Chapter 4
Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students in Higher Education:
A Self Study of Teaching Practice

Jamie Harrison
Auburn University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter discusses the concepts of cultural and linguistic diversity in relation to the higher education classroom. Essential components of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching are considered and a self-study of teaching practice explored. Applications of second language acquisition theory are applied to pedagogical practice to inform the reader about what effective instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the university setting looks like. Conclusions and recommendations are made.

INTRODUCTION

The United States (U. S.) has long been a leading destination for international students to pursue postsecondary education in an English-medium setting (Institute of International Education, 2018a) and according to *Open Doors 2018*, the number of international students in the U. S. has exceeded one million for the past three years. There are currently 1.09 million international students in the U. S., and increase of 1.5% from 2017 (Morris, 2018) which represents 25% of the world's globally mobile students (Institute of International Education, 2018b). These international

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-9989-0.ch004

Copyright © 2020, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited.

students not only bring diverse perspectives, but also tuition dollars, both valued in increasingly competitive higher education markets (Reddin, 2014). While the numbers have steadily grown for decades, in recent years there has been a slight decrease in first year international student enrollment (Institute of International Education, 2018b). Decreases are evident from the top four leading sending countries: China, Indian, South Korea, and Saudi Arabia (Reddin, 2018). In response to this decrease, universities are turning to corporate recruitment partners to attract these high revenue students to campuses across the United States (Reddin, 2014). There are now over 50 such corporate agencies, like Shorelight and INTO, for example, working for profit in conjunction with universities, and universities are reporting mixed results in student enrollment from these efforts (Reddin, 2018). Budgetary concerns largely drive these partnerships, as recruitment agencies can increase international student enrollment more quickly than traditional recruitment procedures (Choudaha & Chang, 2012). International student recruitment remains a priority for universities who seek to diversify campuses, both culturally and linguistically, as well as benefit from the increased revenue that comes with the enrollment of this population of students (Reddin, 2014).

Intense recruitment efforts belie the complex academic environments that these, often, non-native English speakers (NNES) must thrive in. Cultural differences, classroom expectations and norms, isolation, and linguistic challenges contribute to the complex experiences of internationals students at U. S. universities (Lin & Scherz, 2014). Cultural and linguistic complexities are critical factors to consider when seeking to understand the experiences of NNES students on U.S. university campuses.

Additionally, faculty whose courses are highly impacted by NNES enrollment are often blind-sided by the linguistic needs of these students, who they assume, sometimes incorrectly, will be highly proficient in English. Bifue-Ambe (2011) suggests that instructors often make the mistake of thinking that because a NNES student has reached the required TEOFL score for university entrance, he or she will also be fully prepared for that immersive English experience. In fact, language proficiency itself is complex and even attaining university approved scores on language proficiency tests to gain entrance does not ensure complete success in such academic settings (Bifue-Ambe, 2011). Many other factors may also influence academic success for NNES students including motivation, study skills, classroom pedagogies and course curriculums.

While the phenomenon of supporting English language learners (ELLs) in K12 schools is not new in the United States and schools nationwide are grappling with training in-service teachers along with adequately preparing pre-service teachers (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008), these discussions have remained largely silent in the university setting. Writing centers have traditionally assumed the

role of NNES student support, yet, the needs of struggling NNES at the university level are larger than the kinds of support offered at writing centers (Wang & Machado, 2015). According to the TESOL International Association (2010), postsecondary academic success requires the navigation of specialized knowledge of language along with the myriad sociocultural factors embedded into classrooms in U. S. higher education institutions. Faculty and instructor awareness of and attention to the culturally and linguistically diverse students in their classrooms is vital in ensuring a positive academic outcome for these students.

Until recently, the term English language learner (ELL) or English learner (EL) was the commonly accepted term to describe students in K12 schools whose first language was not English and who had been officially designated to received extra support services. Emergent bilingual (student) has emerged in recent years as a term to accentuate the idea that these students were not simply learners of English, but were people who arrived in classrooms with a rich language background that could be used as a resource for their continued English language learning and all other types of learning. Terminology related to this topic, at the university level, is not as nuanced. While not all international students are non-native speakers of English, the majority of international students who come to U. S. campuses come from countries where a language other than English is the primary language (Institute of International Education, 2018). Students from these countries are commonly designated or referred to as ESL (English as a Second Language) students or Non-native English Speakers (NNES) regardless of their language proficiency level or status of matriculation. This terminology does little justice to the high level of achievement these students have in learning English well enough to enter a U.S. university and undertake a rigorous course of study in their second (or perhaps third or fourth) language. Although these students may have difficulties succeeding higher education due in part to language difference, labels such as these further perpetuate the notions of linguistic hegemony that often permeate higher education settings. For this reason, I will use the term *culturally and linguistically diverse* (CLD) (Gonzalez, Pagan, Wendell, & Love, 2011) to discuss the international student population whose first, second, and perhaps even third languages are not English.

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the results of an ethnographic self-study of my own personal reflections and analyses on my own ability to incorporate culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies in the ESOL Education classes I instruct for both native English speaking (NES) students and an increasingly larger number of CLD students. The study is important because it can shed light on effective methods of instruction of CLD students in a mainstream university setting.

The study is also important because I teach in a unique situation as it is not often that teacher educators are teaching the subject content to those who can also benefit from the proficient execution of said content. Teaching CLD students themselves how to teach English as a second language is an exercise in reflexivity beyond what would normally be expected. It is vital that I model the types of teaching classroom and techniques that they should use in their own settings. This type of reflection is an essential component of my teaching and from it I can glean areas of strength and improvement in my practice.

This chapter explores the intersection of research-based understandings of best practices for working with ELLs in the K12 context and linguistically diverse students in the higher education context. My career as a teacher of English to speakers of other languages spans nearly twenty-five years and includes teaching both overseas and in the United States, teaching all grades, K – 12, and adult learners, and teaching at both for-profit and public institutions. For this study, I explored my experiences teaching non-native English speakers in graduate level courses as part of an ESOL Education master's degree. Using self-study methodology, I explored my own practices, attitudes, and beliefs from a linguistically responsive teaching framework. Recommendations for increasing linguistically responsive teaching practices for linguistically diverse students in the U. S. university setting will be discussed.

BACKGROUND

This literature review will provide an overview of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, sheltered instruction as a framework for effective teaching of academic content to CLD students, and CLD students in U. S. higher education settings.

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching

Culture and language are commonly accepted as intricately related concepts often perceived as not mutually exclusive (Brown, 1994). Culture is defined as the "learned and shared human patterns or models for living," (Damen, 1987, p. 367). Banks and McGee (1989) further delineate culture to be the abstract, non-tangible notions and symbols of human societies. Culturally responsive teaching is a critical framework used for discussing the educational needs of ethnically diverse students (Gay, 2007). Gay (2007) proposes that culturally responsive teaching requires "explicit knowledge about cultural diversity" (p. 106) as part of a comprehensive program to meet the educational needs of ethnically diverse students. Decades ago, Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (1995) introduced a culturally responsive teaching framework focused

primarily on adult education based on intrinsic motivation. In their framework, culturally responsive classrooms are co-created between the student and the instructor and include four essential conditions: establishing an inclusive atmosphere, developing a positive attitude by providing personal relevance and choice, enhancing meaning via challenging assignments, and engendering competence.

Scholars assert that culture would not exist without language and vice versa (Jiyang, 2000). Brown (2007) notes that cognitive and linguistic growth are intertwined, each affecting the other, and cultural patterns are often embedded in language. Thus, it is imperative that teachers adopt not only a culturally responsive framework for teaching, but also one that is linguistically responsive. Linguistically responsive teaching is a stance that includes knowledge of second language acquisition principles and pedagogical resources that support language and academic growth of linguistically diverse students (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). Drawing from second language acquisition (SLA) theory, Lucas, et. al. (2008) delineate six core understandings about SLA that general education teachers should know. From these core concepts they outline pedagogical choices that will support linguistically diverse students of a variety of language levels (see Table 1). de Oliveira and Wachter Morris (2015) build on this by describing ten essential strategies used by linguistically responsive teachers. These strategies are also incorporated into Table 1 (in bold) to create a fuller picture of effective pedagogical choices.

Attention to the needs of CLD students in K12 schools is not new, yet the knowledge about SLA and supportive pedagogy for teaching CLD students has been slow to reach the general education teacher training curriculum (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Even more so is the situation of CLD students at the university level. Shapiro, Farrelly, and Tomaš (2014) discuss the opportunities and challenges of international student enrollment in U.S. universities, exploring the urgent question, “Whose job is it to ensure that international students have the academic, linguistic, and social support that they need to be successful?” (p. 3). This question lies at the heart of the discussion about the experiences of CLD students in higher education and leads us to the concept of *sheltered instruction*.

Sheltered Instruction

Sheltered Instruction (SI), introduced in the 1980s by Stephen Krashen (Knoblock & Youngquist, 2016), consists of language development activities in conjunction with techniques to make academic content more accessible to English learners (Short, Fidelman, & Louguit, 2012) and in the United States is primarily used in the K12 context. Traditionally SI places non-native English speakers in separate classrooms from their English-speaking peers so they can receive specialized instruction in the same academic content areas. Typical instructional methods of SI include: visuals

Table 1. SLA core understandings and pedagogical applications based on Lucas, et. al. (2008) and de Oliveira and Wachter Morris (2015)

SLA Core Understanding	Pedagogical Applications
Academic language proficiency is significantly different from conversational proficiency and takes much longer to acquire	• Recognize the cognitive load of the academic reading and writing assigned and adjust as needed **• Scaffold ELLs' academic language and content language**
Comprehensible input (defined as language received that is just a little higher than current level of competence) and opportunities for language output are essential for language growth	**• Pay attention to language** • Be aware of student language levels and what can be expected of a learner at that level • Provide scaffolded supports in the form of graphic organizers, study guides, adapted texts • Consider speech rate and word choice in class lectures and discussions **• Modify rather than simplify instruction**
Active, social interaction supports language growth	**• Build language-rich environments** • Provide lots of opportunities for students to work together **• Provide opportunities for ELLs to communicate with other students**
Native language skill is directly linked to second language skill	• Be aware of the native languages of students • Encourage continued use of native language as a resource for students to draw on **• Make connections to students' language and culture**
Reducing classroom anxiety leads to more successful language learning	• Ensure clear multimodal instructions • Provide exemplar models • Encourage and facilitate native English-speaking peers to engage with linguistically diverse students in supportive ways • Reduce fear of making mistakes and mispronunciation **• Create various opportunities for ELLs to understand and process the material** **• Use multimodal strategies**
Second language learning is influenced by attention to form and function of the language	• Identify key vocabulary • Clarify semantic and syntactic complexity in resources • Consider ways language is expected to be used (listening to teacher lecture, participating in class discussion) **• Identify the language demands in assigned texts** **• Establish language and content objectives**

and realia, language adjustments, opportunities for interaction and cooperation, multimodal lectures, focus on broad ideas rather than key details, and explicit use of reading strategies (Knoblock & Youngquist, 2016). Research over time indicates that SI can be effective with CLD students if appropriately designed and implemented (Knoblock and Youngquist, 2016). Nevertheless, not everyone is convinced. Detractors of SI have cited the simplified academic content and separation of CLD students from their peers as problematic issues in SI (Knoblock & Youngquist, 2016).

Stephens and Johnson (2015) trace one state's policies regarding SI and find that while state policy claims SI as its mode of instruction for ELLs, the enactment of SI varies considerably across the state from school to school. This variability and lack of fidelity to the principles of SI is problematic.

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP; Echevarria, Voght, & Short, 2013) is one research-based model of sheltered instruction used commonly in the K12 setting. Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) is another commonly used framework in K12 education settings to support the linguistic and academic needs of ELLs learning academic content from content area specialists through the medium of English. Genzuk (2011) defines SDAIE as, "the teaching of grade-level subject matter in English specifically designed for speakers of other languages," (p. 6) and distinguishes it from SI by its focus on both academic content and language objectives SDAIE benefits students who have an intermediate and above proficiency level, are literate in the their L1, and have a sufficiently rich academic background of various subjects (Genzuk, 2011).

Many SI and SDAIE concepts and principles have crossover potential in the university classroom where increases of CLD are challenging the traditional practices of both seasoned and new faculty members unaccustomed to CLD in their academic setting. SI has been used at the university level primarily in entry level composition courses (Knoblock & Youngquist, 2016). Other than this context, SI is rare at the university level (Knoblock & Youngquist, 2016). In their own study of the effectiveness of a sheltered reading class, Knoblock and Youngquist (2016) found that CLD students showed improvement in reading skills and a lower dropout rate from placement in a sheltered course of an introductory English course rather than taking the course with native speakers.

CLD Students in Higher Education

The challenges faced by CLD students in university settings have been well-documented. CLD students must overcome marginalization, disempowering discourses, and lack of mentoring (Braine, 1999; Kamhi-Stein & de Oliveira, 2008; Phillipson, 1992). Cultural challenges in university classrooms include decrease of formality and boundaries between student and instructor and more direct communication patterns (Shapiro, Farrelly, & Tomaš, 2014). Additionally, U.S. classrooms, characterized by their heterogeneity, student-centered, active learning environment, and multiple modes of assessment (Shapiro, Farrelly, & Tomaš, 2014) create additional barriers that often go unnoticed by instructors who have learned in these environments themselves. Li and Zizzi (2018) report cultural barriers among international students and their American peers and professors. Lack of commonalities, socializing expectations, and religious intolerance were reported

experiences of participants (Li & Zizzi, 2018). Bringing awareness to these cultural challenges is important to developing a culturally responsive classroom environment in university classrooms.

In addition to these socio-cultural issues, academic challenges reported include understanding rhetorical situations or styles, academic writing, and learning the technical vocabulary of specific academic fields (Casanave, 1990, 1992, 2002; Corson, 1997; Leki, 2003; Zamel & Spack, 2004). Khanal and Gaulee (2019) provide an overview of the literature regarding the challenges of international students. Studies reviewed suggested English language proficiency and classroom learning styles to be key challenges for CLD students in the U.S. higher education setting. Cultural and linguistic diversity are at the heart of these academic challenges and while the learner is most assuredly expected to put forth a requisite amount of effort, the instructor is also a key player in the exchange of academic information and experiences.

Anecdotally, faculty at one major university in the Southeast express consistent concerns about the skills of their students and their own abilities to meet their linguistic needs (author personal correspondence, 2019). Some studies address faculty perspectives of teaching NNES (Andrade, 2010; Kingston & Forland, 2008; Peters & Anderson, 2017; Robertson, Line, Jones, & Thomas, 2000; Shi & Harrison, 2016; Trice, 2003) and illuminate key concerns and pedagogical decisions. Peters and Anderson (2017) provide a comprehensive view of the perspectives of the faculty at the University of Minnesota about the inclusion of NNES in mainstream university settings. Faculty perceived lower language proficiency, academic access, and cultural differences to be among the greatest challenges for NNES students. Language proficiency challenges were further broken down into key areas of writing, comprehension, and pronunciation (Peters & Anderson, 2017). Participation and discussion, academic honesty, and content challenges were identified by faculty as key academic challenges for NNES students in their courses.

Indeed, Harrison and Shi (2016) report their own experiences as instructor and student in one graduate level course. Results of their study suggest that instructors should be aware of their students' language levels and abilities, provide opportunities for interaction, and pay attention to their own and their students' patterns of language use. Shi, Harrison, and Henry (2016) also reported the experiences of NNES students in a graduate level course. Participants in this study indicated cooperative learning and use of supplementary materials to be effective in supporting their academic understanding in their courses. More research needs to be conducted regarding faculty perceptions and pedagogical strategies used when NNES students are enrolled in otherwise mainstream courses.

STUDY BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

Self-study as methodology in educational research has roots in reflective practice and action research (Samaras & Freese, 2009). This style of inquiry situates problems within the practice of teaching but the focus of the study remains clearly on 'self' and experiences of the self (Samaras & Freese, 2009). Self-study is defined as, "the study of one's self, one's actions, one's ideas," and includes a study of the "not self" as well (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 1998) and a reflective practitioner is defined as someone who periodically reviews their own work and their processes with the intention of change and improvement (Brigden, Lilley, Sackville, 1999). The self-study approach is well-suited to the reflective teacher practitioner as it is self-initiated, self-focused, has the set goal of improvement (Hamilton, Smith, and Worthington, 2009), all aspects of reflective teaching.

This self-study was focused on my teaching practices as a teacher educator of adults learning to teach English to speakers of other languages (ESOL). Many of the students in my classes are in fact linguistically and culturally diverse students themselves who come to the classroom with many personal experiences of language learning already. I am curious about the degree to which I employ the very strategies I recommend to my students themselves. Toward this end, I investigated my teaching practice over the span of three years. This research has served to inform me about my own teaching practices as well as shed light on ways university instructors can support linguistically diverse students. In order to effectively understand my practice as a teacher of linguistically diverse students, I analyzed my teaching practices according to the suggested tenets of linguistically responsive teachers. My main question was: "To what extent am I, as a teacher educator of ESOL Education, a linguistically responsive teacher?" Toward this end, I examined materials (Panopto recordings of class sessions, course shells from the learning management system, and course syllabus and assignments) from one graduate level course, Applied Linguistics in Second Language Acquisition, over the span of three semesters. In order to get a broad picture of my teaching, I reviewed three class sessions (beginning, middle, ending) from one course over multiple semesters.

Personal Context and Background

My experiences with language, disability, and classroom learning influence my teaching identity. As a teacher of English to speakers of other languages, I am often asked, "How many languages do you speak?" This requires a long answer from me. While I don't speak a second language fluently, I have been exposed to many languages to varying degrees in my lifetime. I was a typical American teenager who took two Spanish electives in high school in order to graduate, and in college I chose

computer programming to be my second language of study. I had little exposure to other languages beyond some youth mission trips and other religious outreach experiences, and learning a second language held little value to me. In fact, speaking my first language at that time was a herculean task. I grew up with a debilitating stutter. It was the kind of stutter that embarrassed everyone around me. I could barely answer the telephone at home and refused to speak in class. My teachers adapted to me and learned to avoid calling on me to answer questions, offered me chances to present after class to an empty room, and generally enabled my silence. And though I was truly appreciative at the time, my silence turned into voiceless-ness, and voiceless-ness into fear of speaking. I remember middle school and high school as very challenging times for me and the idea of teaching never occurred to me. It was only in college that I determined to break out of these patterns, and I forced myself to take speech classes and participate in classroom discussions. I stumbled and stuttered through my first few years of college, but slowly over time my speaking skills improved. My confidence grew and by the time I was a Junior, I ran for student council, making a speech to the entire student body completely stutter-free.

After graduating from a liberal arts college with a degree in English and Secondary Education, it took me two years to finally take the leap to start teaching. I found the job announcement in the classified section of the newspaper and within three weeks had an interview at Denny's, got hired, applied for my visa, and within three months I was on my way – to South Korea. I fell in love with teaching ESL in South Korea and it was a choice that changed the trajectory of my life in many ways.

I have been a teacher for over twenty years. I have taught English as a Second Language, English as a Foreign Language, and English Language Arts to all ages and grade levels from pre-kindergarten to adult in multiple settings including *hagwans* in South Korea, intensive English programs in the United States, community English programs, and over fifteen years in public schools in Georgia. Upon completing my Ed.D. in School Improvement at the University of West Georgia, I taught another two years before taking my current position at a university in the Southeast. Truly, I have loved, not loved, and loved again teaching over the years and maintain that it is one of the most difficult professions.

I was an early adopter of differentiated instruction, purchasing *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners* (Tomlinson, 1999) on my own volition during my first year of teaching. At the time, I was responding to the varied needs in my classroom and my growing understanding that providing one lesson for all was not effective in meeting those needs. Differentiated instruction allowed me to vary the content, process, and product to meet learner needs according to ability, linguistic proficiency, interest, and learning style. I was hooked and started implementing aspects of it immediately. The next year, I was chosen to represent my

district as part of a 'train the trainer' team on this approach and topic and I got to travel to three different ASCD conferences about differentiation and then redeliver professional development to the entire district. I think that experience set a path in motion for me to establish myself as a leader in my school and push the boundaries of my role as an ESOL teacher. As a reflective practitioner, I always knew a lesson could be better, or my interactions with students could be more rigorous. So, I got into the routine of reading and experimented, reflected and tried again. This process is one of my favorite aspects of the teaching profession as it gives me the freedom to make mistakes, learn, and try again. Still to this day, I am not sure I have fully mastered the art and craft of teaching, but that uncertainty is more borne from my reflective nature than the positive classroom observations of my former administrators and current consistently high student ratings.

Now, here I am a teacher educator, and I love my job and take it seriously. I hope to encourage others into this challenging profession and give them the tools to be successful. Part of that challenge is to consistently use and model the kinds of practices and mindsets that research indicates and which I myself believe, contribute to a successful teaching practice. The results of my investigation are detailed in the next section and recommendations are made regarding supporting the academic linguistic needs of CLD students at the university level.

Course Context

The course I reviewed was a graduate level Applied Linguistics in Second Language Acquisition course which is one of the required courses in an ESOL Education master's degree program intended for additional teacher certification. The same courses are also offered and required as part of a non-certification track for the same master's degree program. Due to this overlap, there are students from a wide variety of backgrounds taking the course together. Americans who are already practicing teachers in K12 settings sit alongside other Americans and CLD students interested in pursuing a career in TESOL in settings other than K12 or the United States. Since this is a course in second language acquisition, the experiences of CLD students are inherently highly relevant.

RESULTS

The findings from my investigation revolve around the strategies I consistently use to support the CLD students enrolled in my graduate classes. In addition, my findings illuminate areas for improvement in which I could be doing more to support CLD students. I used the ten essential strategies of linguistically responsive teachers (de

Table 2. Essential strategies and evidence of use

Essential Strategy	Evidence from LMS and Panopto Recordings
Building language-rich environments (multi-modal; opportunities for interaction)	• Weekly readings • Opportunities for video viewing • Powerpoint lectures • Group work • consistent use of think-pair-share
Paying attention to language	• Power point to accompany in-class lectures, • discussions • language lessons • Panopto recordings available for review • Some effort to review and recast information
Modifying rather than simplifying instruction	• Power point to accompany in-class lectures
Providing opportunities for ELLs to communicate with other students	• Think – Pair—Share activities • Group work and projects • Presentations • Discussion boards in Canvas
Creating various opportunities for ELLs to understand and process the material	• Think – Pair—Share activities • Group work and projects • Presentations • Poster creation • jigsaw reading and reteaching
Using multimodal strategies	• Reading & viewing opportunities • Powerpoints to accompany in class lectures
Identifying the language demands in assigned texts	• Not evident
Establishing language and content objectives	• Not evident
Scaffolding ELLs' academic language and content language	• Powerpoint lectures • powerpoint available on Canvas
Making connections to students' language and culture	• I often say, "think about your own experiences with learning English…" • Students are asked to create a poster of information comparing English with at least one other language (most CLD students choose their own L1 for this assignment)

Oliveira & Wachter Morris, 2015) to guide my investigation and to organize the results (see Table 2). Table 2 highlights the key strategies along with evidence from my teaching artifacts that support strategies listed. In two cases, I did not identify any evidence of using the strategy and have indicated that in the chart.

Student feedback in course evaluations confirm some of these results and show growth over time. For example, in Fall 2016, 8 of 9 students responded to the statement "the instructor created a conducive atmosphere for learning," with Strong Agree (1 responded with Agree). Yet, in additional comments, one wrote,

The course expectations, while manageable, were always a little hazy. It was difficult to know what to expect, but Dr. Harrison was very approachable, understanding, and responded quickly to emails.

In Fall 2017, thirteen students in the course responded to the prompt, "I was provided an environment that supported my learning." Of the thirteen, eleven Strongly Agreed and two Agreed with this statement. One student's comment corroborated these results: "I enjoyed the structure of the class and I was able to learn a lot in the classroom environment." My initial analysis indicates evidence eight of the ten strategies. Of these eight, I would like to focus on two which appear to be strengths that enhance my teaching and create an atmosphere conducive to CLD learning. I also consider the areas in which I see no evidence as areas for reflection and as potential areas for growth, but I would benefit the most from focusing my energy on one of these in particular. The next section will describe these strategies in further detail.

Strength Strategy One: Varied Opportunities to Understand and Process Material

The learning management system (LMS) course shell and class recordings revealed many examples of my output (the verbal and written language I use to communicate the material of my course). The LMS platform clearly shows an attention to providing written materials for students to access. Weekly Modules are created that provide an agenda of in and out of class activities, any handouts, and the Powerpoint of notes that I will use during the in-class session. My intention is to provide the Powerpoints prior to the class meeting in order for students to download and take notes on or read prior to the class meeting or after as a review. Panopto recordings show that I attend to the agenda the beginning of class, being sure to orally explain the agenda and what we hope to accomplish during class. The Powerpoints are typically a summary of key points in the weekly reading and it is clear from the recordings that I use these as a guide for the course lecture or discussion, further providing multiple experiences with the course content.

Strength Strategy Two: Multiple Communicative Opportunities

Language-rich environments are classrooms that provide lots of opportunities for interaction. Fink (2003) proposes an integrated framework of conscious attention to multiple ways of conveying information and ideas, providing opportunities for students

to gain understanding through "rich learning experiences," and utilizing various methods of reflection as formative assessment. I have adopted many aspects of the holistic active learning framework (Fink, 2003) and these offer many opportunities for students to interact with me and with each other. One often used strategy by me is known in K12 educational circles as Think – Pair – Share. This is simply a way of giving students an opportunity to think about a posed question, perhaps even jotting down notes, pair with a nearby student to discuss ideas, and then come back to the whole group for a full class discussion. This simple process which can take as little as 3 – 5 minutes gives CLD students an opportunity to collect their thoughts and gather the English they want and need to express their ideas, try out the ideas on a person nearby while also gaining new ideas and language from that partner before possibly participating in the whole group discussion.

Improvement Area One: Identifying the Language Demands in Assigned Texts

While it is understood that CLD students in graduate school at an American university usually meet specific language proficiency regulations, as Bifue-Ambe (2011) notes these regulations do not always tell the full picture of an ELs potential for academic success in an English-medium setting. A full load of courses at the graduate level results in multiple course texts, exams, and writing assignments from multiple instructors and professors who each have different styles of teaching and expectations for depth of reading, in class participation, and synthesis of course material. It is incumbent upon the instructor to pay attention to the amount and type of reading, writing, and speaking that will be expected keeping in mind that a CLD student will need more time to accomplish the same tasks as their American peers. Some specific ways I could be more intentional about this aspect of my instruction are:

- **Clarify Reading Expections:** Clarify to students the depth at which I expect them to read – should they read for overall main ideas, find specific quotes to support opinions, or be ready for a reading quiz? Whatever the goal, being transparent with students about the expectation will help CLD students in particular to plan for the amount of time they will need to prepare for class.
- **Identify Key Terminology:** Identify key terminology and concepts ahead of time from the reading to help students focus on what is important – in this case, I could provide a graphic organizer or a reading guide to support CLD students focused reading.

- **Provide Discussion Questions Early:** Provide discussion questions prior to class for students to read and prepare for – while this might seem to cut into the spontaneity of a whole class discussion, it is really helpful for students to give them a focus for their reading.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This self-study has provided insights into my current teaching practice as a teacher educator who teaches CLD students in graduate level ESOL Education courses. It is a unique situation in which I am essentially using the strategies and methods that I am teaching my students about as part of their curriculum to become ESL teachers. Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching is key component of effective teaching in K12 schools, but is little discussed in general education settings at the tertiary level. Many assumptions are made about CLD students at this level and even I, who am trained to work with this exact population, have had to become very intentional in how I set up the LMS and conduct my classes. I see from my videos and LMS artifacts that I am careful to offer varied opportunities to process and understand course concepts and material, and I provide multiple communicative opportunities in my course. On the other hand, I could pay much more attention to the language level and demands of the texts and tasks associated with my course. There are some simple things I could do to help my CLD students who are taking several other courses besides mine and having to navigate multiple readings and assignments weekly. Being intentional about my expectations and goals for reading, offering key term lists and graphic organizers are simple ways to support CLD students. I plan to address this weakness the next time I teach the course and hope that it will be an effective way to reduce stress for the CLD students in my classes.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRCTIONS

Future research in this arena is warranted. In my personal self-study work, I could create a survey that deals explicitly with the needs on CLD students rather than rely only on institutionally driven course satisfaction questions at the end of the course. Further research could be conducted in other courses with instructors interested in increasing their efficacy in working with CLD students. It would also be interesting to survey university professors about their perception of need or the use of these strategies that support CLD students. All of these avenues would contribute to the body of knowledge about effective instruction of CLD students at the university level.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed one instructor's experiences teaching CLD students in a higher education setting. Using a framework of sheltered instruction and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching practices, the instructor analyzes her own teaching, which happens to also be the topic of her teaching, how to teach English as a Second or Foreign language. This unusual context provides opportunities for metacognitive reflection on essential teaching practices to support the current CLD students in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Andrade, M. S. (2010). Increasing accountability: Faculty perspectives on the English language competence of nonnative English speakers. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *14*(3), 221–239. doi:10.1177/1028315308331295

Banks, J. A., & McGee, C. A. (1989). *Multicultural Education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bifue-Ambe, E. (2011). Postsecondary learning: Recognizing the needs of English language learners in mainstream university classrooms. *Multicultural Education*, *18*(3), 13–19.

Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brigden, L., & Sackville. (1999). *Encouraging reflective practice*. Mersey Deanery Occasional Paper.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Casanave, C. P. (1990). *The role of writing in socializing graduate students into an academic discipline in the social sciences* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 9024316)

Casanave, C. P. (1992). Cultural diversity and socialization: A case study of a Hispanicwoman in a doctoral program in sociology. In D. E. Murray (Ed.), *Diversity as resource: Redefining cultural literacy* (pp. 148–180). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Choudaha, R., & Chang, L. (2012). Trends in international student mobility. *World Education News and Reviews*. Retrieved from http://wenr.wes.org/2012/02/wenr-february-2012-trends-in international-student-mobility

Corson, D. (1997). The learning and use of academic English words. *Language Learning*, *47*(4), 671–718. doi:10.1111/0023-8333.00025

Damen, L. (1987). National cultures and corporate cultures. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Communication between cultures*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

de Oliveira & Wachter Morris. (2015). *Preparing school counselors for English language learners*. Annapolis Junction, MD: TESOL Press.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Fink, L. D. (2003). *A self-directed guide to designing courses for significant learning*. Retrieved on June 15, 2019 from https://www.deefinkandassociates.com/GuidetoCourseDesignAug05.pdf

Gay, G. (2007). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 106–116. doi:10.1177/0022487102053002003

Genzuk, M. (2011). *Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) for language minority students. Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research Digital Papers Series*. Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research, University of Southern California.

Gonzalez, Pagan, Wendell, & Love. (2011). Supporting ELL/culturally and linguistically diverse students for academic achievement. Rexford, NY: International Center for Leadership in Education.

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). *On the threshold of a new century: Trustworthiness, integrity, and self-study in teacher education*. Academic Press; doi:10.1177/0022487100051003012

Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2009). Fitting the Methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and auto-ethnography, *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(1), 17-28. Retrieved from https://www.doi/abs/10.1080/17425960801976321

Harrison, J., & Shi, H. (2016). English language learners in higher education: An exploratory conversation. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(2), 415–430.

Institute of International Education. (2018a). *Open Doors 2018 "Fast Facts"*. Retrieved on Mar 10, 2019 from https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Fact-Sheets-and-Infographics/Fast-Facts

Institute of International Education. (2018b). *A world on the move: Trends in global mobility.* Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Publications/A-World-on-the-Move

Jiyang, W. (2000). The relationship between culture and language. *ELT Journal*, *54*(4), 328–334. doi:10.1093/elt/54.4.328

Kamhi-Stein, L. D., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2008). Mentoring as a pathway to leadership: A focus on nonnative English speaking professionals. In C. Coombe, M. L. McCloskey, N. L. Stephenson, & N. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Leadership in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 38–49). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Khanal, J., & Gaulee, U. (2019). Challenges of international students from pre-departure to post-study: A literature review. *Journal of International Students*, *9*(2), 560–581. doi:10.32674/jis.v9i2.673

Kingston, E., & Forland, H. (2008). Bridging the gap in expectations between international students and academic staff. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *12*(2), 204–221. doi:10.1177/1028315307307654

Knoblock, N., & Youngquist, J. (2016). College-level sheltered instruction: Revisiting the issue of effectiveness. *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *16*(5), 49–69. doi:10.14434//josotl.v16i5.20022

Leki, I. (2003). Living through college literacy: Nursing in a second language. *Written Communication*, *20*(1), 81–98. doi:10.1177/0741088303253571

Li, S., & Zizzi, S. (2018). A case study of international students' social adjustment, friendship development, and physical activity. *Journal of International Students*, *8*(1), 389–408. doi:10.32674/jis.v8i1.171

Lin, S., & Scherz, S. D. (2014). Challenges facing Asian international graduate students in the US: Pedagogical considerations in higher education. *Journal of International Students*, *4*(1), 16–33.

Lucas, T., Villegas, A., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *59*(4), 361–373. doi:10.1177/0022487108322110

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, *52*(2), 98–109.

Morris, C. (2018). *Number of international students in the United States reaches new high of 1.09 million*. Institute of International Education. Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/Why-IIE/Announcements/2018/11/2018-11-13-Number-of-International-Students-Reaches-New-High

Peters, B., & Anderson, M. (2017). *Supporting non-native English speakers at University of Minnesota: A survey of faculty and staff*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Reddin, E. (2014). Teaching international students. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com

Reddin, E. (2018). As pathway market expands, enrollment outcomes diverge. *Inside Higher Ed*, Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com

Robertson, M., Line, M., Jones, S., & Thomas, S. (2000). International students, learning environments and perceptions: A case study using the Delphi technique. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *19*(1), 89–102. doi:10.1080/07294360050020499

Samaras & Freese. (2009). Looking back and looking forward: an historical overview of the self-study school. In C. A. Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators*. Boston, MA: Sense publishers.

Shapiro, S., Farrelly, R., & Tomas, Z. (2014). *Fostering international student success in higher education*. Annapolis Junction, MD: TESOL Press.

Shi, H., Harrison, J., & Henry, D. (2017). Non-native English speakers' experiences with course access in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *28*, 25–34. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2017.06.004

Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(2), 334–361. doi:10.1002/tesq.20

TESOL International Association. (2010). *Position statement on the acquisition of academic proficiency in English at the postsecondary level*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

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

Trice, A. G. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*(4), 379–403. doi:10.1177/1028315303257120

Wang, P., & Machado, C. (2015). Meeting the needs of Chinese English language learners at writing centers in America: A proposed culturally responsive model. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(2), 143–160.

Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsberg, M. B. (1995). A framework for culturally responsive teaching. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(1), 17–21.

Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. doi:10.4324/9781410609809

ADDITIONAL READING

Shapiro, S., Farrelly, R., & Tomas, Z. (2014). *Fostering international student success in higher education*. Annapolis Junction, MD: TESOL Press.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Culturally and Linguistically Diverse: One of many labels used to describe a person in the United States whose home background and language difer from the mainstream culture and English language. Other terms often used include: English language learner, non-native English speaker.

Sheltered Instruction: Method of teaching that focuses on language acquisition in conjunction with academic content provided in accessible ways based on language proficiency level.