, 2005). Consisting primarily of program descriptions, small-scale qualitative studies, and program evaluations, this literature highlights approaches being used by teacher educators to prepare all teachers to teach ELLs, including the addition of a single course or field experience to an existing curriculum (e.g., Walker, Ranney, & Fortune, 2005); the revision of one or more existing courses or field experiences to incorporate attention to teaching ELLs (e.g., Friedman, 2002); the addition of a minor or supplemental certificate program to a standard certificate (e.g.,

Brisk, Horan, & Macdonald, 2007); innovative program structures that foster collaboration among mainstream, bilingual and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) teachers, and teacher candidates (e.g., Evans, Arnot-Hopffer, & Jurich, 2005); and professional development for teacher education faculty (e.g., Gort, Glenn, & Settlage, 2007). Most of this literature, however, does not attempt to fully articulate the knowledge base incorporated into the approaches being discussed.

A different body of literature has given some attention over the past 15 years to that knowledge base—that is, what teachers need to know and be able to do to teach ELLs (e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005). Unfortunately, this literature has not made its way into many teacher education programs. One reason may be that much of it focuses on the preparation of specialists (i.e., ESL, bilingual, or sheltered content teachers) rather than mainstream teachers. Another reason may be that these publications use linguistic approaches and terminology that can be challenging for those inexperienced in linguistic analysis. Perhaps most problematic, much of this literature seems to suggest the need for an extensive body of knowledge and skills for teaching ELLs, a daunting task for teacher educators given the tight constraints on credit hours in the professional education sequence and the increasing demands on the preservice curriculum from state departments of education and accrediting agencies.

Despite the promising evidence that some teacher educators are seriously tackling the challenge of preparing all teachers to teach ELLs, most perservice teacher education programs still have a long way to go to sufficiently develop among teacher candidates the necessary knowledge and skills. Given the growing numbers of ELLs in mainstream classrooms across the country, teacher educators need to act more quickly than they have up to now to prepare all future teachers for ELLs. Our intention in this article is to move the field in that direction by outlining the special language-related knowledge and pedagogical competence that mainstream teachers must have to begin to teach ELLs well. The article is organized into three sections. We begin by distilling from the literature on second language development a small set of principles that can serve as the linguistic foundation for teaching ELLs in mainstream classes. We then outline linguistically responsive pedagogical practices that flow directly from those principles. In the concluding section, we offer concrete suggestions for how teacher education programs can incorporate the knowledge and skills needed for preparing all preservice teachers to be linguistically responsive.

Essential Understandings of Second Language Learning for Teachers of ELLs

To be effective, today's teachers need a broad range of knowledge and skills, including deep content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of how children and adolescents learn in a variety of settings, skills for creating a classroom community that is supportive of learning for diverse students, knowledge about multiple forms of assessment, and the ability to reflect on practice (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). To be successful with ELLs, however, teachers need to draw on established principles of second language learning (Harper & deJong, 2004; Samway & McKeon, 2007). Language is the medium through which students gain access to the curriculum[2] and through which they display—and are assessed for—what they have learned. To succeed in U.S. schools, students must be able to read academic texts in different subject areas, produce written documents in language appropriate for school (e.g., tests, stories, essays), and understand their teachers and peers—all in English. Therefore, language cannot be separated from what is taught and learned in school. Whereas this is true for everyone, it has special significance for ELLs. Because they are learning English while learning the content of the curriculum, the process of learning English as a second language is inextricably linked with all their school learning. For that reason, a teacher who has ELLs in his or her class is best equipped to teach them if he or she has knowledge of some key principles of second language learning. Although the literature on second language learning is vast, we have distilled six principles that are highly relevant to teachers of ELLs. They are listed in Table 1, and we discuss them in turn below.

Conversational language proficiency is fundamentally different from academic language proficiency, and it takes many more years for an ELL to become fluent in the latter than in the former. The first part of this principle articulates the distinction between what Cummins (1981) originally called *basic interpersonal communicative skills* and *cognitive academic language proficiency.* (He later used the terms *conversational* and *academic language proficiency* [Cummins, 2000].) Some English learners may use their second language fluently in informal conversations but still experience considerable academic or literacy-related difficulties in school, because language varies according to the context in which it is used (Fasold, 1990). In the context of everyday conversations, speakers derive meaning not only from the

Table 1
Essential Understandings of Second Language Learning for Linguistically Responsive Teachers

1. Conversational language proficiency is fundamentally different from academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1981, 2000), and it can take many more years for an ELL to become fluent in the latter than in the former (Cummins, 2008).
2. Second language learners must have access to comprehensible input that is just beyond their current level of competence (Krashen, 1982, 2003), and they must have opportunities to produce output for meaningful purposes (Swain, 1995).
3. Social interaction in which ELLs actively participate fosters the development of conversational and academic English (Gass, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005).
4. ELLs with strong native language skills are more likely to achieve parity with native-English-speaking peers than are those with weak native-language skills (Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 2002).
5. A safe, welcoming classroom environment with minimal anxiety about performing in a second language is essential for ELLs to learn (Krashen, 2003; Pappamihiel, 2002; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008).
6. Explicit attention to linguistic form and function is essential to second language learning (Gass, 1997; Schleppegrell, 2004; Swain, 1995).

Note: ELL = English language learner.

words they hear but also from cues in the setting (e.g., facial expressions, gestures such as pointing to items in the environment). Because the content of such conversations is often predictable and focuses on the speaker's personal experiences (e.g., what someone did over the weekend), it is relatively accessible to ELLs. However, as communication moves further away from the immediacy of personal and shared experiences—such as in academic discourse—it increasingly relies on language itself to convey meaning, thereby becoming more impersonal, more technical, and more abstract (Gibbons, 2002). The use of written text, which makes meaning increasingly dependent on language itself, adds another layer of abstraction.

Academic language poses special challenges for learners. In school, learners use language for purposes different from those used in routine conversations. For example, they are expected to argue points of view, draw conclusions, and make hypotheses. Each purpose demands the use of specialized vocabulary and particular language forms (e.g., passive voice, a range of connecting words; see Schleppegrell, 2004). Because of "inexperience with the linguistic demands of the tasks of schooling and unfamiliarity with ways of structuring discourse that are expected in school" (Schleppegrell, 2004, p. 16), most students, but especially ELLs, experience school language as being more complex and cognitively demanding than conversational language.

Given all these factors, it is not surprising that it takes second language learners longer to develop fluency in academic English than in conversational English. According to Cummins (2008), second language learners develop conversational proficiency within 2 years of initial exposure to the language, but they need 5 to 7 years to develop academic language proficiency comparable to that of a native speaker of the same age. Classroom teachers who know the difference between conversational

proficiency and academic language proficiency are more apt to understand why they need to provide ELLs in their classes with support to successfully complete academic tasks, even when the students appear to be fluent speakers of English.

Second language learners must have access to comprehensible input that is just beyond their current level of competence, and they must have opportunities to produce output for meaningful purposes. This second essential understanding highlights the role of linguistic input and output in second language learning. Krashen's input hypothesis (1982) posits that to learn a second language, learners need to understand the messages being conveyed to them. A large quantity of input in English will not foster language learning if the learners cannot comprehend it. Originally developed to explain language learning, this theory has been extended to apply more broadly to academic learning in a second language (e.g., Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000). As discussed, because ELLs are learning English as a second language while learning academic content in English, their language learning and academic learning cannot be disentangled. Thus, comprehensible input is just as necessary for successfully learning biology, history, or mathematics as it is for learning English as a second language.

Krashen (1982) argued that to lead to new learning, the input should be not simply comprehensible but just slightly beyond the learners' current level of proficiency. In other words, the quality and nature of the input—not just the exposure—play a major role in learning a second language (Wong-Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). Because the learning of a second language and the learning of content in that language cannot be separated, pushing learners beyond their current knowledge and skill in English is necessary for pushing them beyond their current knowledge of academic content. This essential understanding

suggests that to make content comprehensible to ELLs and to foster their development of English, mainstream teachers need to provide students supports for learning.

Input, however, is only part of the equation. Language output is also critical for second language learning. Swain (1995) has argued that trying to communicate in a second language requires a level of engagement with the language different from simply listening and that this engagement leads to greater fluency. To express themselves in a second language, learners are pushed to "process language more deeply" (p. 126) than when encountering input. Doing so raises their awareness of gaps in their knowledge of the second language and thus gives them the opportunity to reflect on linguistic form in the context of negotiating meaning. Knowledge of this principle will help teachers understand that they do not serve ELLs well by allowing them to be indefinitely silent. Although ELLs may need time early on to build some confidence in speaking their second language and develop trust in their peers, they should be encouraged to cultivate their ability in English by using it.

Social interaction in which ELLs actively participate fosters the development of conversational and academic English. While the notions of comprehensible input and meaningful output are grounded in psycholinguistics, a field that focuses primarily on the individual language learner, the third essential understanding of second language learning reflects a sociocultural perspective on learning—specifically, Vygotsky's influential theory (1978) that individual learning originates in social interaction. From this perspective, interaction provides much more than the opportunity for input and output; interaction and the accompanying dialogue serve as the foundation for the development of thought and language. This line of work has led to the view that to learn a second language, learners need direct and frequent opportunities to interact with people who are fluent in that language (Gass, 1997; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005). Through the negotiation of meaning that occurs in interaction, ELLs not only gain access to comprehensible input but also extend their productive capabilities (Ellis, 1985; Swain, 1995).

A particularly important element of Vygotsky's theory of learning (1978) is his identification of the zone of proximal development—the metaphorical space in which a learner can better accomplish tasks with the assistance of a more capable peer. As the learner becomes knowledgeable and skilled, the assistance, or scaffolding, provided by the more experienced or knowledgeable peer (or teacher) is gradually removed until the learner is able to carry out the activities alone. This finding suggests that

ELLs benefit from working with English-proficient and academically capable peers in groups of different configurations on academic tasks that require extensive use of language. As Gibbons (2002) explains, when working in groups, ELLs are exposed to more language, have more language directed toward them, and produce more language as they interact with more speakers. Thus, maximizing opportunities for ELLs to use English with peers who are linguistically and academically knowledgeable supports their academic development as well as their language development.

ELL students with strong native language skills are more likely to achieve parity with native-English-speaking peers than are those with weak native language skills. Fundamental to teaching ELLs is the understanding that proficiency in one language is a significant resource for learning a second language. Strong academic language skills in the native language—usually, the result of formal schooling in that language—are associated with successful second language learning and academic achievement (Thomas & Collier, 2002). The underlying principle is that language skills developed in one's first language—especially, literacy skills—transfer to a second language (Cummins, 2000). For example, if students are already literate in Spanish, many of the skills that they developed in the process of learning to read and write in Spanish will serve them well as they learn to read and write in English (e.g., sound–symbol correspondence, strategies for making sense of text). Similarly, students who are academically strong in their first language already have a broad range of subject matter knowledge and skills to draw on while learning in a second language, thereby easing the burden of having to learn subject matter and a new language simultaneously. Thus, a one-size-fits-all approach to teaching ELLs is bound to fail because students bring varying linguistic and academic backgrounds to learning. To successfully scaffold learning for ELLs, classroom teachers must become familiar with the students' native-language ability—especially, their literacy skills—and their academic preparation in their native language.

A safe, welcoming classroom environment with minimal anxiety about performing in a second language is essential for ELLs to learn. Learning is enhanced for most students when they are in a safe environment, rather than a threatening one. However, because ELLs have been found to feel stigmatized, anxious, unwelcome, and ignored in U.S. classrooms (see Olsen, 1997; Valdés, 2001), teachers of ELLs need to be vigilant about creating such environments. Attention to this

aspect of the instructional context is warranted given the growing anti-immigrant sentiment in the United States in recent years.

Krashen (1982, 2003) hypothesized an affective filter as part of his theory of second language learning. According to this hypothesis, when a learner feels anxious or fears being embarrassed about speaking English, a filter is activated that prevents her or him from making optimal use of linguistic input, even when instruction has been adapted to facilitate meaningful access to content. Pappamihiel (2002) pointed out that not only can anxiety distract second language learners from the linguistic input that they encounter, but it can also lead them to withdraw from social interaction, which is critical to learning English as well as academic content. ELLs may feel anxious in school for a variety of reasons, including peer ostracism and harassment, as well as unfamiliarity with the larger culture, with the people in school, and with the institution of schooling in the United States. Whatever the potential sources of anxiety, the classroom implications of this essential understanding are clear: For optimal learning to occur, teachers must give conscious thought to providing ELLs a safe and anxiety-free environment.

Explicit attention to linguistic form and function facilitates second language learning. In the 1970s and 1980s, teachers of ESL abandoned the traditional grammar-translation method and adopted approaches that emphasized comprehensible input and communicative competence over formal accuracy (see Canale, 1983). This emphasis on communicative approaches to language learning and teaching suggested that, like first-language learning, second language learning would happen naturally with exposure to the language. More recently, scholars and educators have begun to give renewed attention to linguistic form, arguing that to become proficient, ELLs need to focus on the formal elements of English (Gass, 1997; Schleppegrell, 2004; Swain, 1995)—that is, exposure to and interaction in English are not sufficient (Harper & deJong, 2004).

Although teachers whose primary responsibility is to teach students subject matter cannot be expected to become experts on language, they can learn to identify and articulate the special characteristics of the language of their disciplines and make these explicit to their ELLs. For example, because the history curriculum involves students' learning about past events, the past tense plays a salient role in history classes. In teaching about the establishment of missions in the Southwest, a history teacher could focus the attention of ELLs on the different meanings and temporal relationships conveyed by the

simple past tense ("Spanish priests established missions from South to North along the California coast"), past progressive ("Spanish priests were establishing missions on the California coast for almost 100 years"), and past perfect ("By 1823, Spanish priests had established 21 missions on the coast of what is now California"). Similarly, science teachers can scaffold students' science reading and writing by explicitly discussing the prevalence of passive verbs, how they are constructed, and why they are common in science texts (i.e., to convey objectivity, which is a central goal of science, and to focus on the phenomenon being discussed rather than on a person). The language of each discipline is integral to the content and purposes of that discipline (Schleppegrell, 2004); thus, students need to understand the ways language is used in the subjects they study in schools.

The renewed focus on form in second language teaching, however, "should not be construed as a plea to return to grammar-translation classrooms" (Gass, 1997, p. 155). Instead, learners' attention should be brought to bear on linguistic forms "in the context of purposeful learning" (Schleppegrell, 2004, p. 151), not simply in grammar worksheets. In other words, language forms should be learned, not for their own sake, but because they are needed to fulfill certain functions. The school curriculum provides a powerful context for purposeful learning. As the above examples illustrate, particular language functions—and, therefore, particular language forms—are characteristic of different academic disciplines. The language of science emphasizes objectivity and procedures; the language of history expresses past events and the temporal relationships among them; and the language of mathematics serves to articulate precise relationships and procedures involving numbers. In addition, there are general functions of language that apply across academic disciplines. In school, students are expected, for example, to use language to argue, to compare and contrast ideas, to draw inferences and conclusions, and to persuade audiences of the merits of a writer's or speaker's ways of thinking. Each use of language requires special linguistic forms that students must learn if they are to master these academic skills.

As the above discussion suggests, all teachers need basic knowledge of the forms of English and the different ways that language is used in schools (i.e., the functions of academic language). Such knowledge gives them important tools for making the disciplines they teach accessible to their students—especially, those who are learning academic content in a second language.

To summarize, in this section we have identified and discussed six basic principles of second language learning that all preservice teachers must understand to teach

ELLs in their future classes. Even if the students have received bilingual and ESL instruction and even if they are no longer considered "limited-English proficient," they continue to be ELLs. As we have discussed, it takes much longer than 2 or 3 years to develop academic language proficiency comparable to that of grade-level peers whose native language is English. Until that proficiency is achieved, ELLs continue to need supports for making sense of what they are taught in English. The above principles provide the foundation for linguistically responsive pedagogy, to which we now turn.

Linguistically Responsive Pedagogical Practices

Arguably, the primary responsibility of mainstream classroom teachers, relative to ELLs in their classes, is to facilitate the students' learning of the curriculum. If a student is developmentally ready to learn the content of the curriculum, his or her not being fluent in English should not keep him or her from doing so. Because it takes several years for ELLs to approach grade-level norms in academic English, they would be at an ever-greater disadvantage if their academic learning were postponed until they could handle, on their own, the linguistic demands of content instruction in English. Because English is the language of instruction in U.S. schools and because the English skills of ELLs are not comparable to those of their grade-level peers, teachers must adapt instruction to make the content of the school curriculum accessible to them. Instructional adaptations for ELLs constitute a case of differentiated instruction, an approach to teaching that takes into account the wide variation in students' background knowledge, interests, abilities, and language evident in schools today. Differentiated instruction seeks to maximize each learner's growth by adjusting instructional tasks to address students' needs while building on their strengths (Tomlinson, 1999).

The instructional adaptations used to make academic content understandable to ELLs are frequently referred to in the literature as *scaffolds* (see Echevarria et al., 2000; Gibbons, 2002). First elaborated by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976), scaffolding is the instructional response to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (1978), discussed previously. A teacher provides temporary supports (i.e., scaffolding) to help a learner carry out academic tasks that she or he could not do alone. The goal is to help the learner "move toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding" (Gibbons, 2002, p. 10) so that the support can ultimately be removed. Scaffolding is therefore not

remedial assistance that simplifies tasks and minimizes the challenge to the learner. Rather, it is the means through which teachers "amplify and enrich the linguistic and extralinguistic context" of a learning task (Walqui, 2008, p. 107) to make it possible for ELLs to successfully complete it.

To scaffold learning for ELLs, mainstream classroom teachers need three types of pedagogical expertise: familiarity with the students' linguistic and academic backgrounds; an understanding of the language demands inherent in the learning tasks that students are expected to carry out in class; and skills for using appropriate scaffolding so that ELLs can participate successfully in those tasks. Below we discuss these three types of pedagogical expertise—which we consider the essence of linguistically responsive teaching—and suggest how teacher educators might help preservice teachers develop such expertise.

Learning About ELLs

Mainstream teachers need to learn about the language and academic backgrounds of the ELLs in their classes. Without this knowledge, teachers cannot anticipate the aspects of learning that are likely to be too difficult for their ELLs to handle without instructional supports. Numerous factors affect ELLs' success in learning academic content taught in English. Clearly, the students' oral, reading, and writing proficiencies in English play a major role (Gibbons, 2002). Often overlooked, however, are students' linguistic and academic competence in the primary language. Linguistic and academic skills that are developed in one's native language can transfer to a second language and thus serve as rich resources for learning in that language (Cummins, 2000). Therefore, teachers should learn about each student's primary language and his or her language and academic background in English.

Though ELLs tend to be discussed as if they were a homogeneous group, they are not. They enter U.S. schools with varying levels of oral proficiency and literacy (in both English and their native language) as well as prior knowledge of and experiences with subject matter. For example, some immigrant students begin their schooling in this country with well-honed literacy and academic skills in their first language, whereas others arrive without literacy and with significant academic gaps. U.S.-born ELLs also vary widely in their native-language literacy skills, proficiency in English, and preparation for school. Those who are literate in the home language can use these resources as a springboard for learning English and academic content in school, especially when they receive appropriate support for learning.

Others need extensive scaffolding to succeed in mainstream classes and develop English language skills comparable with those of their native-English-speaking peers.

To familiarize themselves with the backgrounds of the ELLs in their classes, mainstream teachers can use a variety of strategies, depending on the students' ages and their English proficiency. For instance, a teacher can directly ask a student to describe, orally or in writing, his or her previous experiences in school, or a teacher can ask the student's parents about those experiences (Lucas, 1997). Adults who know the student and are bilingual—such as classroom aides—can also provide information about his or her native-language abilities (Lenski, Ehlers-Zavala, Daniel, & Sun-Irminger, 2006). Teachers can learn about ELLs' oral English proficiency by interacting with them one-on-one, listening carefully when they interact with others in class (Yedlin, 2007), and observing their interactions outside class (e.g., in the hallway, cafeteria, playground; Verplaetse, 2008). The ESL teacher can be another source of information about students' proficiency in English, because ELLs are often described as being more outgoing and interactive in ESL classes than in regular classes (Verplaetse, 2008).

Preservice teacher education programs can engage prospective teachers in various types of activities that will prepare them to learn about ELLs in their future classes. They can be asked to prepare a report that describes the language and academic background of an ELL in a preK–12 school. This assignment might involve interviewing a mainstream classroom teacher to learn about an ELL in his or her class—specifically, the ELL's oral, reading, and writing proficiency in English and his or her primary language—and to find out strategies that the teacher uses to learn about the backgrounds of ELLs. If the target student also receives ESL instruction, the teacher candidate could ask the ESL teacher similar questions about the student. A second form of data gathering could be to observe the selected student during instruction in subject matter classes and in ESL to focus on his or her level of participation in those lessons. Observations could be extended to include activities outside the classroom for the purpose of documenting the student's use of English and his or her native language. If possible, the preservice teacher might also speak directly with the student about his or her use of English and native language in contexts outside school (i.e., with family and friends) and inside school (i.e., with teachers and peers). The various sources of information could then be used to prepare a linguistic and academic profile of the selected ELL.

To help teacher candidates gain insight into the effects of different linguistic and academic student profiles on the teaching and learning of subject matter in mainstream classes, the assignment could be structured as a comparative analysis of two ELLs with contrasting profiles. Teacher candidates could share the results of their investigations with fellow students in the teacher education program. Working in groups, they could then identify the most promising information-gathering strategies from among those documented. Such a project would go a long way toward helping preservice teachers develop a repertoire of basic strategies for learning about their future ELLs.

Identifying the Language Demands Inherent in Classroom Tasks

Scaffolding learning for ELLs requires teachers to consider the relationship between students' linguistic abilities and the tasks through which they are expected to learn. That is, classroom teachers need to understand not only the conversational and academic language abilities of the student but also the language demands of classroom tasks (Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2007). Before they can decide whether to scaffold learning tasks for ELLs and how best to do so if scaffolding is required, mainstream classroom teachers must identify aspects of the language inherent in those tasks that are likely to pose the greatest challenge to the students. This involves identifying the key vocabulary that students must understand to have access to curriculum content, understanding the semantic and syntactic complexity of the language used in written instructional materials, and knowing the ways in which students are expected to use language to complete each learning task. For instance, are students required to listen to a lecture and take notes from it? Are they being asked to read expository text and draw conclusions from the material read? Are those conclusions to be discussed with other students in small groups or reported in writing to the teacher? If a written report is required, what form of text are students expected to produce? Must they summarize their thinking in a paragraph, or may they do it in bullet form? The more detailed teachers can be in their analysis of the language demands built into learning tasks and related written materials used, the better able they are to identify aspects of the tasks and written texts that could interfere with ELLs' understanding.

Because language is integral to almost all human endeavors, the majority of people do not attend to it at all. It is transparent. We look through language rather than at language (deJong & Harper, 2005). However, because language plays a central role in learning, as we explained previously, it is imperative that teacher educators cultivate

among teacher candidates the willingness and skills for looking at language, rather than through it. To do so, teacher educators need to help future teachers understand that academic learning is inseparable from language. For example, asking future teachers to envision themselves learning some aspect of quantum theory in a language they do not understand will help them intuitively grasp the connection that exists between language and learning. Introducing teacher candidates to Krashen's input theory (1982)—that is, to successfully learn academic content, learners must receive comprehensible language input—will remind them that learning content is dependent on the quality of language. Studying the construct of academic language (Cummins, 2000; Schleppegrell, 2004) would further help teacher candidates understand that to succeed in schools, students must not only have fluency with the language of instruction but be skilled at using that language for different academic purposes (e.g., to define, summarize, critique). These understandings will move preservice teachers toward looking at the language of academic learning rather than simply seeing through it.

As implied above, in carrying out such a linguistic analysis, teachers must identify the key vocabulary and subject-specific terminology that students need to understand. They must also review written texts (textbooks, worksheets, study guides) associated with the various learning tasks to determine aspects of the language that are likely to be problematic for ELLs (e.g., difficult vocabulary, lengthy sentences that are conceptually packed, complex language structures, idiomatic expressions). They must examine academic tasks, to be reminded of the purposes for which the students are expected to use language (e.g., to paraphrase a story, to defend a conclusion, to summarize the steps carried out in an experiment) and to anticipate the extent to which ELLs will need explicit instruction in how to carry out those tasks from beginning to end. Teacher educators can model for future teachers how to analyze the language demands of a lesson. Then, teacher candidates can practice conducting similar analyses, using instructional plans designed by others as well as themselves.

Scaffolding Learning for ELLs

With a clear sense of the linguistic backgrounds and abilities of the ELLs in their classes and with a detailed understanding of the language demands of a lesson or unit, mainstream teachers can be well positioned to scaffold learning for their ELLs. Below, we describe a variety of tools and strategies they can use for this purpose.

Using extra-linguistic supports. When the language of a lesson is too demanding for ELLs, extra-linguistic supports give them a medium other than language through which to access the content (Echevarria et al., 2000; Gibbons, 2002). For example, visual tools (pictures, illustrations, maps, videos) can quickly convey considerable information to students, thereby reducing the amount of auditory information that they must process to make sense of the instructional topic. Graphic organizers (graphs, timelines, Venn diagrams) help students clarify concepts, understand causal relationships, and trace the sequence of events by asking them to organize ideas visually. Making a timeline of a novel, for example, can help ELLs understand its plot, as well as the temporal structure of the text.

Supplementing and modifying written text. The higher the grade, the more challenging textbooks are for ELLs because such books include fewer illustrations and other visuals and because the language is more complex in syntax and vocabulary. Teachers can take a number of steps to make challenging texts more accessible for ELLs. They can develop study guides that include, for example, questions to focus students' reading, definitions of key vocabulary words, and an outline of major concepts (Brown, 2007). Teachers can also adapt or rewrite text to make the language more accessible, taking care not to dumb down the content (Hite & Evans, 2006; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). They can also reserve several textbooks for ELLs and add notes in the margins to support their understanding of the content (Hite & Evans, 2006; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). Alternatively, they can highlight text to signal to students central concepts and the key vocabulary included in it.

Supplementing and modifying oral language. Several strategies can be used to reduce the burden on ELLs of having to process the oral language they hear in class while trying to make sense of new concepts. These include minimizing the use of idiomatic expressions (Hite & Evans, 2006; Yedlin, 2007), pausing more frequently and for longer periods than in usual speech (to give ELLs time to process the language they hear; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008), providing outlines for lessons (to help focus the students' attention), repeating key ideas and building redundancy into teaching (to ensure that ELLs grasp the main points of a lesson; Gibbons, 2002), and establishing classroom routines that enable ELLs to predict what is expected of them in different situations (Willett, Harman, Hogan, Lozano, & Rubeck, 2007).

Giving clear and explicit instructions. It would be a mistake for teachers to introduce a task and assume that all students, especially ELLs, will know how to carry it out. For example, an ELL who has recently arrived in the United States from a country with a highly traditional education system is likely to be at a loss when asked to collaborate with peers in a classroom activity. To help ELLs maximally benefit from classroom activities, teachers need to provide clear and explicit instructions for how to get the work done (Gibbons, 2002). Depending on the task, the teacher may write the instructions on the board or give them orally, and he or she may ask students to take notes and/or to repeat the instructions back to him or her. In some situations, students may need to refer to detailed written instructions as they carry out a task. Whatever method used, teachers must be attentive to using language that is comprehensible to ELLs.

Facilitating and encouraging the use of students' native languages. The use of students' native languages can scaffold their learning in English. One such strategy is to ask bilingual students to provide formal and informal assistance to less-English-proficient ELLs in their first language. Having a peer who can translate and explain content and classroom activities may be the only way for a beginner to gain some access to the school curriculum (Walqui, 2008). To ensure effective assistance and to avoid placing too great a burden on the peer teacher–translator, teachers need to think carefully about the nature of the support the student should provide, and they need to guide that student in determining how to help the ELL student (Hite & Evans, 2006). A strategy that can be effective with beginning English learners who are literate in their native language is to allow them to write first drafts in that language. After getting their ideas down on paper, they can work on expressing them in English. Teachers can also provide materials in other languages to supplement course materials.

Engaging ELLs in purposeful activities in which they have many opportunities to interact with others and negotiate meaning. As discussed previously, social interaction for authentic communicative purposes in which ELLs are full participants fosters the development of conversational and academic English (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996; Swain, 1995). However, simply putting students into groups and giving them a task is not likely to foster the learning of content or language. The focus and nature of the interaction are also important. As Trumbull and Farr (2005) explain, "language learners need to be put in situations where they have access to rich and meaningful input and where they are motivated to produce output." (p. 124). In such situations, all participants, including ELLs, should have "substantial and equitable opportunities to participate" in the interaction (Walqui, 2008, p. 114); the participants should be seeking to achieve a purpose that has meaning for them (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996); and the interaction should involve the negotiation of meaning, not carrying out an exercise that requires little thought (Schleppegrell, 2004). Verplaeste (2008) advises teachers to increase the number of activities in which students work together (e.g., jigsaw activities and study centers focused on activities through which students rotate within an amount of time). Beyond this, she suggests that teachers (a) modify their talk to ask *how* and *why* questions, as well as questions to which they do not know the answers, (b) respond to student comments in nonevaluative ways, and (c) use instructional conversations in which the teacher acts as a facilitator rather than a questioner. She advises teachers to allow ELLs to use their native languages for problem solving with students who speak the same language.

Minimizing the potential for anxiety associated with being an ELL in a mainstream classroom. The learner's affective state strongly influences his or her learning in general and his or her learning a second language in particular. As discussed above, fear of being harassed because of one's accent and errors in speech and writing can be a source of debilitating anxiety for ELLs in mainstream classrooms. To support ELLs' linguistic and cognitive growth, teachers must take active measures to prevent such harassment from taking place in class. They can do so by establishing and enforcing classroom rules that respect all students, minimize competition, and encourage cooperation. They can also give newly arrived ELLs time before requiring them to speak English in the classroom (Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008).

Prospective teachers need exposure to the above tools and strategies that scaffold the learning of ELLs, and they need practice using them. Such teachers can be exposed through class readings and activities, including case studies in which scaffolding strategies are used. If preK–12 classrooms are available in which mainstream teachers are applying these strategies, then preservice teachers can be asked to observe such a class, focusing on which strategies are being used and in what ways. To help prospective teachers develop their facility with these tools and strategies, they can be given descriptions of several ELLs with different language and academic backgrounds and then asked to design lessons or instructional units (or adapt lessons or units that they have already developed) as if they had those ELLs in their

classes. Although teachers can become skilled at scaffolding instruction only by doing it in real classrooms, preservice teacher education can lay the foundation for later practice.

Making it Happen

So far in this article, we have distilled a small set of understandings and practices that need to be incorporated into preservice teacher education programs to provide all new teachers with a beginning repertoire for teaching the ELLs whom they are increasingly likely to have in their classes. We have elaborated on six essential understandings of second language learning and three types of pedagogical expertise that we think characterizes linguistically responsive teaching in mainstream classrooms. We now turn to the question of how best to incorporate this set of specialized knowledge and skills into the teacher education curriculum without radically altering existing programs. Below we offer concrete suggestions to make this reform happen. Our proposal is informed by a slim but fast-growing body of literature that features promising approaches to preparing future teachers to teach ELLs—approaches currently in use in a relatively small number of teacher education programs (for a review, see Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). It is also purposefully attentive to the real constraints on teacher education programs.

First, we suggest that a separate course be added to the teacher education curriculum—namely, one devoted to teaching ELLs and one that all preservice teachers are required to take. Although most teacher education programs will have difficulties acting on this suggestion, we see no way around the addition of a course. Given the lack of experience with the education of ELLs by most teacher educators and the time that it takes to build substantial knowledge among them, it would be irresponsible to rely on an infusion strategy that requires distributing specialized knowledge and practices for ELL education across the faculty. Although such infusion could be a long-term goal, we do not see it as a viable option at present. The new course should address the essential language-related understandings for teaching ELLs and the pedagogical practices that flow from them. It should be taught by a faculty member in the program who has the required expertise or by someone recruited for that purpose.

The added class could be as brief as a one- or two-credit module, or it might entail a three-credit course. A module would be appropriate for programs with an existing diversity-related course that all teacher candidates must take. The pedagogical portion of the specialized preparation for teaching ELLs could be integrated into the diversity course, and the essential language-related principles could be assigned to the module. When considering this option, it is imperative to keep in mind that faculty who currently teach diversity courses might lack the expertise needed to teach preservice teachers to be linguistically responsive. Without professional development support for those lacking this expertise, issues of language are likely to get lost within diversity courses in the larger fabric of culturally responsive teaching (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008).

If attention to differentiated instruction has been infused into selected courses in the professional education sequence, then we recommend that teacher candidates be given practice adapting instruction for ELLs in those courses, as part of their preparation for differentiated instruction. This practice would reinforce and extend what they have learned about linguistically responsive teaching in the introductory module or course on this topic. To successfully carry out this recommendation, the faculty members responsible for teaching differentiated instruction are likely to need some professional development support to hone their expertise with linguistically responsive teaching.

Teacher education programs can also prepare prospective teachers to teach ELLs by requiring them to spend time in schools and classrooms where they will have contact with ELLs during fieldwork courses and fieldwork requirements in regular courses. Without such contact, ELLs will remain an abstraction, defined by their lack of proficiency in English and likely to be perceived through prevalent media stereotypes of immigrants. Direct contact allows future teachers to see ELLs as individuals, and it gives the teachers-to-be a sense of the diversity among ELLs—diversity of languages, cultures, native countries, personalities, and academic backgrounds and abilities. Spending time in a school context is also essential to help future teachers envision how they might apply what they are learning about linguistically responsive teaching in their preservice courses.

Finally, underlying the recommendations above is the pressing need for professional development for teacher educators. As those who teach future teachers, we need to develop our knowledge and skills related to the education of ELLs through professional development before we can make other needed changes in the curriculum and in our pedagogy. We need to be fully aware of the urgency of preparing all teachers to teach ELLs—and, consequently, of the need to change "business as usual" in teacher education. This awareness is the first step toward changing the curriculum and seeking to learn how to contribute to the preparation of all teachers to

teach ELLs. Through professional development, we can learn about resources to which we can direct future teachers for information on teaching ELLs, and perhaps most important, we can develop our understandings about the education of ELLs. With this information and these resources, we can begin to give more attention to ELLs in all our courses. In designing such professional development, we can draw on examples of teacher-education learning communities through which teacher educators are already working together, formally and informally, to develop their ability for preparing linguistically responsive teachers (see Costa, McPhail, Smith, & Brisk, 2005; Gort et al., 2007).

Given the increasing number of students in mainstream classes who speak native languages other than English, teacher education programs need to prepare teachers to teach ELLs. Far too many new teachers find themselves unprepared to meet the special challenges of teaching academic content to ELLs. In 2002, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education issued a call to action to teacher education institutions, indicating that they should prepare teachers who can provide "an equitable education for students whose primary language is not English" (p. 6). Although some teacher education programs have taken up that call, far too many are still on the sidelines. We have offered some ideas to those who want to participate in the action.

Notes

1. We use the term *English language learners* to refer to those who speak native languages other than English. Although such learners are at different levels of proficiency in English, we are concerned with those who have not yet developed the degree of proficiency in academic English that is expected of students at their grade level.

2. When we use the terms *curriculum* and *content of the curriculum*, we are referring to the full range of knowledge and skills that students are expected to develop in school.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Committee on Multicultural Education. (2002, March). *Educators' preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity: A call to action.* Retrieved June 28, 2005, from http//:www.aacte.org/Programs/Multicultural/cultural-linguistic.pdf

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brisk, M. E. (Ed.). (2007). *Language, culture, and community in teacher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brisk, M. E., Horan, D. A., & Macdonald, E. (2007). A scaffolded approach to learning to write. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 15-32). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brisk, M. E., & Zisselsberger, M. (2007, April). *"We've let them in on the secret": Using SFL theory to improve teaching of writing to bilingual learners*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Brown, C. L. (2007). Strategies for making social studies texts more comprehensible for English language learners. *The Social Studies, 98*(5), 185-188.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal, 96*(3), 259-273.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education, *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Sacramento, CA: CA Department of Education.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 2. Literacy* (2nd ed., pp. 71-83). New York: Springer.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

deJong, 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.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Ellis, R. (1985). Teacher–pupil interaction in second language development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 69-85). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Evans, C., Arnot-Hopffer, E., & Jurich, D. (2005). Making ends meet: Bringing bilingual education and mainstream students together in preservice teacher education. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 38*, 75-88.

Fasold, R. (1990). *The sociolinguistics of language.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Friedman, A. A. (2002). What we would have liked to know: Preservice teachers' perspectives on effective teacher preparation. In Z. F. Beykont (Ed.), *The power of culture: Teaching across language difference* (pp. 193-217). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education.

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

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

Gort, M., Glenn, W. J., & Settlage, J. (2007, April). *Teacher educators' efforts to self-improve in the area of linguistic and cultural diversity: Al andar se hace camino.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Harper, C., & deJong, E. D. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English language learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 48*(2), 152-162.

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.

Kindler, A. L. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services: 2000–2001 summary report.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

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

Lenski, S. D., Ehlers-Zavala, F., Daniel, M. C., & Sun-Irminger, X. (2006). Assessing English language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Reading Teacher, 60*(1), 24-34.

Lucas, T. (1997). *Into, through and beyond secondary school: Critical transitions for immigrant youths.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed, pp. 606-636). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1999). *Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/frss/publications/1999080/

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2002). *The condition of education 2002. Contexts of elementary and secondary education: Indicator 33: Participation in professional development.* Retrieved July 6, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/coe/2002/section4/indicator33.asp

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2005). *The condition of education 2005. Indicator 5: Language minority school-age children.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 16, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section1/indicator05.asp

Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant students in our public schools.* New York: New Press.

Pappamihiel, N. E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*, 327-355.

Samway, K., & McKeon, D. (2007). *Myths and realities: Best practices for English language learners* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

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.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Santa Cruz: University of California, Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.

Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Trumbull, E., & Farr, B. (2005). *Language and learning: What teachers need to know.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

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: Jossey-Bass.

Verplaetse, L. S. (2008). Developing academic language through an abundance of interaction. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 167-180). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Verplaetse, L. S., & Migliacci, N. (2008). Making mainstream content comprehensible through sheltered instruction. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 127-165). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, C. L., Ranney, S., & Fortune, T. W. (2005). Preparing preservice teachers for English language learners: A content-based approach. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education, international perspectives* (pp. 313-333). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Walqui, A. (2008). The development of teacher expertise to work with adolescent English learners: A model and a few priorities. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 103-125). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Willett, J., Harman, R., Hogan, A., Lozano, M. E., & Rubeck, J. (2007). Transforming standard practice to serve the social and academic learning of English language learners. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.). *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 33-53). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. (2005). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7-54). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 648-685) New York: Macmillan.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology, 17,* 89-100.

Yedlin, J. (2007). Pedagogical thinking and teacher talk in a first-grade ELL classoom. In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 55-77). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zehler, A. M., Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Stephenson, T. G., Pendzick, M. L., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities. Policy report: Summary of findings related to LEP and SPED-LEP students.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Tamara Lucas, PhD, is a professor in educational foundations and associate dean in the College of Education and Human Services at Montclair State University. Her research explores the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students and the preparation of their teachers. She is author of "Responding to the Linguistic Reality of the Mainstream Classroom: Preparing Classroom Teachers to Teach English Language Learners" (with Jaime Grinberg), in *The Handbook of Research in Teacher Education: Enduring Issues in Changing Contexts* (2008).

Ana María Villegas, PhD, is a professor in the Curriculum and Teaching Department at Montclair State University. Her research and publications focus on culturally responsive teaching and on increasing the diversity of the teaching force. She is editor of the Diversity and Teacher Education section in *The Handbook of Research in Teacher Education: Enduring Issues in Changing Contexts* (2008).

Margaret Freedson-Gonzalez, EdD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Literacy Education at Montclair State University. Her research and writing focus on bilingual literacy development, instructional practice, and the preparation of early childhood teachers to serve English language learners.