



“¿Cómo se dice?” Children’s multilingual discourses (or interacting, representing, and being) in a first-grade Spanish immersion classroom

Lisa M. Dorner^{a,*}, Angela Layton^b

^a Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, University of Missouri-Columbia, United States

^b College of Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Language immersion
Speech community
Scaffolding
Multilingualism
Discourse
Dialogic speech
Appropriation

ABSTRACT

At the Spanish Immersion Elementary School (SIES), most students speak only English at home, but they soon speak Spanish—and other new discourses—at school. Taking a socio-cultural approach, this qualitative study used critically oriented discourse analysis to examine: how did first-grade students at SIES appropriate multiple languages and discourses during classroom activities? In turn, how did they support each other and their teachers in creating new discourses? Data included weekly field notes and six hours of video from four months of participant observation. Analyses demonstrated that teachers’ structured, whole-group activities fostered children’s Spanish while small groups fostered diverse language use. In whole groups, students appropriated ways of interacting, representing, and being that resembled teachers and translators. In contrast, students wrestled with multilingual, identity discourses in small groups. This pushes the field of language immersion education forward by moving beyond the quantification of language use, production and achievement. Highlighting how youth scaffold language development, appropriate new discourses, and create speech communities in multilingual contexts has implications for the design of language education.

© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

It was Friday morning in a small U.S. city in the Midwest. In Profesora Ana’s¹ first-grade class at the Spanish Immersion Elementary School (SIES, a pseudonym), children were sitting in a circle taking turns asking questions to “la estrella de la semana” (the star of the week). On this day, Delmar was the star of the week. Profesora Ana called on Donny to question Delmar:

- Donny: ¿Cuál es tu (*turning from Delmar to Profesora Ana*) ¿Cómo se dice cartoon? [Which is your . . . how do you say cartoon?]
 Profesora A: ¿Qué? [What?]
 Donny: ¿Cómo se dice cartoon? [How do you say cartoon?]
 Profesora A: Dibujos animados.[Cartoons]
 Donny: (*Looking at Delmar*) ¿Dibujos animados favorito?² [Favorite cartoons?]

* Corresponding author at: 212 Hill Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, United States. Tel.: +1 573 882 7938.

E-mail address: dornerl@missouri.edu (L.M. Dorner).

¹ All place and person names in this report are pseudonyms.

² Words are transcribed exactly as children spoke; the grammatical errors, which we note by underlining and italics, are not corrected.

In this immersion classroom, a diverse set of U.S.-born, mostly English-dominant students from various racial/ethnic backgrounds regularly asked their teachers “¿Cómo se dice?” (How do you say?). After employing this common practice—or scaffold, designed by their teacher—they almost always put their new words to use. With limited exposure to anything but English outside of school, this was one way they actively participated in conversations and academic activities in Spanish. Observers to their school were often impressed at their linguistic abilities, noting that for most of these young children, their home language or L1 was English.³ Even more impressive, perhaps, was that this group of children and teachers came from various countries and socio-economic classes. Thus, as a group, they were using multiple varieties of English and Spanish and bringing a range of discursive practices to school, which likely shaped the learning environment.

Language immersion classrooms like these are dynamic and complex settings in which children simultaneously learn academic content while acquiring a new language. The most common immersion schools are “one-way” and “two-way.” The elementary classroom described above was considered an early one-way (or foreign language)⁴ Spanish program because it provided 80–100% of instruction in a new language to students who were dominant in the area’s majority language of English (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011); at SIES, most students came to school as monolingual English speakers. In contrast, two-way (or dual language) programs enroll children from two different language backgrounds and teach content material in both languages. With goals to develop students’ bilingualism, inter-cultural competence, and academic success (Tedick et al., 2011), we argue that both kinds of programs may provide new ways not only of *speaking*, but also of *being*.

Studies on language immersion education have focused largely on measuring academic achievement, literacy outcomes, and language proficiency, as well as the cognitive benefits of early second language learning (Bamford & Mizokawa, 1991; Barik & Swain, 1976; Bialystok, 2005; de Courcy, Warren, & Burston, 2002; Landry, 1973; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). In addition, a small but growing number of studies have examined the socio-cultural contexts of both one-way and two-way programs (Broner, 2001; Gort, 2008; Medina, 2010; Moll, Saez, & Dworin, 2001; Olmedo, 2003; Potowski, 2004). However, most language immersion research has neglected the diverse linguistic and discursive practices that emergent bilinguals⁵ (García, 2009) bring to and create in such environments. We know little about how immersion students develop cultural understandings and identities (Wesely, 2012)—or new ways of *interacting* and *being*—through their new languages. Because sociocultural, dialogic, and discourse theories of language suggest strong interactive connections between languages and identities (Hall, Vitanova, & Marchenkova, 2005; Hicks, 1996b), we used Bakhtinian ideas of dialogue and critically-oriented discourse analysis (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Rogers, 2011) to examine a diverse, one-way, Spanish language immersion classroom. This project interrogated “language-in-use” (Gee, 2011), with these research questions: How did first-grade students at SIES appropriate multiple languages (varieties of English, Spanish) and discourses (ways of being, representing, and interacting) during classroom activities? In turn, how did they support each other and their teachers in creating new discourses?

To summarize this introduction, language immersion schools, which are growing exponentially across the U.S. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2013), aim to provide students access to new ways of speaking and being, but few studies closely examine the processes involved (García & Sylan, 2011; Lee, Hill-Bonnet, & Raley, 2011; Olmedo, 2003). To provide teachers with a deeper understanding of the complex social and linguistic contexts of language immersion classrooms, this study examined weekly field notes and six hours of video collected through four months of participant observation. After describing our conceptual frameworks and methods, we analyze how students used their multiple languages and shaped others’ discursive practices in whole-group activities, as well as spontaneous dialogues that occurred in smaller, peer-led interactions. The conclusion considers implications for teachers and future research.

2. Conceptual frameworks

Broadly, this project employed a socio-cultural framework (Vygotsky, 1978), which highlights how teaching and learning occur within social interactions, where experts help novices “internalize” new ideas. However, language and learning does not only flow from expert to novice, from the outside to the inside. Instead, as Bakhtinian theories of dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981,

³ In some areas of this manuscript, we follow the linguistic convention of noting students’ first, dominant, or home language as “L1” and the language at school or second language as “L2.” This works for almost all children in one-way immersion contexts, where their L1/home language is English and L2/school language is a foreign language for them, such as Spanish. However, there were a few children in our study that spoke Spanish at home; thus, Spanish was their L1 and the school’s target language, while their L2 was English. Some immersion schools also have children growing up in fluently bilingual homes, where two languages constitute their L1. Therefore, we also define students’ languages as their *home language(s)*, versus the *school or immersion language*.

⁴ Because most one-way immersion students come from homes that speak the area’s majority language (in the U.S., English), one-way students are essentially studying a foreign language at school (at our study site, Spanish). Therefore, such programs are sometimes called “one-way immersion programs” and sometimes, “foreign language immersion programs.” Because two-way immersion programs use two languages to teach content material and mix students from two language groups, they are sometimes called “dual language” programs and are often considered one type of “bilingual education” designed for children from U.S. immigrant families.

⁵ Here we borrow Ofelia García’s term, “emergent bilinguals,” to describe *all* students in one-way and two-way language immersion programs, even though this term was coined originally for children from U.S. immigrant homes who speak additional languages other than English. In the case of language immersion schools, however, bilingualism *emerges* for English-dominant children as well, so we believe this term is useful for any individuals who are using/learning more than one language in their daily lives. We recognize the special political importance of using the term “emergent bilingual” rather than the deficit-laden “English Learner” or “Limited-English Proficient” for youth from minority/immigrant homes, so we hope that using “emergent bilinguals” more broadly also meets the political purpose of recognizing that monolingualism should not be the “sole standard” (García, 2009, p. 323).

1986) suggest, conversations shape and re-shape educational interactions, and in fact, constitute learning itself (Hicks, 1996a). That is, students are not only scaffolded by teachers, in turn producing expected discourse, but they also create new language, which re-shapes classroom discourses as well as students' development in their new languages (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). Discourse analysis—with its close examination of individuals' linguistic interactions *and* the social-historical practices that shape those interactions (Rogers, 2003)—is a useful tool for examining such dialogic processes (Hicks, 1996b). The following three sections build this argument and define, respectively, these key concepts used throughout this paper: scaffolding, appropriation, intertextuality, and ways of being/speaking/interacting. The final section summarizes how this research builds upon prior studies in the language immersion field, which generally lacks close analysis of students' discursive interactions and dialogues.

2.1. Sociocultural theories: from the zone of proximal development to scaffolding

“[T]he mechanism of individual development is rooted in society and culture.” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 7)

Sociocultural frameworks, which foreground how learning is situated in social and cultural interactions, have been widely applied in language and education research (e.g., Heath, 1986; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, 2007; Moje, 2004; Moll & Dworin, 1996; Orellana, 2009). Lev Vygotsky's theories continue to remind us that human development is culturally mediated by tools available in our particular times and places (Rogoff, 2003). His concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD)—the distance between a child's “actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving” and the more advanced level capable “through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more able peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)—likewise has been influential. Vygotsky (1978) argued that understanding the ZPD would help educators design learning opportunities. Knowing, for example, a child's capabilities in a completely new, foreign language alone (little to none) is not helpful to an immersion teacher. However, understanding the supports—certain gestures, pictures, or ways of talking—that would allow the child to grasp bits of the new language could be exceedingly helpful.

Related to this notion of the ZPD, then, is the concept of scaffolding. At its broadest and earliest conception, scaffolding is what happens in a “naturally-occurring” zone of proximal development: it is a “process that enables a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts” (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976, p. 90). It is a helpful interaction or framework for constructing something (Cazden, 1983, 2001), such as when a mother asks questions of her son, so he can solve a puzzle. One study examined the naturally-occurring scaffolding that occurred in a two-way immersion classroom; using their meta-communicative skills, students recognized when peers did not understand something, and so they either translated, provided appropriate linguistic or paralinguistic cues, or modeled a response to scaffold fellow students' comprehension of the situation (Olmedo, 2003).

As Pea's (2004) historical review suggests, however, the concept of scaffolding now refers to more than naturally occurring, socially mediated processes. Scaffolding also signifies the “designed artifacts” used in formal learning environments (Pea, 2004). Designed artifacts are the items that educators create—such as worksheets or computer programs—to build students' understandings. Some have argued that this turn of the concept led scholars to divergent foci: many who study scaffolding focus on *adults/experts* controlling children's/novices' performances, while those who examine the ZPD more strongly consider *children's* independent performances (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, 2007). Similarly, an examination of scaffolding alone may place too much emphasis on the *structures* of learning (Hicks, 1996b), to the neglect of what agentic learners bring to the table, in dialogues. As argued by Johnson (2004), studies of second language acquisition must consider the learner/agent, and how learning occurs through “locally bound dialogical interactions” in many different sociocultural settings (p. 4).

2.2. Beyond internalization and scaffolding: Bakhtin and dialogic learning

Vygotsky's contemporary, Mikhail Bakhtin, has also been influential in studies of language and education (Hall et al., 2005; Hicks, 1996b; Johnson, 2004). While Vygotsky theorized that processes of internalization signal development—as individuals move information from the interpsychological to the intrapsychological plane—Bakhtin's theories of dialogic speech stressed that the core of human thinking was creative “appropriation.” That is:

As the individual speaker-thinker engages in activity that involves the discourses of her culture, she also forms a dialogic response to those discourses. Individual thinking, therefore, exists on this rather fluid boundary between the self and other, between social discourses and one's active response to them. Appropriation engenders a dialogic form of consciousness as the individual speaker develops a response to the utterances in her surround. Moreover, the individual's response to the discourses of others, in turn, reconstructs the social contexts that she inhabits. Thinking, and hence learning, is a creative dynamic; the individual constructs new forms of response at the same time that she appropriates the discourses of her social world. (Hicks, 1996a, p. 107)

Thus, language and education scholars have been called to use Bakhtin's theories to examine the “multivocalities” of classrooms, or the many voices and dialogues students use to construct meaning at school and in their language learning (Johnson, 2004).

In dialogues, Bakhtin (1981, 1986) notes, discourses are warm: they are filled with meanings from prior uses and others' intentions. All discourses recreate a bit of the past (Gee, 1999); they are constantly negotiated and changed over time. In turn, discourses are always subject to active questioning and response. In other words, every social interaction has *intertextuality* (Kristeva, 1980). Although its precise meaning is debated in literary circles, we refer to intertextuality as the traces or echoes of language that show up as speakers draw from the texts, discourses and languages around them to create their own speech communities. Taking inspiration from Ofelia García and Lesley Barlett (Barlett & García, 2011; García & Bartlett, 2007), "speech community" refers to the new ways of speaking and being that are created as people work through particular dialogues and discourses in a certain setting.⁶

These theories of dialogic interaction and intertextuality can prove especially helpful for analyzing multilingual educational environments (Johnson, 2004), where language is simultaneously "structured and emergent" (Hall et al., 2005, p. 3). Martin-Beltran (2010), for example, studied the dialogic interaction that occurred as immersion students collaborated on writing activities and co-constructed expertise in their school's target language. Her findings illustrated that children used their home languages to foster new ideas with fellow students. A study of a Swedish immersion program also found that children's language use was intertextual; here, students appropriated teacher talk in their play with peers (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004).

Similarly, this study examined intertextuality in an immersion classroom. By using critically oriented discourse analysis, however, we questioned not only how students interacted with peers and used language, but also how they scaffolded their peers' and teachers' future discourses—or ways of being, representing, and interacting—in multiple languages. That is, we paid attention to words as representations of social identities, values, and power relationships.

2.3. Discourse analysis to study multiple ways of being, representing, and interacting

From Heath's (1983) landmark study to more recent analyses (Rogers & Elias, 2012), we know that students come to school with various "ways with words," or ways of talking and interacting with others. Words, of course, are not just a particular dialect or set of vocabulary; they are a discourse, which represent—and are read as—a particular social identity (Gee, 1996, 2001). That is, words are always accompanied by "culture-specific ways of being," acting and valuing (Hicks, 1996a, p. 105). A variety of studies have examined how children's discourses—from their homes, neighborhoods and peer networks—meet up with school discourses (Hicks, 2005, 1996b; Møller & Jørgensen, 2011; Orellana, 2007; Rogers & Elias, 2012; Siegel, 2006). Such discourse analyses examine the relationships and conflicts that occur among structures (e.g., institutional policies or teacher talk) and agency (e.g., student identities). Fairclough's (1993) theory of discourse emphasizes this dialogism: languages are not only shaped by social and historical practices, but they also reciprocally contribute to the transformation of these practices. These ideas complement the socio-cultural perspective:

Social practices such as teaching and learning are mediated by structures and events and are networked in particular ways through orders of discourse. Orders of discourse are comprised of genres, discourses, and styles or "ways of interacting," "ways of representing," and "ways of being." (Fairclough, 2011, p. 19)

Thus, critically oriented studies of discourse often consider the importance of intertextuality, examining how individuals produce language, drawing upon the available "orders of discourse," specifically: (1) language tied to particular social practices (ways of interacting), (2) language constructions from a particular perspective (ways of representing) and (3) language used for a particular audience and closely linked to one's identity (ways of being). For example, in an examination of songs used in multilingual London Turkish schools, Lytra (2011) demonstrated how students brought their sophisticated understandings of Turkish language and culture into classrooms, ultimately creating a bridge between curricular objectives and their own identities and lives; teachers set up interactional spaces in which children moved among dialects, art forms, and social classes. Similarly, Turkish youth in Denmark have brought the *outside* into schools; in doing so, they worked on their identities, as well as built upon, or contested, local expressions of their country of origin and language(s) (Møller & Jørgensen, 2011).

2.4. Building upon prior language immersion research

While a few studies of language immersion classrooms (reviewed in the previous sections) have examined children's scaffolding and dialogic discourses, overwhelmingly, research in immersion education has concentrated on measuring language use, production, and cognitive development. This research base has importantly demonstrated that well-implemented programs are effective in producing bilingual fluency, academic achievement, and metalinguistic awareness over time (e.g.,

⁶ Ofelia García and Lesley Barlett (Barlett & García, 2011; García & Bartlett, 2007) have defined the "speech community model of bilingual education" as one in which second language acquisition is not something done by an individual, but rather by a group of people in a particular, sociocultural context, where certain languages provide pathways to power as well as identities. While they argue that one international school in New York that had students from the same Dominican language background/speech community assisted in their educational practice and English language development, we suggest that diverse students in a Midwestern one-way language immersion setting come from many different speech communities and thus, must create a new one at school.

Bialystok, Peets, & Moreno, 2012; Christian, Howard, & Loeb, 2000; Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Hermanto, Moreno, & Bialystok, 2012; Thomas & Collier, 2003, 2004). Students have demonstrated the successful transfer of literacy skills from one language to the other (Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Kendall, Lajeunesse, Chmilar, Shapson, & Shapson, 1987; Tedick et al., 2011). Research has also found that immersion students target their linguistic audience: typically, students use their shared home language to play with peers, but their school's target language to complete academic tasks or talk with teachers (Ballinger & Lyster, 2011; Broner & Tarone, 2001; Potowski, 2004; Tarone & Swain, 1995).

However, more research on immersion classrooms is necessary. For one, educators want to know how to encourage students to use new target languages with *each other*, not just teachers (Ballinger & Lyster, 2011). Studies of the complex social and linguistic diversity of classrooms could help with this question, providing insights toward better designing interactive activities that build on students' already developing multilingual discourses. Second, as García and Sylvan (2011) have suggested, we must go beyond analyses of teaching *one* new language to *monolingual* students in this era of new media and transnational movement:

the idea that an additional language could be taught to a monolithic group that starts out as monolingual is no longer viable . . . [T]eaching in today's multilingual/multicultural classrooms should focus on communicating with all students and negotiating challenging academic content with all of them by building on their different language practices, rather than simply promoting and teaching one or more standard languages. (p. 385–386)

Quite simply, all students—and perhaps especially those in diverse immersion schools—are exposed to “various dialects, registers, styles, and indeed, languages” of all kinds and, in turn, devise a set of theories about language, learning, and identities (Dufva & Alanen, 2005, p. 104). Thus, research must examine how students negotiate a range of discourses and discursive practices. Such work will push the field of language immersion education forward by uncovering how young children appropriate new discourses and create unique speech communities. In short, if teachers want to encourage interaction among students, it is helpful to know how youth are viewing themselves and each other as they employ their various languages/discourses/identities.

3. Research design, site, and methods

As part of a larger study documenting the development of language immersion education in the Midwest (Dorner & Layton, 2013), this study examined four months of language-in-use (Gee, 2011) in a first-grade Spanish immersion classroom in a Midwestern U.S. city. This particular project worked in the tradition of microethnography (Erickson, 1992), an approach concerned with describing how “interaction is socially and culturally organized in particular situational settings” (Garcez, 1997, p. 187), especially through the recording and close analysis of select, naturally-occurring, everyday interactions (DuFon, 2002). This section begins with a description of the research context before explaining the data collection and analysis procedures.

3.1. Research context: the site, participants, and researchers' positions

At the time of the study, the Spanish Immersion Elementary School (SIES) was a new, one-way immersion school. In its first year, SIES had three kindergarten and two first-grade classes, and planned to add one grade each year until fifth grade. SIES' students were similar to the surrounding city's racial, ethnic, and mostly monolingual demographics: as defined by the school's data, about 50% of the students' families identified their children as African-American or Black, 30% White/Caucasian, 10% Hispanic/Latino, and 10% as other or multi-racial/ethnic. In addition, about 50% of students received free or reduced-price lunch, and 9% had a home language other than English (mostly Spanish). SIES aimed to provide all content instruction in Spanish from kindergarten to the middle of second grade, at which point students studied English for 50 min/day. Although the teachers focused on speaking and writing in Spanish, children were not prohibited from using English or other languages.

One entire classroom, including the lead teacher (Profesora Ana), assistant teacher (Profesor Jeremy) and 16 first-grade students, agreed to take part in this study. This classroom was purposefully chosen because of its diverse makeup: the variety of linguistic and racial/ethnic backgrounds in the class allowed for an exploration of the research questions. First, students were exposed to two varieties of Spanish: Profesora Ana was a native Spanish speaker from Spain, who was in the process of obtaining her international teaching certificate. Profesor Jeremy, a White native English speaker who grew up in the U.S., became fluent in Spanish when he lived in Argentina for two years. Second, the students likewise brought different experiences to the classroom. There were ten girls (Emerald, Laurell, Holly, Nikki, Britney, Olive, Denise, Enya, Jenny, and Violet) and six boys (Donny, Ozzy, Mark, Calvin, Delmar, and Julio). All students identified as African-American or Black, except for Mark, Donny, and Britney, who were White, and Nikki and Enya, whose families were from Spanish-speaking countries. Three students had prior experience with Spanish: Nikki and Enya spoke Spanish as their primary home language, and Mark had attended a Spanish immersion preschool and had a grandmother who was a Spanish teacher. All other students started learning Spanish for the first time at SIES.

Both researchers, Angela and Lisa, were well-known to these students and teachers because of their volunteer work and participant observation at SIES since the school's founding. Angela, fully bilingual in Turkish and English, considered herself competent in Spanish. She and first author (Lisa) studied Spanish in high school and college. Using a check list provided by the Council of Europe, both were “Independent Users” in comprehension and “Basic Users” in speaking, able to use familiar

Table 1
Classroom activities, routines, and artifacts.

| Activities | Routines | Artifacts |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Círculo</i>—Morning Circle (30–45 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher led | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reglas de la clase (Classroom rules) • El calendario (The calendar) • Estrella de la semana (Star of the week) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posters stating classroom rules • Calendar hanging on the wall • Poster with star student picture and artwork |
| <p><i>Whole-class Lectures</i> (15–20 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher led <p><i>Table Work</i> (30–40 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers provide content-area instruction and questioning about math, language arts, social studies, science, or holidays • Following content instruction, students complete worksheets or arts and crafts at their tables | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of large white board (to note students' answers to professors' questioning and to record ideas) <p><i>Arts and Crafts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making a card and trophy for Father's day: "Mi papa es el número uno" (My dad is number one) <p><i>Worksheets (for example):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Quién soy? (Who am I? Geometric shapes) • Fracciones/Equivalentes (Equivalent Fractions) • Chiquita (Chiquita the lady bug: Story completion) • Transporte, Escritura, y Iluminación: De George Washington y Hoy (Transportation, Writing, and Lighting: Of George Washington and Today) • Si fuera presidente (If you were president) • Note-card quizzes (Spelling, Mathematics) • Pizarritas (students use mini white boards to answer quiz questions) |
| <p><i>Assessments</i> (10 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers question students about content-area knowledge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading A-Z leveled readers • Completing math workbooks |
| <p><i>Ability Groups</i> (20 min)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers work with groups of 3 or 4 students. | |

language in work, school, and leisure settings. At the time of this study, both researchers had years of experiences as language teachers, having taught English as a second language in the U.S. to youth and adults, and English as a foreign language in Turkey (Angela) and Japan (Lisa). In addition, Lisa had worked with two-way immersion programs in the Chicago area prior to completing the project reported here (Dörnyei, 2010, 2011, 2012).

3.2. Data collection

This study was part of a larger ethnographic project documenting the development of new language immersion schools in the Midwest (Dörnyei & Layton, 2013). While that larger case study collected over 150 sets of field notes, 26 interviews, and one focus group, this microethnography depended upon close analysis of 11 sets of field notes and transcripts of six hours of purposefully sampled video recordings from four months of participant observation in Profesora Ana's class.

After obtaining consent from all participants, the researchers visited Profesora Ana's class weekly from March to June for a total of 11 visits lasting from two to three hours each. As the main participant observer, Angela sometimes worked with students in small groups; she also observed and video-taped interactions without participating. Data collection in March and April used a wide-angle approach with field notes on the general setting and as many classroom interactions as possible. After introducing the video camera to students and after initial data analysis (as described below), observations "zoomed in." Specifically, in May and June, we recorded 11 "whole events:" 6 whole-class and 5 small-group interactions. A "whole event" is one in which an entire activity is completed, for example an entire lesson was video-taped from beginning to end. In discourse studies, it is especially important to have whole events to analyze because any given utterance is shaped by prior utterances (DuFon, 2002). (There were other video recordings in the classroom, but some did not have sufficient sound quality or were incomplete, as they had been stopped so as not to disrupt the students' learning.) In summary, the final data set analyzed here included over 70 pages of field notes, six hours of video, and numerous classroom artifacts, including worksheets, photos of posters, and student work.

3.3. Data analysis overview

Data analysis, a collaborative process between the two authors (Smagorinsky, 2008) and inspired by a constructivist approach to grounded theory (Charmaz, 2010), began during data collection. First, knowing from the literature that classroom activities shape language choice, we coded for all activity types, as well as the routines and languages used in each. These analyses soon demonstrated that teachers regularly structured the whole-class Morning Circle (*Círculo*) and lectures in Spanish. The *Círculo* was almost always followed by individual or group work, where students used a mix of Spanish, English, and other languages. Table 1 summarizes these activity types found at SIES and many U.S. elementary schools: whole-class (Morning Circle, lectures); student-focused (Table Work, ability groups); and individual (assessments).

Next, our second round of coding—which continued to follow the socio-cultural perspective reviewed above—compared the behaviors, language use, and artifacts present in each activity type. Through this step, we determined that the Morning

Table 2
Typical Behaviors, Language Use, and Artifacts in *Círculo* and Table Work.

| Activity | Participants | Behaviors | Language Use Sample | Artifacts |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <i>Círculo</i> /Morning Circle Routine: Estrella de la semana [Star of the Week] | Whole group Emerald Profesora Ana Teacher-directed | Profesora Ana asks for students to nominate a star of the week and provide a rationale. Emerald nominates Britney. Emerald excitedly points to herself explaining that Britney gave her a nomination previously. To complete her thought she asks for the phrase “give me.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRE discourse pattern • Familiar, structured scripts (e.g., “como se dice”) • Sitting in whole-group circle | <i>Spanish and English:</i> Prof A: ¿Okay, alguien tiene una idea sobre alguien que ha se portado muy bien durante todo la semana y pensáis que sería una buena estrella de la semana/alguna idea? [Okay, does anyone have an idea about someone who has behaved very well all week and you think would be a good star of the week, any idea?] Emerald: Cuando tú digo ella es la estrella de la semana ella, como se dice give me. . . me le da y a las todos de la clase ayuda. [When you said she is the star of the week, how do you say give me. . . gives me (voted for me) and helps all the class.] | Posters: Star of the Week Classroom rules |
| Table Work Routine: Worksheet arts/crafts | Laurell Enya Mark Student-directed | Profesora Ana asks students to return to their desks to create a collage, which would answer the question: “Qué necesita una persona para vivir y ser mayor?” [What do you need to live and grow?] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity work • Relatively unsupervised, unstructured • Sitting at tables, small groups | <i>English:</i> <i>Flipping through a magazine, the girls look for items they can cut out. Laurell points to a picture of a woman and says:</i> Laurell: “I’m her.” Enya (pointing to another): “I’m her.” . . . Laurell and Enya: “Mark’s mom! Mark’s mom!” <i>Enya runs with the magazine over to Mark’s table to show him</i> Mark: “Hey that’s my mom in the magazine!” <i>Enya cuts out the picture and gives it to Mark</i> | Paper Magazines Scissors Glue Tables Chairs |

Circle and Table Work were the most theoretically interesting activities, given our research questions. Comparisons of them offered a unique opportunity to examine the varying nature and functions of dialogues in immersion classrooms, as they were structured so differently (see Table 2). The class also spent the most time on these activity types. Thus, the discourse analysis focused on these interactions, asking: How did first-grade students at SIES appropriate multiple languages and discourses? How did they support each other and their teachers in creating new discourses?

3.4. Discourse analysis procedures

To begin, we transcribed the recordings using notations adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1999) (see Appendix 1). Transcriptions were made in Spanish, English and any other languages used, and were reviewed by a fluent bilingual. These data were first segmented by turns (complete utterances made by participants) and then grouped by stanzas, or sets of turns devoted to a unifying topic, event, perspective, image, or theme (Gee, 1999). Then, we created multimodal transcripts in which video screen shots were accompanied by descriptions of non-verbal actions and corresponding verbal text.

These transcripts were analyzed initially by Angela and then re-analyzed during multiple meetings with Lisa. In general, analyses explored *who* supported language use, and *how*, that is, moments when the linguistic choices of teachers and students seemed to extend discourse within one transcript and over time. Analyses also considered how students appropriated specific discourses or enacted “situated identities” (Gee, 1999, p. 33). This process used tools of critically-oriented discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1993, 2003; Rogers, 2011) and drew on ethnographic data to situate interpretations (Rogers, 2003). Specifically, we coded the data to examine relationships among the orders of discourse—or ways of interacting, representing, and being—in the Morning Circle and Table Work, as described in the following paragraphs.

First, *ways of interacting* were represented by the type of language tied to a particular social activity (turn-taking patterns, cohesion, repetition, topic control, and humor). For example, as explicated within the findings section, turn-taking patterns in the Morning Circle followed the typical initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) pattern found in classrooms (Cazden, 2001; Martin, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Creese, 2006), whereas the Table Work patterns were fluid and spontaneous. Analyzing turn-taking and cohesion—or how stretches of words and sentences were connected—identified that the Morning Circle discourse

provided students with familiar scripts, which helped them use the school's target language. Table Work discourse, on the other hand, did not reveal such familiar scripts, but instead demonstrated student (and, in turn, teacher) creativity.

Second, *ways of representing* were analyzed through considering how individuals constructed some theme or idea from their particular perspectives. Here, we analyzed for common themes and how these connected to discourses of the classroom or school (such as school rules) and/or the wider societal context (such as U.S. ideologies about language/bilingualism). For example, within the Morning Circle, "good student behavior" was a prominent theme. Meanwhile, Table Work provided opportunities for students to present personal perspectives on language, ethnicity, and pop culture.

Third, *ways of being* were analyzed through close examination of the texts and non-verbal modes used to establish a sense of identity. Each transcript was coded for how students used languages and actions to present themselves in relation to others. For example, we explored how students' gazes, movements, gestures, facial expressions, and word choices represented their social roles as students, teachers, translators, and/or language learners.

Analyzing each order of discourse demonstrated how students appropriated multiple languages, enacted identities, and created new speech communities at SIES. In the following sections, we analyze representative ways of interacting, representing, and being across a particular activity type. In addition, examples of discourse that were captured less frequently are presented to demonstrate the variety of multilingual speech opportunities available, or what "could be" in diverse language immersion environments.

4. Findings

In appropriating language and ways of interacting/representing/being at SIES, students not only learned Spanish but also (re)shaped discursive interactions. The first sub-section that follows examines how the whole-class, teacher-led Morning Circle routines provided scripted opportunities for students to practice their L2 and other school discourses, like good behavior. In comparison, the next sub-section about Table Work discourse demonstrates how students creatively shaped interactions, as they made agentic choices about language and identity.

4.1. Language learning, scaffolding, and intertextuality in *El Círculo's* routines

The first activity type examined is the whole-class *Círculo*. SIES teachers implemented this activity to build students' vocabulary, practice Spanish, and develop a positive classroom atmosphere. In other words, as shown below, *El Círculo* was a scaffold that developed students' Spanish language use, as well as their character or *ways of being*, as shown through analysis of the discursive theme, or *way of representing*. First, Excerpt 1 demonstrates how this teacher-led activity structured opportunities for students to repeat Spanish from previous interactions, use vocabulary in new ways, and review how to behave (patterns found in 7/9 recordings of *Las Reglas*, The Rules). Second, an analysis of intertextuality from Excerpts 1 to 2 provides an example of students appropriating school discourse by acting as the teacher during *Las Reglas* (recorded in 2/9 instances of *Las Reglas*, and presented as one example of students taking on teacher identities found throughout the field notes). Third, an analysis of *La Estrella de la Semana* (Star of the Week) routine in Excerpts 3 to 4 demonstrates similar appropriation of languages and identities, over time.

4.1.1. *Las Reglas de la Clase: a time to practice and review school-sanctioned discourse*

Excerpt 1 depicts one of the most common daily routines of the class that happened in the Morning Circle: *Las Reglas de la Clase* (Classroom Rules). Here, Profesora Ana was leading students through the rules as she had done the entire school year. By May, students could name the rules in Spanish, and they tried to explain why each one was important. In this excerpt, Jenny listed the rule, "Cuidamos *enelturno*" (approximation of "we take care of the surroundings"). After repeating the correct pronunciation, Profesora Ana asked Jenny to explain its importance:

Excerpt 1, May 20—Stanza 4 (Cuidamos el entorno 1)

- 1 Profesora: Okay, vamos con otra regla de la clase/vamos co::n Jenny. [Okay, let's go with another rule of the class, let's go with Jenny.]
- 2 Jenny: Cuidamos *enelturno* [Take care of the surroundings.]
- 3 Profesora: El//repite en-**tor**-no. [The, repeat sur-**roun**-dings.]
- 4 Jenny: *Eltoino*. [Surroundings.]
- 5 Profesora: En-**tOr**-no. [Sur-Oun-dings.]
- 6 Jenny: **Entorno**. [Surroundings.]
- 7 Profesora: Okay, ¿por qué es importante cuidar el entorno, E::e, Jenny, tú misma? [Okay, why is it important to take care of the surroundings, Jenny, you?]
- 8 Jenny: Porque if um if you don't//if you don't, how you say if you don't? [Because. . .]
- 9 Profesora: Si tú no. [If you don't.]
- 10 Jenny: Si tú no *compartir/cuidamos eneltoino*, how you say materials? [If you don't share, take care of the surroundings. . .]
- 11 Profesora: Materiales. [Materials.]
- 12 Jenny: Materiales *al escuela, el clase muy sucio*. [Materials, to/the school, the class very dirty]

- 13 Profesora: [[Mmmhmm estará muy sucia. [Mmmhmm it will be very dirty.]
 14 Julio: [[And we get to swim en materiAle::s! [. . .in materials!] (*making strokes in the air like he's swimming*)
 15 Nikki and Donny: (Start making swimming strokes too)
 16 Emerald: **YEAH!** (*Smiling big*)

In line 10, after using the phrase “si tú no” given by Profesora Ana, Jenny started to say the first word of a different rule, “compartir el material,” but she quickly came back to the current one, “cuidamos el entorno.” She then asked her teacher how to say “materials” in Spanish. Altogether Jenny said: “Si tú no, cuidamos el entorno, materiales al escuela, el clase muy sucio” by which she meant: *If you don't take care of the surroundings, like the materials in the school, the school will be very dirty.* Jenny's language was full of approximations. She mispronounced words, left out key verbs, and applied article forms incorrectly. However, the dialogue demonstrates that both peers and teachers understood her statement, as seen in lines 14–15 from Julio's joke about swimming in materials and his classmates' subsequent play.

This excerpt shows how teacher-structured routines in whole-class activities like *El Círculo* played out near the end of the school year. Students understood the expectation that they had to remember and explain the class rules, or the wider community's discourse posted in the room: “Respetamos y escuchamos a los profesores. Respetamos a los compañeros. Hablamos en voz baja. Cuidamos el entorno. Compartir el material. Respetamos el turno.” Teachers primarily led this activity through common classroom IRE discourse. However, students also demonstrated agency here, as they re-used previously-learned words in new instances, for example, when Jenny asked for the word “materiales” (a word from the rule about sharing) as she tried to explain why one takes care of the classroom environment (to organize materials and have a clean school). Their gestures also show a high level of active and fun participation in the routine.

Students had these conversations about classroom rules nearly every day; the discursive theme here (*way of representing*) was SIES' expectations for good behavior. Thus, students not only practiced language, but also regularly reviewed school-sanctioned *ways of being* during *El Círculo*. Excerpt 2 demonstrates this in another way, when Mark actually *became* the teacher. In this case, Profesora Ana sat next to students in the circle while Mark led the class:

Excerpt 2, May 27—Stanza 11 (Cuidamos el entorno 2)

- 1 Mark (*looking around*): Vamos con las reglas de la clase. ¿Julio? [Let's do the classroom rules. Julio?]
 2 Julio: Uhh, compartimos *en* materiales. [Uhh, we share materials.]
 3 Mark: Sí. ¿Enya? [Yes. Enya?]
 4 Enya: Hablamos en voz baja. [We talk quietly.]
 5 Mark (*turning to Jenny*): Sí. Jenny? [Yes. Jenny?]
 6 Jenny: Cuidamos *en entono* [We take care of the surroundings.]
 7 Mark (standing in front of Jenny, moving his head as he emphasizes the 'tor' syllable): Entorno. [Surroundings.]
 8 Jenny: Entorno. [Surroundings.]
 9 Mark: Bien [Good.]

Here, Mark repeated the familiar scripts that Profesora Ana had used throughout the year. He called on students and helped with their responses. When Jenny mispronounced “entorno” again, Mark did exactly what his teacher had done the previous week: he asked her to repeat the word and even mimicked Profesora Ana's pronunciation and stress on the middle syllable. He also corrected behavior; later in the interaction when students talked out of turn, he told them, “*levanta su mano!*” [raise your hand!]. He and other students also told peers when a rule had already been reviewed—“*ha dicho*” [she/he has said]—suggesting that they needed to say a different one. Mark had appropriated not only the Spanish language, but also a particular identity: his *ways of interacting* (correction of Jenny's pronunciation, praise for repeating it correctly) and *being* (teacher stance and gestures) mirrored those of Profesora Ana.

4.1.2. *La Estrella de La Semana: star of the week and appropriation over time*

The next excerpts are from the *La Estrella de la Semana* (Star of the Week) routine in the Morning Circle, in which we find similar appropriation and scaffolding. During *La Estrella*, students asked information about the weekly “star,” while practicing their new language. Similar to above, students repeated specific phrases—in this case, “Cuál es tu _____ favorito/a”—and then added their own ideas and new vocabulary, demonstrating the intertextual and dialogic nature of language immersion classrooms. The following excerpts also show how students scaffolded each others' learning as they enacted teacher/translator identities.

Excerpt 3, April 8—Stanza 1 (Questions for the Star of the Week, Nikki)

- 1 Profesora Ana: Okay, ¿preguntas a las Nikki? [Okay, questions for Nikki?]
 2 Jenny: ¿Cuál es tu/cuál es tu/color favorito? [Which is your, which is your, favorite color?]
 3 Nikki: Morado. [Purple]
 4 Laurell: ¿Cuál es tu libro *favarito*? [What is your favorite book?]
 5 Nikki: Tinkerbelle.

- 6 Holly: [[Tinkerbelle? (questioning as if this was a strange choice for a favorite book)
 7 Profesora Ana: [[Tinkerbelle, okay, bien. [Tinkerbelle, okay, good.]
 8 Ozzy: ¿*Cuál es* tus zapatos favoritos? [Which are your favorite shoes?]
 9 Nikki: (*shrugs her shoulders*) No sé. [I don't know.]
 10 Britney: ¿Cuál es tu número favorito? [What is your favorite number?]
 11 Nikki: Veinte. [Twenty.]
 12 Julio: ¿Cuál es tu bebida favorita? [What is your favorite drink?]
 13 Ozzy: What's a bebida?
 14 Violet: [[It's a drink.
 15 Nikki: [[Juga de naranja. [Orange juice.]
 16 Julio: What's that?
 17 Enya: Orange juice.

Although Profesora Ana began this interaction, she was silent during the rest of it. The students took on teacher and translator identities (*ways of being*) to help, or scaffold, each other, when necessary. In this case, translations came from L1 English speaker Violet (line 14) and L1 Spanish speaker Enya (line 17). This kind of scaffolding—students taking on the role of translator—helped children use the school's target language and occurred on a somewhat regular basis (3/5 recordings and observed throughout the field notes). By this point in the year, in fact, based on the lack of gestures and reactions from other students, peer translations appeared to be common and accepted classroom discourse, as others have found in immersion classrooms (Olmedo, 2003).

Similar to *Las Reglas*, the repetition of familiar scripts in *La Estrella* also developed vocabulary over time, as evidenced by the intertextuality in Excerpt 4, which occurred two weeks later. Here, students appropriated the idea of “jugo” (juice) as a specific kind of “bebida” (beverage) to ask about (line 1), and Donny re-used the phrase “jugo de naranja” to answer (line 2). We also see the scripted language use/scaffold mentioned in the introduction. Julio used the common “cómo se dice” (how do you say) phrase to learn how to say “toy.” After Profesora Ana introduced the activity, Olive began questioning this week's star, Donny:

Excerpt 4, April 22—Stanza 1 (Questions for the Star, Donny)

- 1 Olive: ¿Cuál es tu jugo favorito? [What is your favorite juice?]
 2 Donny: Jugo de naranja. [Orange juice.]
 3 Julio: ¿Cuál es tu:::u/cómo se dice toy? [What is your favorite, how do you say toy?]
 4 Profesora Ana: Juguete. [Toy.]
 5 Julio: ¿Cuál es tu juguete favorito? [What is your favorite toy?]
 6 Donny: (*shrugs his shoulders and smiles*)

The preceding excerpts demonstrate how children actively engaged in Spanish during Morning Circle activities. The routines, *Las Reglas* and *La Estrella*, gave students a chance to listen to, repeat, and create their Spanish language over multiple instances. Familiar scripts, originally modeled and explained by the teachers, provided students with the structures they needed to start using their new language. Within these scripts, students gave rationales for their thoughts and translated for each other, while trying out newly learned words and phrases. Students also demonstrated understanding of school discourse through these routines, as many repeated classroom rules and took on identities as teachers and translators. *El Circulo* was made of scaffolds that developed both students' Spanish and particular schooled *ways of being*.

4.2. Freedom of speech: students bring the outside into Table Work

Students' interactions during Table Work proved to be different from the Morning Circle. In general, the discourse was not scripted; youth explored a variety of topics, mostly in English, unless there was a teacher present. While they engaged in some code-switching during these activities—saying things like “pass me the goma” [eraser] or “I need the pegamento” [glue]—they less often scaffolded each other through direct translation or teacher-like behavior. Instead, Table Work opened opportunities for students to create unique speech communities. During four out of five recorded social science and language arts activities, students brought “outside” discourses about identity into school, and in various ways shaped their peers' and teachers' subsequent interactions and language use. We purposefully analyze two events here, one in which students interacted with their peers after a particular question from researcher Angela, and one in which students interacted with their peers and Profesor Jeremy.

4.2.1. Table Work and appropriating discourses of language and identity

On May 27, children were completing a worksheet called “George Washington versus Hoy” [Today]. They were cutting out pictures of different forms of transportation and lighting, and gluing them in the correct column/time period. The worksheet was originally written in English, but Profesora Ana had written over it in Spanish. Researcher Angela sat with seven students, observing and recording them. Upon receiving the instructions, the following discussion ensued:

Excerpt 5, May 27th—Stanza 1 (Ooh it has English!)

- 1 Emerald (*looking at the worksheet*): I already know these things.
 2 Holly: Ooh it has English! (*reading through the scratched out Spanish*) Compare life in George Washington's time with life today.
 3 Researcher: Holly, how do you know how to read in English, I thought you were learning Spanish?
 4 Holly: I just read.
 5 Researcher: Do you practice reading English at home?
 6 Holly: Mmhhh, I read with my mom.

Stanza 2 (Talking English and Spanish)

- 7 Emerald: I talk English sometimes, but I hate it.
 8 Holly: When I get home I talk with my mom.
 9 Emerald: Ya'll talk Spanish in the car?
 10 Holly: Yeah sometimes.
 11 Donny (*pointing to Nikki*): She! She never speaks Spanish on the bus, I can guarantee that!

Stanza 3 (Where are you from?)

- 12 Emerald (*smiling*): Nikki, where you from, Africa?
 13 Holly and Emerald: (laugh and giggle)
 14 Nikki: (continues working on her worksheet, cutting out paper and gluing, and also cutting out tiny rectangles from the scraps of paper left over)
 15 Holly: You from Africa?
 16 Nikki (not looking up; responding enthusiastically, but perhaps not understanding Emerald's question): I wish I was in Africa!
 17 Emerald: Where you from?
 18 Nikki: I'm from Mexico and Virginia. [Meksikoh said using English pronunciation, and Virhinia, using Spanish pronunciation.]
 19 Holly and Emerald: Virhinia? (repeat Nikki's pronunciation, look at each other, laugh)
 20 Nikki (passing a small rectangular piece of paper to Britney as part of a spontaneous, made-up game): The next person who's gonna get a driver's license is Britney.
 21 Ozzy: She don't know how to drive!
 22 Nikki (throwing one of the paper rectangles to Donny, making the noise "fssssh"): Okay/Donny, you get/you know what kind of driver's license you get? Here it is! Fssssh.

In this excerpt, Holly's excitement about reading directions in English and the researcher's subsequent question sparked a peer-led conversation about children's language use outside of school, during which they enacted particular *ways of being, interacting, and representing*. Regarding *ways of being*, African-American L1 English speaker Emerald started by saying, "I talk English sometimes but I hate it." Knowing that her native language was English, it may be difficult to believe that she said she hated speaking English; some might imagine that she meant to say "Spanish," as a second language learner in an immersion school. However, a range of data suggests that this statement about hating English reflected, in fact, her proud identification as a Spanish speaker. In seven out of 11 field notes, Emerald was observed either initiating Spanish with her peers during free time or Table Work, or having extended dialogues in Spanish with peers and teachers during teacher-led activities like the Morning Circle. For example, the morning of June 11, she said to her L1 English-speaking friend, without any adults or L1 Spanish speakers nearby: "*Le duele mi stomago porque yo esta bebiendo mucho de mi soda.*" [My stomach hurts because I am drinking a lot of my soda.] On another day, when the video camera was introduced, many students tried to speak into it; when Emerald did, she used Spanish, unlike the other L1 English speakers. Finally, Emerald was placed in the high-ability literacy group with two high-performing students who had previous experience with Spanish, Mark and Nikki, which perhaps further encouraged her identity as a Spanish speaker.

After this comment by Emerald, Donny introduced other discourses about language (*ways of representing*). Specifically, he noted that, despite using Spanish as her home language, he believed that Nikki would *never* choose to speak Spanish on the bus. Again, whether or not this statement is true is somewhat irrelevant; the important point is that Donny's statement marked Nikki as someone who would not want to speak Spanish outside of school, despite her active work as a leader and native speaker of Spanish within the classroom. With this comment, Donny brought wider societal discourse about immigrants, language, and identity into the classroom, specifically the idea that non-U.S.-born individuals need to learn and use *English*. In the moment, his suggestion led Emerald to display her perception of Nikki as from "somewhere else." Initially, Nikki ignored Emerald's and Holly's questions about her origins, as she continued to cut out papers for their made-up game. After she finally responded to them, Emerald and Holly repeated how she said "*Virhinia*" using a Spanish accent and laughed.

Nikki appeared bothered by the way they marked her: she did not treat Donny—who brought up her neglect of using Spanish in the first place—in the same way that she treated Britney in her game.

There were conflicting themes about identity (*ways of representing*) that occurred in this classroom. For L1 English students, being bilingual was valued—by them and the surrounding community—and they demonstrated an awareness of and pride in their developing capacities. This identity work is quite a significant achievement for SIES, as low-income youth in urban areas rarely have such an opportunity to develop a bilingual *way of being*. At the same time, however, some students appeared to recognize, ironically, that English-only, not bilingualism, was perhaps more valued for students like Nikki, a native Spanish speaker with an immigrant parent; this reflects wider anti-immigrant discourse found in the U.S. (García, Skutnabb-Kangas, & Torres-Guzmán, 2006).

Thus, Excerpt 5 shows a complex enactment of various discourses (*ways of being, interacting, representing*), as students worked out relationships between language and identity. Through their questions and responses, Holly and Emerald—both African-American, L1 English speakers—identified themselves as Spanish speakers *outside* of school. Using their control of the topic and questioning (*ways of interacting*), they highlighted that a bilingual or Spanish-speaking *way of being* is better than mere English. At the same time, however, the continued conversation with Nikki indirectly brought in a negative societal discourse about immigrant Spanish speakers in the United States (*ways of representing*). Donny's comment suggested that Nikki, perhaps as a Mexican-American, felt pressure to speak *only* English outside of school.

4.2.2. Table Work shaping teacher discourse

This next example shows what happened during a recording of Table Work discourse that included a teacher from SIES. In Excerpt 6, students were talking about pop culture and their plans for the summer. Holly mentioned that she would visit New York, California, and then France, which led to a playful conversation about French and, eventually, the made-up language, “Abudabi.” Students' awareness of a French immersion school nearby likely influenced this conversation.

Excerpt 6, June 11 - Stanza 2 (Can you speak French?)

- 1 Donny (to Holly): Can you speak French?
- 2 Holly: Bonjour! (*laughing*) I'm gonna tell my mamma to take me to French class///bonjour, oui oui (*in a higher than usual tone*) [Hello, yes, yes.]
- 3 Mark: Bonjour! [Hello!]
- 4 Laurell and Holly: (*laughing and giggling as other students around the table say 'bonjour' with French accents.*)
- 5 Professor Jeremy (*walking up to the table*): Bonjour! [Hello!]
- 6 Holly: Bonjour si pa, bonjour si pa///bonjour si fe, bonjour coo coo! [*playing with different sounds*]

Stanza 3 (speaking pig Latin and Abudabi)

- 7 Profesor Jeremy (to Holly): ¿Puedes hablar pig latin? [Can you speak pig Latin?]
- 8 Holly: aloh Eremyj! Eremyj, I get that wrong sometimes. Eremyj/Hola Eremyj
- 9 Laurell: Eremyj!
- 10 Profesor Jeremy: ¿Alguien puede hablar Abudabi? (*laughing*). [Can anyone speak Abudabi?]
- 11 Mark: Abudabi?
- 12 Britney: ¿Qué es esto? [What is this?]
- 13 Mark: What in the world is that?///¿Quién puede hablar francés? [Who can speak French?]
- 14 Holly: Ah shi shi///Jeremy, Jeremy puede hablar en francés! [Jeremy, Jeremy can speak in French!]
- 15 Profesor Jeremy: Abudabi! (*Laughing*)
- 16 Britney: ¿Qué es esto::o? [What is this?]
- 17 Mark: Abudabi! (*laughing as he reached for a crayon*)
- 18 Holly: Jeremy *puedo* hablar! [Jeremy can speak!]
- 19 Profesor Jeremy: Abudabi esaba unaba//labenguababa. [Abudabi is a language.]
- 20 Students: (*all laughing at Profesor Jeremy*)

In this interaction, prompted by Donny's questioning if Holly could speak French, students tried to figure out Profesor Jeremy's words, with Mark and others finally playing along that Abudabi was actually a language. (Profesor Jeremy was inspired by Ubbi Dubbi, an English language game from the Public Broadcasting Service.) Students controlled the topic initially, as they brought forth various languages and sounds after Donny's original question. This shaped Profesor Jeremy's interaction with them. Here, students and teacher together created a unique multilingual speech community, with various *ways of interacting, representing, and being*.

First, this analysis of Table Work demonstrates *ways of interacting*—questioning, repetition and turn-taking patterns—that are different from *El Círculo*. In this case, questions and interest in trying out various languages motivates the dialogue. Questions flow back and forth from teacher to student, student to teacher, and student to student quickly, without a pre-formed structure or scaffold. Initially, Holly answered a question from her peer, Donny, by using French words and sounds. This discourse—brought from the outside and children's knowledge of the nearby French school—then sparked Profesor

Jeremy's questions and language play. While children's agency initially directed the conversation, Profesor Jeremy's creative appropriation soon steered the dialogue to pig Latin and Abudabi, and more interactions using the school's target language, Spanish. Some students responded and repeated each other's linguistic choices, further appropriating language inspired by Profesor Jeremy's questions. For example, Holly answered "aloh Eremyj," which Laurell repeated. However, others like Mark tried to redirect the conversation back to "French," using questions in Spanish, although to little avail.

Second, the major theme, or *way of representing*, apparent in this dialogue is the relationship between language and identity, as students' and Profesor Jeremy's behaviors display particular *ways of being*. Holly demonstrated what she believes French speakers sound like, taking on a high-pitched voice and particular manner to say "bonjour." Students also situate themselves as language *students*, as they often responded to Profesor Jeremy, not in English, but in Spanish (unlike the preceding Table Work Excerpt 5, among students). In addition, Holly recognized that she gets pig Latin "wrong sometimes," demonstrating that a certain kind of language learning (pattern recognition) was occurring in this playful situation. Profesor Jeremy and many of the students in this interaction take on multilingual identities, as they appropriate and use multiple languages and discourses with each other. Unlike Excerpt 5, multilingualism appears valued by all here, as they strive to figure out what's being said.

5. Discussion

Prior research has made clear that language immersion programs can effectively teach academic content and new languages at the same time. However, too few studies have considered the "pluralities" (García & Sylvan, 2011) of contemporary multi-ethnic and multilingual classrooms. For example, research has examined how often immersion students use their "L1" (English) versus their "L2" (Spanish), but not how students from different backgrounds use a range of discourses or shape others' exchanges and identities. In contrast, this study used sociocultural, dialogic, and discourse theories to examine students' multilingual interactions and creative appropriation of diverse ways of interacting, representing, and being. The following sub-sections review the major findings and implications of this research: First-grade students at SIES interacted using English, Spanish, French, pig Latin, and Abudabi (and other discourses beyond the scope of this paper including Midwestern, White/Caucasian, middle-class, African-American/Black, and L1 Spanish speakers' varieties of English). They enacted various identities, including student, teacher, helper, translator, and joker. With deeper understanding of these complex discourses occurring in language immersion classrooms, educators should be better positioned to build upon students' range of linguistic abilities and identities, encourage students to converse in multiple languages with each other, and work against discourses that do not privilege the schools' goals, especially of bi/multilingualism.

5.1. Scaffolding language development—and more—in immersion classrooms

Profesora Ana's Morning Circle routines scaffolded children's speaking in Spanish. The modeling of particular questions—like "¿Cómo se dice. . .?" [How do you say. . .?] and "¿Cuál es tu. . . favorito/a?" [What is your favorite. . .?—and enactment of daily routines helped students practice their spoken Spanish and appropriate new vocabulary. The analysis of Excerpts 1–4 demonstrated how language learning is intertextual: students re-used words from previous dialogues in different ways over time. Students re-voiced ideas and added new conceptions, as Jenny did in Excerpt 1, and as Olive and Donny did in Excerpt 4. Repetition and modeling were common at SIES, as they are in other immersion schools and classrooms that teach content and language simultaneously. Such scaffolds provided structure to social interactions and helped students actively engage in using their new language.

Teachers were not the only ones, however, who provided scaffolding, and scaffolding helped with more than just language development. In the different *ways of being* and *representing* of the Morning Circle routines, we saw students enact particular identities that supported their peers. Specifically, Mark enacted a teacher identity as he helped Jenny repeat and practice the correct pronunciation for "entorno" [surroundings]. Violet and Enya became interpreters and helped their peers understand the conversation. Thus, the routines designed by the teacher within the Morning Circle encouraged and, most certainly, allowed students to take on particular identities, which in turn, led to supportive interactions. Making space for students to adopt new identities in immersion classrooms may be important for children's linguistic development. Teachers should consider how and whether they provide such opportunities for their students to interact as leaders, teachers and translators.

Students also supported each other's understanding of good behavior and school-sanctioned *ways of being*. Interestingly, the explicit modeling and scaffolding that occur in language classrooms may provide students access to not only a new language, but also other school discourses (e.g., ways to behave). In this case, students came to SIES with different ways with words (Heath, 1983) and cultural practices. They came from diverse socio-economic, racial/ethnic, immigrant, and language backgrounds. However, they came together to learn content material in a language that was new to almost all of them. Thus, the teachers had to be very explicit about providing guidance not only for language, but also for behavior/school expectations, as shown through the continual review of classroom rules. Educators might consider how diverse multilingual classrooms not only build knowledge of new languages, but also new ways of being for students from different backgrounds. Future research might consider how language immersion schools, in particular, could "level the playing field" for children who come to school with differential access to typical school discourses.

5.2. Enacting identities in immersion classrooms

While the whole-group, Morning Circle routines allowed students to practice their new language and school-sanctioned *ways of being*, Table Work provided greater opportunity for appropriation of (and struggling with) outside discourses, especially themes about language and identity. In Excerpts 5 and 6, students talked about and enacted various *ways of being*, and demonstrated conflicting themes or *ways of representing* such identities. To review, many of the L1 English students took pride in their bilingualism and played with multiple languages, an important achievement for schools that serve low-income students who do not normally gain access to multilingualism. However, at other times, some students drew attention to Mexican-American students' being from "someplace else," and echoed discourses that suggested learning/using English, or monolingualism, was more important for children from immigrant families.

Themes on language and identity—which often occurred in students' small group dialogues—were pervasive. Some have argued that early literacy work with students should be conceptualized as interventions into not only the literacy/reading process, but also processes of identification (Rogers & Elias, 2012). Hicks (2005) notes we must make room in classrooms for what students view as "real." Schools have been pressed to build and build upon "third spaces" in which students reconsider who they are (Gutiérrez, 2008; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada, 1999). Similarly, as educators devise multilingual diverse immersion schools, we must recognize that students are learning new *ways of being* as much as they are learning new language(s) and content. During this process, they are struggling with discourses that may run counter to their experiences or to the goals of their schools. Teachers should be aware of the diversity of linguistic practices and backgrounds of their students, as well as the *ways of representing* that they might bring in from the "outside."

Perhaps unintentionally, Profesora Ana and Profesor Jeremy opened up spaces for creative, intertextual dialogues about language and identity during Table Work. Immersion schools like SIES might be more intentional in creating such spaces. They might also focus analyses on peer-led dialogues, to ensure peer interactions do not lead to isolating some students, as demonstrated in Excerpt 5 with Nikki. In other words, educators could consider how to create a hybrid third space for multilingualism in their classrooms, where students would study prevalent ideologies about language and their own speech communities, and then create new *ways of being* together. Contrary to assumptions that simply teaching a second language will broaden students' viewpoints, explicit discussion about multilingualism and language ideologies is necessary to provide students with alternate *ways of being*, *interacting* and *representing*. In dialogues about being bilingual or multilingualism in the U.S., immersion educators could address students' ideas, such as those about who speaks which languages on the bus or at home, or who speaks English or Spanish but sometimes hates it. Having a third space means inviting children to bring their sociocultural worlds and speech communities to the forefront. Without analyzing language and discourse in diverse contexts, immersion educators will not know whether or how their vision for a cohesive, multilingual speech community is being met.

6. Conclusion

A comparison of children's language-in-use across only two activity types in one classroom provides just a snapshot of everything that happens in immersion education. Nonetheless, the tools of critically oriented discourse analysis situated in ethnographic data collection demonstrated *how* students at SIES were active agents in both learning languages and enacting identities. Further exploration of multilingual classrooms should consider language learners not as isolates acquiring their L2 through an individual process, but rather as part of a community of learners with particular *ways of interacting*, *representing* and *being*. We must continue to question: How does immersion education provide diverse groups of students access to new languages as well as school and community discourses? Such research would help meet learners' and teachers' needs in our increasingly diverse, global and multilingual society.

Funding

This research received funding from the Susan Rudin Salesky Qualitative Research grant for UMSL graduate students.

Acknowledgements

Support of a graduate research assistantship from the College of Education, Department of Educational Psychology, Research, and Evaluation at the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL) supported the data collection phases of this project. The authors would also like to thank Marjorie Faulstich Orellana, Rebecca Rogers, anonymous reviewers, and fellow presenters at the American Anthropological Association, for their kind and insightful feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript.

Appendix A.

Transcript notations

[[Simultaneous utterances-double left hand brackets

: Colon or colons:: indicate an extension of sound or syllable depending on length

. A period indicates a statement

, A comma indicates a continuing intonation

? A question mark indicates a question

! An exclamation point indicates an animated tone

/ A slash indicates a pause by 1 s

° A degree symbol indicates quieter talk than surrounding talk

CAPITAL letters represent an utterance much louder or with a stronger emphasis than surrounding talk

>< Indicate talk that is faster than surrounding talk

Bold marks extra stressed words and syllables

Words that are underlined and in italics represent words and phrases that are mispronounced by students or grammatically incorrect.

() In parentheses and *italics* various characteristics of talk and movement or other contextual information is displayed

Note: (1) [Translation of Spanish will follow in brackets]

References

- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1999). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 158–166). London, UK: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin* (V. Liapunov & K. Brostrom, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V.W. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ballinger, S., & Lyster, R. (2011). Student and teacher oral language use in a two-way Spanish/English immersion school. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 289–306.
- Bamford, K. W., & Mizokawa, D. T. (1991). Additive-bilingual (immersion) education: Cognitive and language development. *Language Learning*, 41(3), 413–429.
- Barik, H. C., & Swain, M. (1976). A longitudinal study of bilingual and cognitive development. *International Journal of Psychology*, 11(4), 251–263.
- Barlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (2005). *Consequences of bilingualism for cognitive development*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bialystok, E., Peets, K. F., & Moreno, S. (2012). Producing bilinguals through immersion education: Development of metalinguistic awareness. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716412000288> (FirstView Article)
- Broner, M. (2001). *Impact of interlocutor and task on first and second language use in a Spanish Immersion Program*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research On Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Broner, M., & Tarone, E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifthgrade Spanish immersion classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(3), 363–379.
- Cazden, C. B. (1983). Adult assistance to language development: Scaffolds, models, and direct instruction. In R. P. Parker, & F. A. Davis (Eds.), *Developing literacy: Young children's use of language* (pp. 3–17). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cekaite, A., & Aronsson, K. (2004). Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: Playful recyclings in an immersion classroom. *Discourse Studies*, 6(3), 373–392.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2013). *Directory of Foreign Language Immersion Programs in U.S. Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/>
- Charmaz, K. (2010). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In W. Luttrell (Ed.), *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice* (pp. 183–207). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Christian, D., Howard, E. R., & Loeb, M. I. (2000). Bilingualism for all: Two-way immersion education in the United States. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(4), 258–266.
- de Courcy, M., Warren, J., & Bursston, M. (2002). Children from diverse backgrounds in an immersion programme. *Language and Education*, 16(2), 112–127.
- Dorner, L. M. (2010). English and Spanish para un futuro – or just English? Immigrant family perspectives on two-way immersion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(3), 303–323. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050903229851>
- Dorner, L. M. (2011). Contested communities in a debate over dual language education: The import of public values on public policies. *Educational Policy*, 25(4), 577–613. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0895904810368275>
- Dorner, L. M. (2012). The life course and sense-making: Immigrant families' journeys toward understanding educational policies and choosing bilingual programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(3), 461–486.
- Dorner, L. M., & Layton, A. (2013). What makes a good school? Data and competing discourses in a multilingual charter network. In D. Anagnostopoulos, S. Rutledge, & R. Jacobsen (Eds.), *The infrastructure of accountability: Mapping data use and its consequences across the American education system* (pp. 145–162). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.
- DuFon, M. A. (2002). Video recording in ethnographic SLA research: Some issues of validity in data collection. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 40–59.
- Dufva, H., & Alanen, R. (2005). Metalinguistic awareness in dialogue: Bakhtinian considerations. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning* (pp. 99–118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Erickson, F. (1992). Ethnographic microanalysis of interaction. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 202–225). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Fairclough, N. L. (1993). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. L. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. L. (2011). Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 119–127). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. L., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2: *Discourse as social interaction*) (pp. 258–284). London: SAGE.
- Fortune, T. W., & Tedick, D. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Garcez, P. M. (1997). Microethnography. In N. H. Hornberger, & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Research methods in language and education* (Vol. 8) (pp. 187–196). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers/Springer.
- García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 322–326.
- García, O., & Bartlett, L. (2007). A speech community model of bilingual education: Educating Latino newcomers in the USA. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(1), 1–25.
- García, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Torres-Guzmán, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and globalization*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 385–400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x>
- Gee, J. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Gee, J. (2001). Language, class, and identity: Teenagers fashioning themselves through language. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(2), 175–194.
- Gee, J. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Two case studies of content-based language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 3–33.
- Gort, M. (2008). You give me idea!: Collaborative strides toward bilingualism and biliteracy in a two-way partial immersion program. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 10(4), 192–200.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148–164.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6(4), 286–303.
- Hall, J. K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. (Eds.). (2005). *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1986). *Sociocultural contexts of language development Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*. Los Angeles, CA: California State University, Los Angeles, Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.
- Hermanto, N., Moreno, S., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Linguistic and metalinguistic outcomes of intense immersion education: How bilingual? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 131–145.
- Hicks, D. (1996). Contextual inquiries: A discourse-oriented study of classroom learning. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning, and schooling* (pp. 104–141). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hicks, D. (2005). Class readings: Story and discourse among girls in working-poor America. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(3), 212–229.
- Hicks, D. (Ed.). (1996). *Discourse, learning, and schooling*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, M. (2004). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. Binghamton, NY: Vail Ballou Press.
- Kendall, J. R., Lajeunesse, G., Chmilar, P., Shapson, L. R., & Shapson, S. M. (1987). English reading skills of French immersion students in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22(2), 135–159.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Landry, R. (1973). The enhancement of figural creativity through second language learning at the elementary school level. *Foreign Language Annals*, 7(1), 111–115.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. VanPatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 201–224). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, J. S., Hill-Bonnet, L., & Raley, J. (2011). Examining the effects of language brokering on student identities and learning opportunities in dual immersion classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 10(5), 306–326.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Block, N. C. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43–60.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Howard, E. R. (2008). Language development and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. In T. W. Fortune, & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 177–200). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lytra, V. (2011). Negotiating language, culture and pupil agency in complementary school classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(2011), 23–36.
- Martin, P., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Creese, A. (2006). Managing bilingual interaction in a Gujarati complementary school in Leicester. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 5–22.
- Martin-Beltran, M. (2010). The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing bilingual language learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 254–277.
- Medina, C. (2010). Reading across communities in biliteracy practices: Examining translocal discourses and cultural flows in literature discussions. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(1), 40–60.
- Moje, E. B. (2004). Powerful spaces: Tracing the out-of-school literacy spaces of Latino/a youth. In K. Leander, & M. Sheehy (Eds.), *Spatializing literacy research and practice* (pp. 15–38). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Moll, L. C., & Dworin, J. E. (1996). Biliteracy development in classrooms: Social dynamics and cultural possibilities. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning, and schooling* (pp. 221–246). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Moll, L. C., Saez, R., & Dworin, J. (2001). Exploring biliteracy: Two student case examples of writing as a social practice. *Elementary School Journal*, 101(4), 435–449.
- Møller, J. S., & Jørgensen, J. N. (2011). Linguistic norms and adult roles in play and serious frames. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(2011), 68–78.
- Olmedo, I. M. (2003). Language mediation among emergent bilingual children. *Linguistics and Education*, 14(2), 143–162.
- Orellana, M. F. (2007). Moving words and moving worlds: The challenges of being in the middle. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Orellana, M. F. (2009). *Translating childhoods: Immigrant youth, language and culture*. NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Pea, R. D. (2004). The social and technological dimensions of scaffolding and related theoretical concepts for learning, education, and human activity. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 13(3), 423–451.
- Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 75–101.
- Rogers, R. (2003). *A critical discourse analysis of family literacy practices: Power in and out of print*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rogers, R. (Ed.). (2011). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rogers, R., & Elias, M. (2012). Storied selves: A critical discourse analysis of young children's literate identifications. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 12(3), 259–292.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, J. (2006). Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education*, 17(2006), 157–174.
- Smagorinsky, P. (2008). The method section as conceptual epicenter in constructing social science research reports. *Written Communication*, 25(3), 389–411.
- Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(2), 166–178.
- Tedick, D. J., Christian, D., & Fortune, T. W. (Eds.). (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2003). Teaching all students: The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 61–65.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1–20.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wesely, P. M. (2012). Cross-cultural understanding in immersion students: A mixed methods study. *L2 Journal*, 4(2).
- Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 17, 89–100.