

10-25-2017

From Test Scores to Language Use: Emergent Bilinguals Using English to Accomplish Academic Tasks

Claudia Rodriguez-Mojica

Santa Clara University, crodriguezmojica@scu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/tepas>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rodriguez-Mojica, C. (2018). From Test Scores to Language Use: Emergent Bilinguals using English to Accomplish Academic Tasks. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 12(1), 31-61. doi:10.1080/19313152.2017.1389222

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *International Multilingual Research Journal* on Oct 25, 2017, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/19313152.2017.1389222>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education & Counseling Psychology at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teacher Education by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.

From Test Scores to Language Use: Emergent Bilinguals using English to Accomplish Academic Tasks

Abstract

Prominent discourses about emergent bilinguals' academic abilities tend to focus on performance as measured by test scores and perpetuate the message that emergent bilinguals trail far behind their peers. When we remove the constraints of formal testing situations, what can emergent bilinguals do in English as they engage in naturally occurring classroom interactions about content? Using six months of naturally occurring emergent bilingual talk, this article shows that (1) emergent bilinguals produced a wide range of academic speech acts in English while engaged in English language arts tasks, (2) these speech acts were aligned with state academic expectations, and (3) even emergent bilinguals considered "struggling" by conventional standards used in schools showed evidence of using English to accomplish academic tasks in ways aligned to state academic expectations. I argue that determining emergent bilinguals' English language proficiency using test scores alone provides an incomplete view of what they can and cannot do in English.

Key words: emergent bilinguals, English language arts, classroom discourse, speech acts

Word count: 8,869

Emergent bilinguals¹ (EBs) are assumed to not yet know English well enough to succeed in a classroom without instructional supports. Test scores contribute to constructing an image of

¹ I follow Ofelia Garcia (2009) and use the term "emergent bilingual" in place of "English learner" because I want to emphasize the children's potential bilingualism. In some instances, I use "English learner" to highlight the term used by the school and state department of education.

EBs as lagging far behind their English proficient peers. Questions have arisen about whether looking at traditional test measures is an appropriate way to understand fully what EBs can do with English when engaged in real-time classroom talk (Valdés, Capitelli, & Alvarez, 2010).

Consider the following scenario.

“Point to the girl holding the red balloon” the woman said. I looked at her, confused. The woman was holding the big picture card in her hands and was looking at me expectantly. Couldn’t she see the girl holding the red balloon? The girl was right there, next to the man with the animal balloons. How could she not see the girl holding the red balloon? Or maybe I was wrong. Was it red? It looked a little orange too, maybe orange red? I must be missing something, I kept thinking. Finally, I hesitantly pointed at the girl holding the orange red balloon, completely unsure of my response. The woman wrote something down and continued to ask questions that I could not make sense of. “What is this?” she asked as she pointed to familiar items such as a dog, car, and a bicycle.

The young girl in the scenario is me as an emergent bilingual in early elementary. I have vivid memories of confusion as I tried to figure out the trick behind the obvious answer to the questions. The question was more than a known-answer question; it was senseless. My problem was not that I lacked the listening comprehension or vocabulary knowledge necessary to understand the woman’s directions. I could hear perfectly well and I knew the meaning of *point*, *holding*, *red*, and *balloon*. My problem was that I could not wrap my head around the simple task presented in this artificial testing situation. My friends and I were being pulled from class one by one to meet this woman and answer her questions. We were told it was important that we try our best. Was she really just asking for me to point to the girl with the red balloon?

Testing scenarios like the one above are artificial events with the purpose of getting at what students know in a systematic way, but their artificialness can confuse children and dim what they really know. If I had the courage to deviate from the initiation-response-evaluation routine, and said “She’s holding a red balloon, but it looks a little orange. Does that count?” my English proficiency would have been clear. But, as a child I had been taught to follow directions

(whether spoken or unspoken) and so I pointed. My response was constrained by the testing environment in a way that most natural talk in interaction is not. When we remove the constraints of formal testing situations, what can emergent bilinguals do in English as they engage in naturally occurring classroom interactions about content?

Investigating what EBs can do in English as they engage in classroom conversations about content has become especially important because a large majority of states in the United States have adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The CCSS have very high expectations of what students must be able to do with language. If teachers have an incomplete view of what students can do with the English language, they are likely to underestimate them and fail to build on their emerging and existing language abilities. Developing a solid grasp of what emergent bilinguals are doing with their developing English while engaged in academic tasks is pivotal to teachers' understanding of how close (or far) they are in meeting the CCSS. In this article, I consider what fourth grade emergent bilinguals can do with their developing English. While acknowledging the advantages of standardized tests and teachers' unique insight into their students' proficiencies, I argue that they provide an incomplete and at times misleading picture of what students identified as English learners can do as they work through academic content and communicate about content in English.

Speech acts

Analyzing speech acts, or the acts performed by the speaker as a result of an utterance made (Crystal, 2009), is a powerful way to investigate what emergent bilinguals can do in English. Flowerdew (2013) explains that much like the basic units of grammar may be clauses or sentences, the basic units of communication are speech acts. By studying the speech acts that emergent bilinguals produce in English, I am interested in talk as action and not in the

grammatical features of the children's utterances. If in response to a peer suggestion the speaker says, "I don't think we should do that" the speech act is a refusal. The student could have also performed a refusal by any of the following:

1. How about we write about lizards instead?
2. Are you crazy?
3. You crazy?
4. The teacher said we can't do that.
5. That won't work.
6. Heck no!

Any of the utterances above serve to refuse a peer's suggestion, but clearly some may be better received than others depending on context. The indirect "How about we write about lizards instead?" may be better suited than "Are you crazy?" if students are under direct teacher supervision or if the speaker is concerned with hurting their interlocutor's feelings. Alternatively, given the right context², "Are you crazy?" and "Heck no!" may be preferred over indirect approaches. Notice that "You crazy?" contains an *are* copula deletion and could be interpreted as "incorrect grammar" or non-Standard English, but the copula deletion does not hinder the communicative intent. It is important to note that copula deletion is a key feature of systematic and rule-governed African American Vernacular English. By using speech act analysis, I view "You crazy?" as equal to "Are you crazy?" and not subordinate. I acknowledge that emergent bilinguals will likely make grammatical errors common among language learners as they produce speech acts in English. I intentionally ignore grammatical errors that do not get in the way of the intended message because I am interested in how the children communicate their

² The speaker may want to take a strong stance, for instance, because she knows it will get the intended response.

ideas about content, not how “accurate” their speech is. Grammatical correctness in speech and writing can at times blind teachers from receiving the messages students are attempting to communicate. Furthermore, in naturally occurring conversations, adults and children seldom stop to correct utterances that deviate from “standard” usage because the focus is on communication. My focus in this study is also communication. I use the term *academic* speech act to mean the speech acts used to engage with academic ideas and academic tasks.

As the refusal examples show, speech acts can be performed via interrogative, declarative, and imperative sentences. Interrogative, declarative and imperative sentences are commonly taught in elementary school reading curricula, but understanding language in terms of sentence types or grammatical form can be misleading when considering communicative functions. Not all requests, for example, come in the form of a question. “I need help on this” can serve as a request for assistance just as “Can you help me?” does. Dore’s 1977 study provides additional support that form alone does not determine speech acts. Dore (1977) shows that a hearer can interpret an utterance such as “Why don’t you sit in the seat behind?” as a request to sit in the seat behind instead of a query as to why he hadn’t sat in the seat behind. Dore concluded, “It is not grammar that conveys illocutionary intent” (1977, p. 143).

In short, there is more than one way to deliver an intended speech act and speech acts are not tied to grammatical forms. All speakers, emergent bilinguals included, face the continuous task of selecting the most appropriate way in which to deliver their message during rapid verbal exchanges. We can alter the grammar of the speech act but, Dore tells us, it is the speaker’s intended message that carries meaning. Like with Dore’s example, language users interpret messages by distinguishing between grammatical features and the intended message. We use body language, gestures, tone, context and our collected experiences of using language in

interaction. Sometimes the grammatical features match the intended message (e.g., an interrogative sentence for a request), but other times they do not (e.g., a declarative sentence for a request). Even the most eloquent language users will stumble with words and construct utterances using unfamiliar forms while engaged in conversation, but this does not always result in a clouded message. Following Dore, my analysis of speech acts does not focus on grammatical form and instead zeroes in on the children's communicative message.

Speech Acts: From Austin and Searle to Bachman

By identifying five basic kinds of speech acts (verdictive, expositive, execrative, behabitive, and commissive), Austin's *How to do things with words* (1975) laid the groundwork from which to better understand speech acts. Although Austin put forth the first speech act classification, he did so tentatively. He states "I distinguish five very general classes: but I am far from equally happy about all of them" (Austin, 1975, p. 151). Searle (1976) noted that Austin's classification was not truly a speech act classification, but rather a classification of illocutionary verbs. Searle then developed a new classification that took into account Austin's initial work and added a focus on the speech act purpose, direction of fit and expressed psychological states.

While Austin classified speech acts (or Speech Act verbs) according to meaning, Searle classified speech acts by differences in the purpose of the speech act (illocutionary point), differences in direction of fit between words and the world (direction of fit) and differences in expressed psychological states (sincerity condition). Differences in direction of fit have to do with whether the speaker is using her words to fit the world (e.g., explain, inform) or using the world to fit her words (e.g., requests, commands) (Searle, 1976). Differences in expressed psychological state have to do with expressing beliefs, desires, intentions, and regrets (Searle, 1976). Searle's speech act classification is composed of the following classifications:

representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Searle, 1976). Searle's classification of speech acts has been the classification that has been best received and most widely used (Flowerdew, 2013).

Bachman (1990) draws on Austin and Searle's speech act theory from the philosophy of language to inform his understanding of Illocutionary Competence in language teaching.

Bachman (1990) identified Ideational, Manipulative, Imaginative and Heuristic competence as macro-functions within Illocutionary Competence. While Searle's classification is useful in gaining a fine tuned perspective of speech acts, Bachman's broader classifications better captures classroom academic interactions among young children. Classroom environments, for example, are not the richest environments in which to find Declarations. Declarations are speech acts where successful performance lends itself to a match between what is said and reality (Searle, 1976). Searle explains, "...If I successfully perform the act of declaring a state of war, then the war is on; if I successfully perform the act of marrying you, then you are married" (1976, p. 13).

Bachman's classification can be likened to Searle's direction of fit where Ideational speech acts use words to fit how the world is perceived and Manipulative speech acts attempt to change the world to fit the words. An explanation, for example, is an Ideational speech act and serves to explain how the speaker sees an aspect of the world. Requests, on the other hand, are Manipulative speech acts and aim to impact the world by getting the hearer to do something. This study was focused on Ideational and Manipulative speech acts and excluded Imaginative and Heuristic speech acts because Ideational and Manipulative speech acts most closely match emergent bilingual classroom environments. That is to say, given the current age of accountability, young children are seldom provided the opportunity to use language for humorous and enjoyable purposes (Imaginative) while abiding by classroom rules. While

creating a cartoon strip or song incorporating the plot from a short story would be relevant to academic work, these tasks are rare and children engaging in them are often reprimanded for being off task. The heuristic function encompasses a wide range of language uses such as using language to solve problems, learn and teach (Bachman, 1990). Using language to solve problems, learn and teach was captured by the ideational and manipulative functions. This made the heuristic function redundant.

The language expected by the CCSS

The CCSS are rigorous internationally benchmarked academic standards aimed to ensure that all students are college and career ready in a globally competitive society (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017). As a way to capture emergent bilinguals' academic communication relevant to the CCSS, I identify and describe the academic speech acts the children used to talk about academic content and engage in academic tasks. By academic speech acts I mean the speech acts used to engage in academic work, specifically oral engagement with ideas and tasks in one academic discipline -- English language arts (ELA). The CCSS Speaking and Listening standards define what students should be able to do with oral communication by the end of each grade. My focus on oral communication made the Speaking and Listening standards key standards in my understanding of how the children communicated orally about academic ideas and tasks. Below, I use Speaking and Listening standard 4.1c (See Figure 1) to demonstrate the connection between the language expected by the CCSS and academic speech acts.

Figure 1: Speaking and Listening Standard 4.1c

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.SL.4.1c: Pose and respond to specific questions to clarify or follow up on information, and make comments that contribute to the discussion and link to the remarks of others.

Speaking and Listening standard 4.1c reveals the following expectations:

- (1) Pose specific questions to clarify or follow up on information
- (2) Respond to specific questions to clarify or follow up on information
- (3) Make comments that contribute to the discussion
- (4) Make comments that link to the remarks of others

The four expectations in standard 4.1c can be separated into many academic speech acts that can be performed in a variety of ways. To make comments that link to the remarks of others, for example, a student can confirm or disconfirm a peer's remark, disagree or agree with the remark or provide evidence in support or against an argument (supportive or refuting comment). These are academic speech acts that can be performed directly, indirectly and through various types of sentences. For example, a student can disconfirm a peer's remark directly using a declarative sentence "No, Yosemite Falls is not the tallest water fall in the world" or indirectly using an interrogative sentence "Remember last week Teacher she say that Angel Falls the tallest in the world?". Although the latter contains grammatical errors, both perform the academic speech act of disconfirming a peer's remark and thus meet the CCSS expectation of *making comments that link to the remarks of others*.

I recognize that some readers may argue that the grammatically incorrect statement makes the contribution less academic and perhaps not an example of the academic language expected by the CCSS. Since Cummins' (1980) introduction of Basic Interpersonal

Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), there have been many efforts to grasp the distinguishing characteristics of academic language. The literature often described BICS as the easier social or conversational language and CALP as the more complex, “decontextualized” academic language (Anstrom et al., 2010; Zwiers, 2008). Scholars have challenged the idea that social language (BICS) is less cognitively demanding than academic language (CALP), the notion of academic language as inherently difficult and the idea of language as “decontextualized” (Aukerman, 2007; Bailey, 2007; Edelsky et al., 1983; Gee, 2005, 2014; MacSwan & Rolstad, 2003; Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986; Rolstad, 2017; Schleppegrell, 2004; Wiley & Rolstad, 2014). In short, BICS and CALP have been critiqued for devaluing the complexity of interactional spoken language.

The whole idea of language as academic or non-academic has also been challenged. Bunch (2014) argues that “focusing predominantly on the distinction between “academic” and “other” forms and uses of language can unintentionally mask how students productively use a wide variety of linguistic resources to approach academic tasks” (p. 72). Bunch (2014) introduces the concept of *language of ideas* and *language of display* as a way of reconceptualizing academic language. The *language of ideas* refers to the language used as students engage in and complete academic tasks, no matter how “academic” the language appears. The *language of display* is the language designed for an outside audience. For example, when students are attending to the language of display, “oh that guy’s selling indulgences” (language of ideas) becomes “the message of this cartoon is a man selling indulgences during the Reformation” (Bunch, 2014, p. 81). Bunch explains, “Had the group’s sole interest been in using the questions to interpret the cartoon themselves, there would have been no need to re-frame their answers in this way” (Bunch, 2014, p. 81). Following Bunch, I argue that the language

students use to work through ideas about academic content, regardless of how traditionally “academic” it may be, should be considered as valid a form of classroom communication as the language of display. By focusing on academic speech acts and embracing what Bunch calls the *language of ideas* as a valuable way to engage in academic tasks, this article provides a window into what emergent bilinguals actually do with English in the ELA classroom.

Methods

The School, Classroom and Children

This study took place over a period of six months at Sage Elementary³, a school in the northern California Bay Area. At the time of this study, the school’s 693 students were 67% Latino, 25% Asian, 2% African American, 2% Filipino and 2% White. Sage Elementary provides instruction in English. Approximately 58% of Sage’s students were classified as “English Learners” and 76% of the students were eligible for free or reduced priced meals. These student demographics reflect the school neighborhood where store signs and billboards were just as likely to be seen in Spanish as in English.

The focal classroom was chosen after consultation with the school principal. This was a fourth grade classroom where Ms. Nielson, the classroom teacher, made conscious efforts to design classroom activities conducive to student talk. Out of a total of 32 students, 19 were designated “English Learners”, 7 Reclassified Fluent English Proficient, and 4 English Only⁴. Most students were Spanish speakers, but a handful of students spoke Vietnamese.

Eight fourth grade emergent bilinguals were chosen to participate in this study. The criteria for selecting participants were: (1) that they be classified as “English learner” according to state criteria, (2) that they speak Spanish and (3) that they meet the “struggling” or

³ All proper names are pseudonyms

⁴ Data was unavailable for two students.

“successful” criteria described below. I focused on Spanish speaking EBs because, as a native Spanish speaker, it allowed me to communicate with Spanish speaking families in the language the parents felt most comfortable. Communicating in Spanish was especially important as I worked to establish the trust necessary for parents to feel comfortable with their child’s participation in the study and to ask questions and make comments as the study progressed. This type of communication and trust would have been challenging via an interpreter. With the help of the classroom teacher, I identified four “successful” and four “struggling” EBs; two boys and two girls were selected for each “successful” and “struggling” group. I identified “struggling” EBs by the following criteria: Below Basic or Far Below Basic on the California Standards Test (CST) English language arts and a score of below average in ELA curriculum assessments. I identified “Successful” EBs by the following: Basic or Proficient on the CST English language arts and a score of average or above average in ELA curriculum assessments. The ELA curriculum assessments measured student progress in answering multi-part questions, vocabulary, text-based comprehension, writing and citing text evidence. Selecting focal students in such a way helped me capture the English language use of a range of EBs. Table 1 provides a summary of student test performance.

(Insert Table 1)

All of the students in this study, except for Silver, were born in the United States. Silver moved to the United States before starting school and is not a newcomer to the United States. The children all received English-medium instruction since Sage Elementary did not have bilingual education options. When I asked Ms. Nielson about the focal students’ academic needs, she described Silver as struggling most with writing and reading and Jack as struggling with forming grammatically correct sentences when writing and speaking. Alexandra and Jenny also struggled

with using correct grammar in oral communication. According to Ms. Nielson, Tommy and Dominic demonstrated impressive oral skills and were both improving in writing. Josey did well when speaking, but struggled at times with writing. Like Alexandra and Jenny, Olivia made grammatical errors when speaking and had a difficult time remembering to make grammatical corrections in her speech.

English Language Arts instruction

Six of the eight focal students' ELA instruction took place in Ms. Nielson's classroom. Students in Ms. Nielson's classroom worked on vocabulary, used graphic organizers, spent time correcting sentences presented as grammatically incorrect, read chorally from the *Reading Street* reading anthology, answered teacher questions and worked on writing.

In addition to typical fourth grade tasks, however, Ms. Nielson took special care to design interactive activities that would increase student talk and participation. Students in her class created questions about the reading selection and participated in question and answer group activities using their own questions. Ms. Nielson had students write multiple expository and narrative drafts, share them with a partner, evaluate peers' writing and provide feedback. Students were encouraged to speak in complete sentences and Ms. Nielson frequently provided sentence starters and sentence frames for students to use during group discussions and when answering whole class questions.

Two students, Alexandra and Silver, did not receive ELA instruction with their home class. Instead, they attended Ms. Yang's reading class for fourth and fifth grade struggling readers for the entire ELA block. Ms. Yang's class ran from late October to late February⁵. This reading class was half the size of Ms. Nielson's class and used *Inside*, an intensive intervention-

⁵ Most of Alexandra and Silver's classroom talk is in Ms. Yang's class, but some is from Ms. Nielson's class after the intensive reading class ended.

reading curriculum. Ms. Yang's smaller class size was designed with the purpose of lowering the teacher to student ratio and increasing the opportunity for students' to interact with the classroom teacher. Students in Ms. Yang's class worked on practice book pages, writing friendly letters, irregular verbs and exercises aimed at vocabulary building.

The Study

I observed and audio recorded the children's classroom interactions for a period of six months two times a week. During my observations, I took field notes and systematically audio recorded the eight focal students for approximately three hours a day during all subject areas except math. Focal students placed a small recorder in their pocket and wore a clip-on microphone connected to the recorder. The microphone captured both the focal students' and interlocutors' talk. Having the focal students wear the recording device enabled me to capture their language use as they moved about the classroom, interacted with various class participants and received instruction in different classrooms. As a whole, I collected a total of 288 hours of student talk. Considering I had more student talk than I could carefully analyze, I focused only on ELA and developed a data selection plan to help with narrowing of the data.

This article reports on findings from the academic language data that met audio selection criteria. Audio transcription and analysis was limited to: (1) good quality audio and (2) at least 1 exchange of direct teacher-focal student talk or at least 5 minutes of peer-peer talk. If the language data failed to meet the criteria, the audio most closely meeting the criteria within a two-month block was transcribed and analyzed.

Following the selection criteria above, I used conversation analysis (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013) to transcribe and analyze over 40 hours of the participants' talk. I recruited and trained two transcribers. Training began with a two-hour session designed to introduce them to my study and

the conversation analysis conventions to be used followed by three rounds of practice transcriptions prior to transcribing the selected audio files. After the transcribers completed the first pass at transcriptions, I completed a second pass of transcription. During this second pass, I listened to the audio files and using the first transcription, supplemented the original transcription. Supplementing the original consisted of adding a description of events and clarifying utterances that the transcriber was uncertain about or deemed inaudible. In all, the audio received three full listens, two of which were transcriptions.

Data Analysis

To identify the academic speech acts the children produced during ELA, I used the Getting Work Done Spanish language functions in Benjamin's (1996) study of fifth grade bilingual children's Spanish language use as initial codes. Specifically, I used speech acts in Benjamin's Getting Help and Working Together sub-categories, but excluded Talking to Myself speech acts because I was interested in children's speech act production in communication with peers and adults. I used Benjamin's speech acts for initial identification of academic speech acts because they captured language use among bilingual children of a similar age group within a school setting. After identifying the initial speech acts, I proceeded by coding all of the academic speech acts in the transcripts. I then grouped the speech acts into categories and placed them within the larger Ideational and Manipulative language functions groups. Next, I went through every speech act and began the process of merging similar speech acts and separating speech acts that were different but originally in the same group. After this process, I reviewed every speech act individually to check for fit within the particular speech act group and recoded speech acts that no longer fit. Finally, I reviewed and relocated speech acts to ensure they were in the appropriate category and larger Ideational and Manipulative groups.

I was also interested in learning how frequently each academic speech act occurred. To gauge frequency, I first converted the raw number of each speech act produced per student into individual frequency ratios identifying speech act per hour. Converting raw speech act numbers into per hour ratios allows for a comparison across students that was previously made challenging due to a wide range of total audio minutes analyzed per focal child. Having converted raw speech acts to per hour ratios, I calculated descriptive statistics for each individual speech act by Ideational and Manipulative functions and ranked them from most frequent to least frequent occurring speech acts.

Findings

The United States' newly implemented standards are touted as being more rigorous than the previous standards and given emergent bilinguals' difficulty meeting the last standards, they are expected to experience challenges meeting these standards as well. Setting test performance aside, the goal of this sociolinguistic study was to examine how emergent bilinguals used English as they engaged in academic tasks in their natural classroom environment and in relation to the expectations set out by the standards. As a whole, the emergent bilinguals in this study produced a total of 57 different types of academic speech acts. These speech acts served two larger academic functions: (1) **Ideational** used to express feelings, propositions and to exchange information about knowledge and (2) **Manipulative** used as an attempt to get the hearer to do something. Within each function, I identified sub-functions that represent sub-sets of the academic speech acts. See Table 2 (Ideational) and Table 3 (Manipulative) for descriptive tables detailing the function, sub-function, academic speech acts, corresponding definitions, an illustrative example from the data with contextual information and the corresponding ELA Speaking and Listening CCSS.

Drawing on the corpus of classroom discourse that identified 57 different types of speech acts, I focus on seven speech acts relevant for meeting two of the six ELA Speaking and Listening standards. Below, I focus on standard 4.1, sub-standard 4.1c and standard 4.2 to show how the children in this study met part of the standards as they provided feedback, made requests for clarification, organized peer talk and activities, indicated that they were following along with the discussion, made supportive assertions, described their partner's ideas and attempted to save face following a mistake. I focused on these seven speech acts because they highlight the range of ways the children used English to meet the standards of focus. I also share the frequency with which each speech act occurred (See Appendix A and B for full frequency tables).

Figure 2: Speaking and Listening Standard 4.1

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.SL.4.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 4 topics and texts, building on others' ideas and expressing their own ideas clearly.

The children in this study performed the following academic speech acts relevant to the expectations communicated by Standard 4.1:

(1) Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 4 topics and texts: academic comment, academic think aloud/brainstorm, clarifies, describes, description giving explanation, piggybacks on another's idea, reason giving explanation, states or comments on lack of understanding, defends, disagrees, does NOT accept a correction or suggestion, agrees, accepts a correction or suggestion, accepts a request or proposition, confirms, supportive assertion, attempts to make others feel better about their work,

provides feedback or helps others brainstorm, bids for academic turn, content request for confirmation, content request for information, procedures request for information, procedures request for confirmation, request for clarification, request for opinion, calls attention to text or content, gives orders, invites others to enter discussion, organizes peer talk or activities, prompts, academic delay, suggests, refuses, request for action, request for assistance, procedures request for information, I'm with you

(2) **Build on others' ideas:** confirm, disagree, agree, supportive assertion

(3) **Express their own ideas clearly:** academic comment, describes, description giving explanation, piggybacks on another's idea, reason giving explanation, confirms, supportive assertion, calls attention to text or content

While the children performed various academic speech acts relevant to Standard 4.1, I will focus on *provides feedback* and *organizes peer talk or activities*. The children *provided feedback or helped others brainstorm* at a rate of 1.42 per hour of recorded classroom discourse; it was the fourth most frequently occurring Manipulative speech act. Children in this study also used other speech acts like explanations and suggestions to deliver the feedback.

In the following excerpt⁶, Jack, a student identified as Struggling, provides feedback on his partner's writing as part of a one-on-one peer feedback activity. Jack begins by asking his

⁶ Transcription conventions are as follows:

[Overlapping talk]	Two or more people talking at the same time
=	<i>Latching</i> indicates no silence between two turns or two parts of a turn
:	Stretching of a sound
°Quiet/soft voice°	Indicates quiet or soft voice, but not a whisper
°°Whisper°°	Indicates whispering
-	Indicates self-interruption or cut-off
£	Indicates use of smiley voice
((description of events))	Words inside double parentheses describe events
(possible hearing)	Words inside single parentheses indicate a possible hearing

partner, Oliver, what he thinks his writing needs. The question helps Oliver think about how to improve his writing.

- (1) *Jack* **Okay. Oliver what do you think you: need to do?**
- Oliver* °Uh I say, make my writing better.°
- Jack* Okay. Make [wri:ti:ng-]
- Oliver* [-°So I can be more fluent.°]
- Jack* **Wri:ti:ng. Make writ:ing neater so you: ca:n see it cle:arly?**
- Oliver* ° Sort of °

Oliver shares that he needs to make his writing better so he can be more fluent. Jack provides indirect feedback that Oliver needs to write neatly by presenting his feedback in the form of a question. As the exchange continues, Oliver insists that he needs to work on reading fluently and Jack maintains that Oliver needs to work on writing neatly.

- (2) *Jack* O:r ma:ybe-
- Oliver* -° Read more fluent °
- Jack* **[Ma:ke writing nea:te:r]**
- Oliver* [Be more fluent]
- Jack* Okay
- Okay wait wait what are we doing. **First one is make writing nea:ter.**
- Okay. Second?

In the end, Jack writes “make writing neater” on the peer feedback form and takes charge of the activity by cuing the second suggestion for improvement. By cuing the second question, Jack performs the *organizes peer talk or activities* speech act associated with standard 4.1 and a second speaking and listening ELA standard, standard 4.1b. *Organizes peer talk or activities*

occurred at a rate of 1.39 per hour of recording and was the fifth most frequently occurring Manipulative speech act. Excerpts (1) and (2) above show Jack engaged in a one-on-one collaborative discussion about grade four writing. The standard expectation is that the students’ “engage effectively” in a range of collaborative discussions. The standards, however, do not provide guidance on what counts as “effective” engagement. In this exchange, I argue that Jack’s engagement in the one-on-one discussion was effective because he was successful in providing the feedback he perceived as the most necessary in strengthening Oliver’s writing.

Earlier in this article, I deconstructed Standard 4.1c to show the four academic expectations embedded within the single sub-standard. The four expectations can be separated into the following academic speech acts performed by the children in this study:

- (1) **Pose specific questions to clarify or follow up on information:** request for assistance, request for clarification, content request for confirmation, procedures request for confirmation, spelling request for confirmation, content request for information, procedures request for information, spelling request for information, request for opinion
- (2) **Respond to specific question to clarify or follow up on information:** clarify, description-giving explanation, reason-giving explanation, describe the meaning of a word, describe
- (3) **Make comments that contribute to the discussion:** academic comment, piggybacks on another’s idea, suggest
- (4) **Make comments that link to the remarks of others:** confirm, disagree, agree, supportive assertion

Below, I continue to draw on the standards to demonstrate how students requested clarification, showed that they were following along, made supportive assertions, described and saved face after making a mistake.

Requests for clarification occurred at a rate of 1.29 per hour of recording and was the seventh most frequently occurring Manipulative academic speech act. The examples below illustrate how the children in this study used *Requests for clarification* and in so doing met part of the 4.1c Speaking and Listening standard. Children produced *Requests for Clarification* to better understand something that was unclear or confusing.

(3) *T* Hang on. I have to finish his.
 You need-
 -Did you finish your high frequency words?

Alexandra **What are tho:se?**

T On the computer.

The teacher asks Alexandra, a student identified as Struggling, if she has finished her high frequency words. Alexandra does not understand what the high frequency words are and *requests clarification* by asking “What are those?” Is Alexandra’s request for clarification an illustration of *posing specific questions to clarify*? It is unclear what a non-specific question is, but Alexandra’s question seems specific enough to meet this part of the standard. The teacher understood her request for clarification and, using ellipsis, informed her that the high frequency words were on the computer.

- (4) *Student* This doesn't make sense
- Tommy* **What?**
- Student* A lot of parts of Yosemite is wonderful

In the example above, a student comments that what he's reading does not make sense. Tommy, a student identified as Successful, isn't clear on what exactly doesn't make sense. He asks for clarification, "What?" and the student clarifies.

- (5) *Dominic* Ho:w do you do dra:w a reference like in whatever.
- Sub* That's a reference.
- Dominic* **That? Thi:s? Oh like a book or something like that?**
- Student* A dictionary is a reference.

Above, Dominic, a student identified as Successful, asks the substitute teacher how to draw "reference" for a vocabulary task that asks for a definition and an illustration. The substitute teacher responds by providing an example - "That's a reference". Dominic does not understand. He *requests clarification* by asking several questions, the last question more specific than the rest.

Are the emergent bilinguals in these examples meeting the *pose specific questions to clarify* part of the standard? Without additional information to state that any other requirement must be met to meet this piece of the standard, the answer is yes. Some might argue that simply asking "what?" is a non-specific question because the question omits information about what specifically needs clarification. I argue that in the context of excerpt (4) "what?" is a specific question that uses the common conversation device ellipsis. Within the context, "what doesn't make sense?" would be redundant because it was clear that Tommy sought clarification about

what didn't make sense and not about something completely unrelated like what his peer had for breakfast.

As the class previews an upcoming unit on mysteries, they engage in a teacher-led discussion of an image with a water faucet that appears to be floating in mid-air. After sharing a few comments about the image, Ms. Nielson instructs the students to take a minute of think-time and then engage in one-on-one discussions about what they think is happening in the picture. Was the water faucet really floating? If not, how did the artist give the illusion of a floating faucet? Jenny, a student identified as Struggling, and her partner discuss the image.

(6) *Student* Maybe they painted it
 The color that's here
 Maybe- you see the bottom right here all this kind of stuff right

Jenny °O::h there (we go:)

Excerpt (6) shows Jenny performing the *I'm with you* speech act to show that she is following along and understands. At a rate of 4.85 per hour, the *I'm with you* speech act was the most frequently occurring speech act. Jenny and her partner continue their one-on-one discussion.

(7) *Student* The base:s and the air
 Maybe they painted-
 Jenny
 Jenny

Jenny **Oh I see the stake**
 They just painted it white

In excerpt (7), Jenny supports her partner's idea that the stake may have been painted white to give the illusion that the faucet is floating against a white background. By stating that she sees

the stake and restating her partner's proposition (indirectly agreeing), Jenny is performing a *supportive assertion* that provides evidence in support of a proposition or argument. In this way, Jenny is linking her contribution to the remarks of others (standard 4.1c) and engaging in a collaborative one-on-one discussion about a grade four text (standard 4.1). Supportive assertions (0.50 per hour) occurred less often than other speech acts.

After the partner discussion, Ms. Nielson asks students to share their partner's idea with the whole class. In this teacher-led discussion, Jenny is tasked with paraphrasing the information presented orally during the one-on-one discussion. The task of paraphrasing oral information is an academic expectation in standard 4.2.

Figure 3: Speaking and Listening Standard 4.2

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.SL.4.2: Paraphrase portions of a text read aloud or information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.

Jenny *describes* her partner's ideas to paraphrase the oral information shared.

(8) *Jenny* **My- my partner thinks tha:t**

Um they- they painted um

They painte:d the thin-

The: fossi:l clear

Student Faucet

Jenny The fauce:t

°That's what you said°

A student corrects Jenny's use of "fossil" instead of "faucet" and Jenny *accepts the correction* by repeating the correct term. Following the correction, Jenny attempts to recover from her mistake

by whispering to her partner that it was her idea. This attempt to recover from possible embarrassment at making a mistake is a *saving face* academic speech act. *Accepting a correction* and *saving face* assisted Jenny's engagement in a teacher-led collaborative discussion about grade four topics and texts (Standard 4.1). The children in this study accepted corrections or suggestions at a rate of 0.69 per hour and performed the saving face speech act less frequently.

Discussion

By listening to eight emergent bilinguals in ELA, I identified a total of 57 types of academic speech acts. The number of speech act types, however, is less important than the range of academic speech acts young emergent bilinguals produced as they engaged in ELA tasks and simultaneously met CCSS expectations. In the Findings, I showed how the emergent bilinguals in this study used their developing English to engage in a range of collaborative discussions on grade level topics and texts, posed specific questions to clarify information, made comments that linked to the remarks of others and paraphrased information shared by peers—all in English. Prominent discourses about emergent bilinguals' academic abilities tend to focus on performance as measured by test scores and as such perpetuate the message that emergent bilinguals trail far behind their peers. This study helps us gain a better understanding about how emergent bilinguals use their developing English in ELA and how their classroom discourse measures up to CCSS expectations. In short, this study takes the conversation about emergent bilinguals' ability to meet the standards to the student discourse level and shows that emergent bilinguals' speech is aligned with the CCSS.

By deconstructing standards into expectations and speech acts, I show the need to clarify and better describe the language of the standards. For example, what does it mean to pose a *specific* question? And how will the use of common conversational devices such as ellipses be

taken into consideration when analyzing whether a student met the particular standard? These questions are especially relevant given Bunch's (2014) proposition that the *language of ideas* "constitutes a central if not essential part of academic discussions" (2014, p. 82). In other words, it is by using the language of ideas that students develop and refine their understanding of academic concepts. The children in this study largely used the language of ideas as they worked through academic tasks with others. Analyzing the classroom discourse of emergent bilinguals as they utilized the language of ideas to arrive at understandings and the language of display when they reported out to the classroom teacher or whole class shows us that they *are* meeting the CCSS expectations and they are doing so in English. I provide examples of emergent bilinguals identified as struggling and successful in ELA performing seven specific speech acts in English directly linked to the CCSS. Tables 2 and 3 provide 57 examples.

Conclusion and Implications

Emergent bilinguals are assumed to not yet know English well enough to fully participate and succeed in a classroom setting without instructional supports and test scores show that they are lagging far behind their English proficient peers. Findings from this study, however, suggest that young emergent bilinguals *can* and *are* using English to participate in academic discussions and to accomplish academic tasks within their 4th grade classroom environment. I purposefully selected emergent bilinguals identified as struggling and successful in order to examine the academic speech act production of a range of students. This study shows that students perceived as successful *and* struggling in ELA performed academic speech acts that are aligned with CCSS expectations. Alexandra and Silver, the most academically struggling children in this study, scored at the lowest level possible —Far Below Basic— in the state English Language Arts assessment. As the lowest level possible, a score of Far Below Basic demonstrates a serious lack

of performance in English Language Arts. Alexandra and Silver also scored at the two lowest levels possible—Beginning and Early Intermediate—in the state English language proficiency test. Beginning and Early Intermediate scores indicate that oral production is likely limited to phrases, memorized statements and questions and perhaps only single word utterances. Looking at test scores alone, it would be easy to assume that Alexandra and Silver were newcomers who spoke little to no English when in fact, no students in this study were newcomers or spoke little English.

Listening and focusing on what the children are doing with their emerging English inside the classroom shows that Alexandra and Silver’s English was not limited to phrases, memorized statements or single word utterances. Alexandra was born in the United States and Silver immigrated to the United States as a young child. They were both able to use English to accomplish academic tasks. While they did indeed struggle to communicate in the grammatically correct complete sentences the teacher expected, Alexandra and Silver made academic comments, attempted to explain and describe, sought clarification, and posed and responded to questions all in English. These attempts to engage with content in English, however, can be easily overlooked if English language proficiency continues to be measured by how closely speech adheres to traditional notions of academic language. When we keep listening to emergent bilinguals speak without allowing incomplete sentences or “grammatical errors” to interrupt their message, we gain the opportunity to hear them engage with academic content, explain ideas, pose questions, agree and disagree. All of the emergent bilinguals in this study used English to accomplish academic tasks regardless of whether they had low English proficiency scores or were considered struggling or successful in English Language Arts.

It should be noted that I focus analysis on the children's speech acts and do not analyze the teacher's speech acts in interaction with the focal students. Interactions between the children and teacher were at times, though not always, dialogical. I analyzed student speech acts within the context of the broader dialogue with the teacher and other interlocutors, but did not analyze teacher speech acts in themselves. Identifying the classroom teachers' speech acts and how they interact with the students' speech acts could provide a more complete picture of the classroom discourse.

This study opens up new questions for future research that aims to understand the relationship between what state and classroom assessments tell us about emergent bilingual ability and what is reflected in real-time classroom discourse. Findings from this study suggest that understanding what emergent bilinguals can and cannot yet do with their developing English needs to include real-time student discourse. While I recognize the importance of standardized assessments, I argue that to fully understand our emergent bilinguals' abilities we need to analyze their classroom discourse as they work through academic tasks.

California's new English Language Development standards correspond with the CCSS and were designed to prioritize meaning and interaction over language structure (California Department of Education, 2014). Prioritizing meaning and interaction in the standards will presumably minimize the disconnect between performance on assessments and real-time classroom discourse. A focus on meaning and interaction calls for classrooms where emergent bilinguals can engage in meaningful highly interactive practices anchored in the CCSS (van Lier & Walqui, 2012; Verplaetse, 2014). Planning and carrying out meaningful interactive practices, however, is a challenging feat. Some teachers have responded to the language-rich expectations of the CCSS and ELD standards by providing students with more interactive classroom

activities. While this is a great start, it is important that students are able to engage in these activities *meaningfully* and not superficially.

Engagement in interactive activities becomes superficial when the structures and scaffolds are so heavy that the activities become less and less interactive. For example, while intended to help, requiring the use of rigid turn-taking structures in combination with mandatory agree or disagree sentence frames intended to support building on the ideas of others can transform what could have been an interactive activity into a highly regimented exercise nearly absent of meaning. If the objective is for students to build on the ideas of others, then students should be given opportunities to use the language of ideas to ask clarifying questions if they do not understand the ideas under discussion, to pose follow-up questions, agree or disagree, make supportive assertions and respond to questions and comments. Providing space and flexibility for emergent bilinguals to perform these speech acts allows for engagement in meaningful interactive practices.

Importantly, I argue that classroom discourse should be analyzed according to what the children are *doing* with English without being penalized for using the language of ideas as they brainstorm and arrive at understanding. This is an important point because emergent bilinguals are frequently expected to use the language of display when they are working through concepts in groups or in pairs. The California ELD standards (2014) document, for example, states “With strategic scaffolding, students can learn to adopt particular ways of organizing their discourse during group work and “practicing” aspects of academic English that approach the more “literate” ways of communicating that are highly valued in school” (p. 149). This statement implies that when designing group work teachers should provide scaffolds that guide emergent bilinguals towards communicating in “academic English” that approaches “literate ways of

communicating”. I argue that this recommendation has the potential to thwart the focus on meaning and interaction the new ELD standards claim by reverting to a focus on “academic” vocabulary and syntactic structures. Emergent bilinguals need to be allowed the space to brainstorm in English, stumble through ideas, muddle their words and make other speaking missteps like English proficient children (and adults) make when learning content. These missteps are completely natural as children and adults use the language of ideas to make sense of concepts and arrive at understandings about content. By focusing on “literate language”, the new ELD standards and corresponding assessments will continue to miss the wide range of ways the emergent bilinguals in this study used English while engaged in academic tasks.

By recording real-time student talk or taking close notes on the academic speech acts being used, classroom teachers can gain a better understanding of their emergent bilinguals’ abilities to navigate academic content in English and build on these abilities. Furthermore, by recognizing the language of ideas as a valuable form of academic communication, emergent bilinguals will have the freedom to engage with academic content without hypervigilance of their English language use. These tasks may seem daunting, but with support and resources classroom teachers can begin to analyze their own students’ classroom discourse and use their analyses to inform instruction. Incorporating classroom discourse analysis and providing opportunities to practice within teacher education courses and professional development sessions could help prepare teachers to listen to how students are communicating within the classroom and design lessons aimed at developing students’ argument or message.

References

- Anstrom, K., DiCerbo, P., Butler, F., Katz, A., Millet, J., & Rivera, C. (2010). *A review of the literature on academic English: Implications for K-12 English language learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.ceee.gwu.edu/>
- Aukerman, M. (2007). A culpable CALP: Rethinking the conversational/academic language proficiency distinction in early literacy instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 60(7), 626-635.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, A. L. (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic language to the test*: Yale University Press.
- Benjamin, R. (1996). The functions of Spanish in the school lives of Mexicano bilingual children. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 20(1), 135-164.
- Bunch, G. C. (2014). The Language of Ideas and the Language of Display: Reconceptualizing "Academic Language" in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(1), 70-86. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.852431
- California Department of Education. (2014). *California English Language Development Standards: Kindergarten Through Grade 12*. Sacramento, CA.

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2017). About the Standards. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/>

Crystal, D. (2009). *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. *Current issues in bilingual education*, 81-103.

Dore, J. (1977). "Oh Them Sheriff": A Pragmatic Analysis of Children's Responses to Questions. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child Discourse* (pp. 139-163). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Edelsky, C., Hudelson, S., Flores, B., Barkin, F., Altweger, B., & Kristina, J. (1983). Semilinguallism and language deficit. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 3-22.

Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English Language Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Garcia, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *Tesol Quarterly*, 43(2), 322-326.

Gee, J. P. (2005). Language in the science classroom: Academic social languages as the heart of school-based literacy. In R. K. Yerrick & W.-M. Roth (Eds.), *Establishing scientific classroom discourse communities: Multiple voices of teaching and learning research* (pp. 19-37). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Gee, J. P. (2014). Decontextualized Language: A Problem, Not a Solution. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(1), 9-23. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.852424

- Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The Conversation Analytic Approach to Transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (First Edition ed., pp. 57-76): Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- MacSwan, J., & Rolstad, K. (2003). Linguistic diversity, schooling and social class: Rethinking our conception of language proficiency in language minority education. In C. B. Paulston & R. Tucker (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings* (pp. 329-341). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Romaine, S. (1986). Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 26-38.
- Rolstad, K. (2017). Second language instructional competence. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(5), 487-509.
doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1057101
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Valdés, G., Capitelli, S., & Alvarez, L. (2010). *Latino Children Learning English: Steps in the Journey*: Teachers College Press.
- van Lier, L., & Walqui, A. (2012). *Language and the Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved from <http://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/04-Van Lier Walqui Language and CCSS FINAL.pdf>

Verplaetse, L. S. (2014). Using Big Questions to Apprentice Students Into Language-Rich Classroom Practices. *Tesol Quarterly*, 48(3), 632-641. doi:10.1002/tesq.179

Wiley, T. G., & Rolstad, K. (2014). The Common Core State Standards and the Great Divide. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(1), 38-55.
doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.852428

Zwiers, J. (2008). *Building Academic Language: Essential Practices for Content Classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Teacher.

Table 1
Focal student test scores

Focal student	CST ELA score¹ (grade 3)	CELDT score² (grade 4)
Silver	Far Below Basic	Early Intermediate
Alexandra	Far Below Basic	Beginning
Jack	Below Basic	Intermediate
Jenny	Below Basic	Intermediate
Dominic*	Proficient	Early Advanced
<u>Josey*</u>	Basic	Early Advanced
Olivia	Proficient	Intermediate
Tommy*	Proficient	Early Advanced

Notes:

CELDT: California English Language Development Test

CELDT score ranges: Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, and Advanced

CST score ranges: Far Below Basic, Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced

* Dominic, Josey, and Tommy were all reclassified fluent English proficient after the end of data collection. Thus, they are no longer considered ELs.

Table 2
Ideational Language Functions and Speech Acts

The Ideational function is introduced in bold and defined. Within this function, I identify the sub-functions. Then I present the corresponding speech acts, definition, example from the data, the context and corresponding grade 4 Speaking and Listening CCSS.

Ideational: The expression of feelings, propositions and exchange of information about knowledge.					
Sub-function	Speech Act	Definition (as applied to academic content)	Example	Context	Corresponding CCSS ELA - SL
Display Knowledge	Academic comment	Express an opinion or reaction.	<i>Dominic (Su¹):</i> I think that the falls is healthy to drink because it, it has no garbage inside it	In a small group, students are working to identify the main idea of a passage about Yosemite Falls. Dominic comments that he thinks the falls are healthy to drink.	4.1 Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 4 topics and texts, building on others' ideas and expressing their own ideas clearly. 4.1c Pose and respond to specific questions to clarify or follow up on information, and make comments

¹ Su indicates "Successful" student

					<p>that contribute to the discussion and link to the remarks of others.</p> <p>4.1d Review the key ideas expressed and explain their own ideas and understanding in light of the discussion.</p> <p>4.4 Report on a topic or text, tell a story, or recount an experience in an organized manner, using appropriate facts and relevant, descriptive details to support main ideas or themes; speak clearly at an understandable pace.</p>
	Academic think aloud/ brainstorm	The verbal process of thinking through and negotiating ideas before they are set. This could be a student saying possible sentence ideas aloud to	<p><i>Alexandra (St²):</i> The opposite of ugly i:s pretty.</p> <p>The opposite of ye:s is °no:.</p> <p>°I already did mu:s:t°</p> <p>She blank quickly down the street.</p>	One-on-one with C, Alexandra verbalizes her thoughts as she works through a worksheet problem. Her head is down as she studies the worksheet. “She ra:n quickly down the °street?°” is not	4.1 4.1d

² St indicates “Struggling” student

		peers, adults or to self and can be prompted or unprompted.	She ran quickly down the °street?° ((looks up at C ³)) The opposite [of-]	identified as academic think aloud because she looked up and posed the question to C.	
	Clarifies	A prompted or unprompted attempt to make a previous statement less confusing.	<i>Jenny (St):</i> Hey what's number nine? What's number nine? <i>Student:</i> Review paragraph slash outline. °I just read it to you.° <i>Jenny (St):</i> no I meant like what, what is it?	While working independently, Jenny asks a student what number nine is. The student responds by repeating the task. Jenny appears to see the response as a misunderstanding of her question and attempts to clear up her former request.	4.1 4.1d 4.2 Paraphrase portions of a text read aloud or information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally. 4.4
	Describes	A prompted or unprompted account of someone or something. A description does not involve solving a problem or puzzle, simply an account of what is.	<i>C:</i> Bees are bad because they also make you bleed? When they- when what? <i>Jenny (St):</i> ° When you touch them ° <i>C:</i> Okay That doesn't look like touch them They make you bleed when you touch them? Is that what you're trying-	Jenny has asked C for help on her writing. Jenny begins to share what she has written and C prompts Jenny for more information on how bees can make people bleed. Jenny describes how bees make people bleed.	4.1 4.1d 4.2 4.4
	Describes the meaning of a word	Child states the meaning of a word (defines). Can be prompted or unprompted.	<i>C:</i> Ok So what does crime mean <i>Jenny (St):</i> Crime	Students are working on a vocabulary activity. Jenny has just finished reading the	4.1b Follow agreed-upon rules for discussions and

³ C indicates, the researcher

			Crime could mean like to Like for example Some people that don't go to this school crime through the law	definition of crime from a dictionary. C asks Jenny what crime means and Jenny explains the meaning of the word.	carry out assigned roles.
Description giving explanation	Child provides a response to a question that within the context poses a true problem relating to knowledge. A description giving explanation is in response to "How" and "What" question and must attempt to solve the inquirer's problem relating to knowledge.	<p><i>Student 1:</i> Who knows how to spell Hawaii</p> <p><i>Student 2:</i> Hawaii?</p> <p><i>Jenny (St):</i> °I do°</p> <p><i>Student 2:</i> It's right there</p> <p><i>Student 3:</i> Hawaii</p> <p><i>Jenny (St):</i> °Hawaii°</p> <p><i>Student 2:</i> Hawaiian</p> <p><i>Jenny (St):</i> °But that's Hawaii-an°</p> <p>°She- she's trying to spell Hawaii °</p> <p>°But I'm tell- I'm telling her that's Hawaiian°</p> <p>°Just take away-°</p> <p>°Just take away the A and N°</p> <p><i>T:</i> At the end</p>	<p>A student in Jenny's group indirectly asks how to spell "Hawaii". Ms. Nielson walks by and listens to their discussion. Jenny explains what the group is talking about and how the student can use "Hawaiian" to spell "Hawaii". This is a description giving <i>explanation</i> and not simply a description because, within this group context, how to spell "Hawaii" is a true problem relating to knowledge. That is to say, Student 1 does not know the answer to his question and Jenny explains why using "Hawaiian" will solve the student's problem.</p>	4.1 4.1d 4.4	
Piggybacks on another's idea	Child attaches their idea to someone else's idea.	<p><i>Student:</i> El Capitan is the biggest single rock of granite in the world</p> <p><i>Dominic (Su):</i> That's what I was gonna say.</p> <p>El Capi-tan, is the biggest, largest, rock-</p>	<p>In a small group, students are working to identify the main idea of a passage about Yosemite Falls. A student shares what they think is the main idea of the passage and Dominic piggybacks on the student's idea.</p>	4.1 4.1c 4.1d	
Shares own writing	Child shares their own writing by reading it aloud	<p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> I went to the beach with my cousins. We had-</p>	<p>One-on-one, Alexandra is sharing what she has written with the teacher. The teacher interrupts</p>	4.1b	

		to others. Can be prompted or unprompted.	<i>T</i> : -Okay hold on. Cousins. Spe:lling okay. <i>We:nt</i> . Is that an E:?	and points out Alexandra's spelling mistakes.	
--	--	---	---	---	--

	States basic concepts or facts	Prompted or unprompted statements that communicate basic concepts or facts.	<p><i>T:</i> After you write your rough draft What do we call that? <i>Tommy (Su):</i> Revi:se <i>T:</i> Revise</p>	Ms. Nielson is reviewing the steps students should take in their writing. She asks the whole class what the step after writing their rough draft is called. Tommy answers.	4.1a Come to discussions prepared, having read or studied required material; explicitly draw on that preparation and other information known about the topic to explore ideas under discussion. 4.4
	States or comments on lack of understanding	Child states or comments on their lack of understanding or ability to complete a task	<p><i>Student:</i> Ci:vi:l ci:vi:l ri:ghts! <i>Alexandra (St):</i> Civil Rights. Umm I don't get, I don't know that one. <i>Student:</i> I'll give you a hint.</p>	In pairs, students are quizzing each other on vocabulary terms. Alexandra's partner gives her "civil rights". Alexandra responds by stating that she does not know the definition. The student offers a hint, but Alexandra's dismissive body language and lack of interest in the activity suggests that her statement was not a request for help.	4.1

	Reason giving explanation	Child provides a response to a question that within the context poses a true problem relating to knowledge. A reason giving explanation is in response to “Why” questions and must attempt to solve the inquirer’s problem relating to knowledge.	<i>Student:</i> Do you- Why do you think Lee moved to a new place and a new school? <i>Dominic (Su):</i> He probably moved to a new school and a new place because in their old place probably they were like, paying too much tax, and then they moved somewhere else.	In a small group, students are asking and answering questions about a book they have just read. A student asks a why the group thinks Lee moved to a new place and a new school. Dominic explains that the reason he thinks Lee moved homes is because they were probably paying high property taxes on their previous home.	4.1 4.1d 4.4
Disrupt Discourse Line	Accuses	Child blames another for having done something wrong	<i>Alexandra (St):</i> These were all re:d or- -oh my god! You made me get them wrong. This one had to be, this had to be re:d.	Students are working on a worksheet about verb tenses and Alexandra is getting her answers from a student sitting next to her. Alexandra realized that her answers were wrong and accuses the student of making her get the wrong answers.	none
	Complains	Child expresses dissatisfaction	<i>Silver (St):</i> I don’t want to do a:ll over It taking me an hour	In pairs, students are giving each other feedback on their writing. Silver’s partner has explained that he doesn’t have a lot of details in his story. Silver expresses dissatisfaction at writing his story over again.	none
	Disagrees	Child expresses a different opinion	<i>Student:</i> Cause he was going in the sixth grade?	In a small group, students are posing and answering questions about a chapter from <i>Dear Mr.</i>	4.1 4.1c 4.1d

			<p><i>Jack (St): No:! How would he want to change schools if he's in the sixth grade!</i></p> <p>Our school has a sixth grade!</p>	<p><i>Henshaw.</i> A student has asked the question "Why do you think Lee has moved to a new place and a new school?" Another student provides an answer. Jack disagrees.</p>	
Does NOT accept a correction or suggestion	Child does not pick up on a correction or suggestion	<p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> I need totally help. Ugh. Ate pizza and cheeps. <i>Student:</i> Chee:ps? <i>Student 2:</i> Cheeps? <i>Alexandra (St):</i> Yeah why? The name of the beach was <i>((inaudible))</i></p>	<p>Alexandra is having a tough time with her writing. She reads aloud a sentence she has written. Two of her peers repeat Alexandra's <i>cheeps</i> mockingly suggesting there is something wrong with her pronunciation. Alexandra does not pick up on the mocking or suggestion and continues with her writing.</p>	4.1	
Makes less of another's idea or comment	Child downgrades another's idea, comment, or accusation. Often done to take back the floor and/or make light of the situation.	<p><i>T:</i> [Thi:s i:s very difficu:lt.] I have to keep doing this. <i>A:</i>ll the time. Monitori:ng you. [<i>A:</i>ll the ti:me.] <i>Alexandra (St):</i> [°°It's alright. °°] <i>T:</i> Remember I mentioned it. Your mom is ve:ry concerned.</p>	<p>The classroom teacher has accused Alexandra of not listening and she expresses her dissatisfaction with her behavior. Alexandra's response of "it's alright" attempts to make less of the teacher's accusation and reprimands.</p>	none	
Defends	Child resists an accusation or attack. Can be a challenge to someone's utterance	<p><i>Student:</i> Oh my go:d! I hate when you do tha:t! You with your guns and stuff! <i>Dominic (Su):</i> £I just sai:d pape:r, scisso:rs, ro:ck, not gu:ns and a:ll tha:t£</p>	<p>In a group, students are trying to come to a decision as to who will share their group answer with the whole class. They decide to use rock, paper, scissors as a way to solve the issue of who will share</p>	4.1	

				with the class. While doing rock, paper, scissors, Dominic makes a gun signal with his hand instead of scissors. The student protests and Dominic defends himself.	
	Refuses	Child refuses to comply with a request or go along as intended by others	<p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> Okay read yours</p> <p><i>T:</i> [Of why they scored it the way they did]</p> <p><i>Tommy (Su):</i> [Let- let me tell me what yours]</p> <p>°You do not ha:ve describing detai:ls°</p>	In pairs, students are sharing their writing and providing feedback. Alexandra proposes that Tommy read his writing next. Tommy indirectly refuses Alexandra’s proposition by making his own proposition that he provide feedback to her writing first.	4.1

	Threatens	Utterance where the child threatens another with some future action	<p><i>Josey (Su):</i> You're not my mom <i>Jenny (St):</i> °Proof read° Fine If- if you- if you don't think that we're not your mom Then I'll tell the teacher</p>	In a small group, the students are telling Josey that she is not following the teacher's instructions. Josey explains that she has already finished the tasks under discussion. When they continue to tell her she is doing the wrong task, Josey replies with "You're not my mom". Jenny threatens to tell the teacher.	none
Follow Along	Choral decoding, repetition or response	Child reads aloud chorally, repeats after the teacher chorally or provides a choral response	<p><i>T:</i> Drake and Nell Ready go <i>Olivia (Su) & group:</i> Drake and Nell slogged through mud puddles lugging the garbage can between them</p>	The students are taking turns reading <i>The Case of the Gaspin Garbage</i> , a story in their reading anthology. Under the teacher's direction, Olivia and her group read the next passage of the story chorally.	none
	I'm with you	Utterances used to show that the student is following along. Typically a "yes" following a teachers' "Does everyone understand?"	<p><i>T:</i> You guys remember what a hypothesis is <i>Olivia (Su):</i> Ye:s</p>	During the choral reading of <i>The Case of the Gaspin Garbage</i> , the teacher stops at "hypothesis" to check if the students remember the meaning of the word. Olivia responds. It is unclear if Olivia really remembers what hypothesis means, but her "ye:s" response signals that she heard the question and has given an acceptable response.	4.1

Maintain Discourse Line	Agrees	Child expresses agreement	<p><i>T:</i> You are missing- You are missing the complete subject of the sentence <i>Tommy (Su):</i> °Yes we are°</p>	As a whole class, students work to edit sentences that the teacher has presented as incorrect. They are editing the following sentence: We went to New York. To see the game. The teacher comments that the sentence is missing the subject. Tommy expresses agreement.	4.1 4.1c 4.1d
	Accepts a request or proposition	A request or proposition has been made. The child accepts the request or proposition.	<p><i>Student:</i> He’s still working. [Can you do it?] <i>Jack (St):</i> [Just do it.] Fine he’ll read it, and I’ll do the initials.</p>	The students are peer-editing each other’s writing. A student has requested that Jack edit her paper. Jack accepts the request. By doing the initials, Jack means he’ll fill out the peer-editing checklist and write his initials as proof that he has peer-edited the piece.	4.1
	Confirms	State the truth or correctness of something	<p><i>Student:</i> °It doesn’t change the topic? ° <i>Dominic (Su):</i> It doesn’t change the topic.</p>	The students are using rubrics to score each other’s writing. The rubric requires the students to write why they assigned the writing a particular score. Dominic is working with another student and the student asks if one of the reasons for the assigned score is that the author did not change topic. Dominic confirms.	4.1 4.1a 4.1d

	Accepts a correction or suggestion	Child picks up on a correction or suggestion	<p>C: Can you change it up? You're saying my sister a lot. Can you say somebody else?</p> <p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> My brother likes eating oyster.</p>	Alexandra is sharing her sentences with Claudia. Claudia points out that Alexandra is starting many of her sentences with "my sister". Alexandra picks up on the suggestion.	4.1
	Supportive assertion	Statement providing evidence in support of an argument	<p><i>Student:</i> The buse:s and the air Maybe they painted- Jenny Jenny <i>Jenny (St):</i> Oh I see the stake They just painted it white <i>Student:</i> Yeah I know Maybe they just painted it this But see all this maybe they painted this yellow</p>	Jenny and a peer are trying to figure out an explanation to an odd image in their reading anthology. The image shows a faucet floating in midair. Jenny's partner starts to float the idea that maybe they painted the stake white to make it look like the faucet is floating. Jenny follows up by supporting her peer's idea and providing evidence that the stake is in the image and she agrees that the authors likely painted it white.	4.1 4.1c
Other Ideational	Informs of actions, plans or abilities	Child states what she's doing, has done, is going to do or can do	<p>T: Thi:s is the ve:ry first thing on your writing list to get done. Okay? You:r ve:ry first thing that you need to finish i:s the special da:y essay. <i>Jack (St):</i> £I finished it£</p>	Addressing the whole class, Ms. Nielson explains that the first thing the students need to finish is their special day essay. Jack informs his peers that he has already finished his special day essay.	none
	Offers assistance	Child offers to help	<p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> If you need help just tell me.</p>	Students are working on a spelling activity on the classroom computers. Ms. Yang is	

				explaining the login instructions to a boy sitting next to Alexandra. Alexandra offers to help the boy.	
	Reads aloud for others	Child reads aloud for peers or an adult. This does not include the child reading to self.	<i>Josey (Su): The total drop is two thousand four hundred twenty five feet which is as [high as two Nigeria falls ((reading aloud))</i>	The students are working on a task that involves them answering questions and re-reading text. Josey reads aloud for her group.	4.1b

Table 3
Manipulative Language Functions and Speech Acts

The Manipulative function is introduced in bold and defined. Within this function, I identify the sub-functions. Then I present the corresponding speech acts, a definition, example from the data, the context and corresponding grade 4 Speaking and Listening CCSS.

Manipulative: An attempt to get the hearer to do something					
Sub-function	Speech Act	Definition (as applied to academic content)	Example	Commentary	Corresponding CCSS ELA - SL
Helping Others	Provides feedback or helps others brainstorm	Child provides feedback on peer's work or helps brainstorm. Child may use other speech acts to (e.g., explanations, suggestions) to deliver the feedback or brainstorming ideas, but it is still considered a <i>Provides feedback</i> speech act.	<i>Tommy (Su): I gave you a two becau:se Becau:se You didn't have any describing details Nor complete sentences And when I heard you say I had very fun- Alexandra (St): (-I had very fun) Tommy (Su): You could have said I had fun And took- took off- took off very Alexandra (St): I know it's because it was all (inaudible)</i>	Tommy and Alexandra are partners for a peer editing activity. Tommy is providing Alexandra with feedback about her writing. This excerpt counts as two instances of <i>Provides feedback</i> because Alexandra takes a turn within Tommy's feedback.	4.1 4.1b

	Attempts to make others feel better about their work	Child provides words of comfort, encouragement or compliments	<p><i>Dominic (Su):</i> -Spe:-cies o:f an[imals.]</p> <p><i>Student:</i> [of animals]</p> <p>Oh my gosh I spelled animals wrong!</p> <p><i>Dominic (Su):</i> Don't worry. I used to spell things wrong and then I like, yeah.</p>	Students are working together to make a main idea sentence that summarizes the passage they have read. Dominic is repeating segments of the sentence as his peers write it down. A student states that she wrote <i>animals</i> wrong and Dominic tries to make her feel better by saying that he used to spell things wrong before too.	4.1
Requests	Bids for academic turn	Child expresses interest in academic participation	<p><i>T:</i> Skill four you need to do odd numbers</p> <p>Carla what are odd numbers</p> <p><i>Silver (St):</i> Odd numbers are one three five</p> <p><i>T:</i> Okay Carla, what are odd numbers from skill four</p> <p><i>Silver (St):</i> ((Gasps)) Can I do it?</p>	Ms. Yang is telling the class that they only need to work on the odd numbers from the skill four task. She asks a student to tell her what odd numbers are. The student remains silent but Silver answers Ms. Yang's question. Ms. Yang repeats the question and Silver gasps and bids to answer the question by asking if he can answer her question.	4.1 4.1b

	Request for Action	Child requests action. This typically took the form of requesting attention from peers or others.	<p><i>T</i>: Let each other focus please Let each other focus ((T talking with other Ss)) <i>Olivia (Su)</i>: °Excuse me Ms. Nielson° °Sorry:! (°Unclear°) ((Silence)) °Who likes my wa:nd° <i>Student</i>: Who likes your what? <i>Olivia (Su)</i>: °Encyclopedia:° °Gathered° °Gathered so:me° °Gathered some clue:s° °A:nd° °Ms. Nielson° °What- what is° °What did you write here?° <i>T</i>: Details <i>Olivia (Su)</i>: °Oh okay°</p>	Ms. Nielson is talking with students when Olivia requests her attention. Ms. Nielson continues talking with the students and Olivia begins talking with the student next to her. When Ms. Nielson is ready to give Olivia attention, Olivia asks her a question.	4.1
	Request for Assistance	Child requests help. Requests for assistance were produced indirectly (I need help) and directly (Can you help me?).	<p><i>C</i>: Yes? <i>Alexandra (St)</i>: I need he:lp on this <i>C</i>: What are the directions? <i>Alexandra (St)</i>: Umm: it says read each word in the box below. Tell if the word has a long vowel sound or short vowel sound. Be-</p>	The students are working to complete a worksheet and Alexandra waves Claudia over. When Claudia arrives, Alexandra indirectly requests Claudia's help. Claudia begins to help by asking Alexandra to share the assignment instructions.	4.1 4.1c

	Request for Clarification	Child requests clarification to better understand something that is unclear or confusing.	<p><i>Dominic (Su):</i> Ho:w do you do dra:w a reference like in whatever.</p> <p><i>Substitute:</i> That's a reference.</p> <p><i>Dominic (Su):</i> That? This? Oh like like a book or something like that?</p> <p><i>Student:</i> A dictionary is a reference.</p>	Students are working on a vocabulary activity in small groups. They are to define, provide a synonym, write the part of speech and draw a picture of the word. Dominic asks the Sub for information about how he could draw a picture for the word <i>reference</i> . The Sub answers and Dominic, unsure of what she means, requests clarification.	4.1 4.1c
	Content request for confirmation	Child request confirmation about content. An attempt to ensure that they have understood the content.	<p><i>Student:</i> Mo:st Hammer Head Sharks and Great White Sharks live in the coast of North America. I have three similarities between a Hammer Head Shark a:nd a Great White Shark. It i:s that they swim when they are sleeping. They also have sha:rp teeth-</p> <p><i>Jack (St):</i> °They do?°</p> <p><i>Student:</i> °Yeah°</p> <p><i>Jack (St):</i> They swim when they're sleepi:ng?</p> <p><i>Student:</i> Yes</p>	Students are working in partners to help provide feedback on their compare and contrast writing assignment. Jack's partner reads his writing and Jack interrupts to seek confirmation. His partner confirms and Jack seeks confirmation again, this time being very explicit about what he is seeking to confirm. This is an example of two instances of content request for confirmation.	4.1 4.1c 4.1d
	Procedures request for confirmation	Child requests confirmation about procedures. An attempt to ensure that they have	<p><i>Jenny (St):</i> °Like write a question right the:re, and then make a sentence [right the:re]°</p>	Jenny explains the procedures for a task. Jack seeks confirmation that he has understood the procedures correctly.	4.1 4.1c

		understood the procedures correctly.	<p><i>Jack (St):</i> °[O:h you write] the questions?° °And then you [write the sentences?]° <i>Student:</i> °[Yeah like] what do you like to ea:t, or where were you bo:rn. Whe:n do you like to read other books.°</p>		
	Spelling request for confirmation	Child requests confirmation about spelling. An attempt to make sure they have spelled something correctly.	<p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> °Sing° How do you spell singed? S-i-n-d? Sa:w? <i>Student:</i> You have to do (inaudible) No it's we: sa:w Yeah we saw not we: see: <i>Alexandra (St):</i> No I said we si:nged! How do you spell si:nged?</p>	Alexandra is working on her writing and needs help spelling <i>singed</i> . She asks the girl sitting next to her how to spell <i>singed</i> . Immediately following her spelling request for information, Alexandra seeks confirmation that <i>singed</i> is spelled s-i-n-d. The girl misunderstands and thinks Alexandra is asking for help in spelling <i>see</i> .	4.1c
	Work of others request of confirmation	Child requests confirmation about the work of others. An attempt to make sure they have understood their interlocutor's work report.	<p><i>Student:</i> Teacher I already finished mine. <i>Jack (St):</i> £You did?£ <i>Student:</i> £Yeah£</p>	A student informs the teacher that he already finished the assignment. Jack seeks confirmation about his peer's work report.	none

	Correct answer/response request for confirmation	Child requests confirmation about whether or not they have answered/responded correctly.	<i>T</i> : Why do we need to skip lines again? <i>Tommy (Su)</i> : So: we can fix them?	Ms. Nielson is explaining the procedures for the writing assignment. She asks the class why they need to skip lines when writing their rough draft. Tommy's uncertain response seeks confirmation that he has provided the correct answer.	none
	Content request for information	Child requests information about content to gain information about the academic topic of discussion.	<i>Josey (Su)</i> : Why do you give me a three? <i>Silver (St)</i> : Because I, oh because you: were reading, you were reading gently, and you were reading mm slowly.	Josey and Silver are partners for a peer editing activity. Silver has informed Josey that he gives her writing a score of a three. Josey requests information about why Silver has given her writing a three.	4.1 4.1c 4.1d
	Procedures request for information	Child requests information about what to do or how to do something.	<i>Alexandra (St)</i> : £Pffff!£ °Ms. Nielson if we're done with this what do we do?° <i>T</i> : Choose, choose one of these and write- -Actually you would start with probably a flow map, wouldn't you?	Alexandra asks Ms. Nielson what she's supposed to do after she's completed the task.	4.1 4.1c
	Progress request for information	Child requests information about another's progress.	<i>Jack (St)</i> : Enormous. Which one are you on? What are you doing? Proof reading?	Jack is working on a writing task. He requests information about his peer's progress on the writing task.	none

	Spelling request for information	Child requests information about how to spell a word.	<i>Alexandra (St):</i> °° Sing °° How do you spell singed? S-i-n-d?	Alexandra is working on her writing and needs help spelling <i>singed</i> . She asks the girl sitting next to her how to spell <i>singed</i> .	4.1c
	What's the answer request for information	Child requests information that will give him the answer to an academic problem/task.	<i>Dominic (Su):</i> -Point, is a beau:ti:fu:l place. Place, and, AND, AND!? <i>Student:</i> A very beautiful sight!	Dominic is working with his small group on identifying the main idea of a passage read. One of his group members has shared what she thinks the main idea is while the rest of the group writes the sentence on their own worksheets. Dominic repeats the sentence and prompts his team member to continue providing the main idea answer.	none
	Request for Opinion	Child requests another's thoughts/opinion.	<i>T:</i> Why The housing <i>Jenny (St):</i> °Should I write about this one?° <i>T:</i> Prices <i>Jenny (St):</i> °Should I write about this one?° <i>T:</i> Are up	Ms. Nielson has provided the class with stacks of newspapers. The students are to identify a news article that they can use to write about cause and effect. While Ms. Nielson provides instructions, Jenny asks a peer for their thoughts on her news article selection.	4.1 4.1c

	Request for Permission	Child requests permission to do something.	<i>Olivia (Su): °Ms. Nielson° Could we open this one ‘cause there’s no more papers T: Yes you may</i>	Olivia is looking for lined paper for her writing assignment. She walks over to the designated extra paper drawer and realizes that there is no more paper. She asks Ms. Nielson for permission to open the bottom drawer where she knows unopened supplies are kept.	4.1b
Taking Charge	Calls attention to text or content	Child calls attention to text or content. Used as a way to share something they find interesting or to provide help in locating something.	<i>Student: L-i-v L-i-z Alexandra (St): Lizards don’t have. L right here, look for it right here. Porque aqui esta la L-i/ Because L-i is right here Student: °L, v aqui esta/ here it is°</i>	Alexandra and a peer are working on a vocabulary activity where they are to define a list of words. Her partner is having a tough time finding the word <i>lizard</i> in the dictionary. Alexandra calls attention to the <i>L</i> on the dictionary page as a way to show her partner where to look.	4.1b
	Gives orders	Child tells others what to do.	<i>Student: Another question= Jack (St): No:! You have to do it. Everybody has to answer i:t, the teacher said.</i>	Students are participating in a new activity where they take turns asking and answering questions about the book they are reading <i>Dear Mr. Henshaw</i> . A student prompts the group to move to the next question. Jack tells the student that he has to answer the question too because everyone has to answer the question before they move on.	4.1 4.1b

	Invites others to enter discussion	Child opens the discussion to others.	<p><i>Student:</i> You could do it by You have another TV in your house <i>Silver (St):</i> °And then you fell asleep° °What's your solution° <i>Student 2:</i> I: wou:ld um Um (Inaudible) until I finish my show</p>	As a group, students are to decide on a solution to a problem (you want to watch your favorite show, but your brother wants to watch their show too) the teacher has provided. After he provides his solution, Silver invites a peer to enter the discussion by asking what her solution would be.	4.1 4.1b
	Organizes peer talk or activities	Child takes charge by organizing how the talk or activities will progress	<p><i>Josey (Su):</i> Oka:y rea:dy? I'm gonna read mine. And you're g-you're gonna check wha:t two errors I have.</p>	In partners, the students are to share their writing and provide feedback. Josey takes charge of the activity and organizes how they will tackle the task.	4.1 4.1b
	Prompts	Child prompts their interlocutor to continue talking	<p><i>Dominic (Su):</i> Yosemite- <i>Josey:</i> -Yes= <i>Dominic (Su):</i> is a beautiful place to meet to see all the bats and other species of animals.</p>	Dominic is reciting the sentence the group has agreed on. Josey interrupts to prompt Dominic's recitation.	4.1
Other Manipulative	Academic delay	A conversational device used to buy thinking time. Conversational devices were usually enacted by stretching words, repeating utterances or using the filler <i>um</i> .	<p><i>T:</i> What is that Olivia Complete sentence please <i>Olivia (Su):</i> U:m Spri:ng is a noun <i>T:</i> It is It's a thing It's a thing that's inside the ball point pen</p>	During a test prep activity, Ms. Nielson is talking with the class about multiple meaning words. Ms. Nielson asks Olivia to identify the part of speech of word <i>spring</i> as it is presented in the passage. Olivia buys thinking time by uttering <i>U:m</i> and stretching the word <i>spri:ng</i> ,	4.1

	Academic tattle	Child reports the academic actions of a peer to an adult in an effort to correct their peer's actions.	<p><i>Jenny (St):</i> °Um Josey doesn't understand° °Cause she's supposed to follow the must do list° °And teacher said to do-° °To either do um° °Your I have a dream thing° °Or you gotta do the flow map but she's already on- on PB205° °She not supposed to do that yet° C: 'Cause she hasn't finished her I have a dream?</p>	Jenny and her tablemates believe that Josey is not doing what she's supposed to be doing. Jenny calls Claudia and explains that Josey is not following the must do list and is working on the wrong assignment.	none
	Saving face	Child attempts to recover from mockery or insult.	<p><i>Alexandra (St):</i> No I said we si:nged! How do you spell si:nged? <i>Student:</i> £You said si:nged hahaha£ <i>Alexandra (St):</i> °You have a booger° You have something right here?</p>	Alexandra asked her peer to help her spell <i>singed</i> . Her peer responds by making fun of Alexandra's use of <i>singed</i> instead of <i>sang</i> . In an attempt to recover, Alexandra points out that she has a booger.	4.1
	Suggests	Child puts forward an idea for consideration. This is different from Giving Orders because it is a proposition and not an authoritative command. Suggestions were	<p><i>Student:</i> °Write my topic sentences be:tter?° <i>Jack (St):</i> Yea:h sure sure. Let's say, wri:te topic se:nte:nce. Write topic sente:nce more interesting?</p>	Jack is working with a peer on a peer editing activity. They are to arrive at two recommendations for improvement and write them down on a peer-editing sheet. His partner asks if he should write down <i>write topic sentences better</i> . By using <i>Let's say</i> and a question form, Jack makes a suggestion to write something else instead.	4.1 4.1c

Appendix A
Descriptive Statistics for Ideational Speech Acts per Hour of Recording

No.	Sub-function	Speech Acts	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1	Follow along	I'm with you	4.85	2.53	1.48	9.09
2	Follow along	Choral decoding, repetition or response	3.98	4.43	0.75	13.96
3	Other Ideational	Inform of actions, plans or abilities	3.78	1.77	2.06	6.41
4	Display Knowledge	States basic concepts or facts	2.89	1.98	0.56	6.19
5	Display Knowledge	Academic think aloud	2.25	1.65	0.00	4.59
6	Display Knowledge	Academic comment	2.05	1.04	0.70	3.74
7	Other Ideational	Responds to a non-content question	1.72	1.59	0.19	5.23
8	Maintain Discourse Line	Confirms	1.55	1.19	0.58	4.16
9	Disrupt Discourse Line	Defends	1.37	0.95	0.38	2.40
10	Display Knowledge	Describes	1.27	0.79	0.35	2.78
11	Display Knowledge	Describes meaning of a word	0.97	0.95	0.00	2.78
12	Disrupt Discourse Line	Refuses	0.96	0.56	0.19	1.89
13	Disrupt Discourse Line	Disagrees	0.86	0.46	0.35	1.65
14	Other	Read aloud for others	0.83	0.61	0.00	1.81
15	Maintain Discourse Line	Agrees	0.81	0.72	0.00	2.08
16	Display Knowledge	States or comments on lack of understanding	0.70	0.76	0.00	2.35
17	Maintain Discourse Line	Accepts a correction or suggestion	0.69	0.38	0.19	1.29
18	Display Knowledge	Reason giving explanation	0.66	0.47	0.00	1.24
19	Display Knowledge	Shares writing	0.52	0.45	0.00	1.49
20	Maintain Discourse Line	Supportive assertion	0.50	0.66	0.11	2.06
21	Disrupt Discourse Line	Complains	0.32	0.27	0.00	0.69

22	Disrupt Discourse Line	Makes less of another's idea or comment	0.31	0.38	0.00	1.03
23	Display Knowledge	Clarifies	0.31	0.26	0.00	0.64
24	Maintain Discourse Line	Accepts a request or proposition	0.28	0.31	0.00	0.82
25	Display Knowledge	Piggybacks on another's idea	0.18	0.21	0.00	0.62
26	Display Knowledge	Description giving explanation	0.15	0.22	0.00	0.62
27	Disrupt Discourse Line	Threatens	0.06	0.09	0.00	0.21
28	Disrupt Discourse Line	Accuses	0.04	0.11	0.00	0.32
29	Disrupt Discourse Line	Does NOT accept a correction or suggestion	0.04	0.08	0.00	0.21
30	Other Ideational	Offers assistance	0.01	0.038	0.00	0.11

Appendix B
Descriptive Statistics for Manipulative Speech Acts per Hour of Recording

No.	Sub-function	Speech Acts	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1	Taking charge	Gives orders	1.83	0.93	0.47	3.20
2	Request	Content request for information	1.59	0.98	0.43	3.30
3	Request	Procedures request for information	1.46	1.19	0.29	3.33
4	Helping others	Provides feedback or helps others brainstorm	1.42	1.22	0.35	3.77
5	Taking charge	Organizes peer talk	1.39	1.08	0.35	3.51
6	Other Manipulative	Suggests	1.37	1.25	0.35	4.15
7	Request	Request for clarification	1.29	0.82	0.37	2.40
8	Request	Correct answer request for confirmation	1.17	1.79	0.00	5.02
9	Request	Request for action	1.16	0.70	0.38	2.46
10	Other Manipulative	Academic delay	1.01	0.71	0.17	1.92
11	Request	Request for assistance	1.00	1.41	0.12	3.76
12	Request	Spelling request for information	0.79	1.32	0.00	3.92
13	Request	Bids for academic turn	0.78	0.54	0.00	1.64
14	Request	Procedures request for confirmation	0.76	0.97	0.00	2.88
15	Request	Content request for confirmation	0.52	0.40	0.00	1.17
16	Request	Progress request for information	0.50	0.51	0.00	1.20
17	Helping others	Attempts to make others feel better about their work	0.49	0.55	0.00	1.67
18	Taking charge	Calls attention to text or content	0.37	0.41	0.00	0.87
19	Other Manipulative	Saving face	0.31	0.30	0.00	0.82
20	Request	Request for permission	0.23	0.27	0.00	0.72
21	Other Manipulative	Academic tattle	0.20	0.19	0.00	0.53
22	Request	What's the answer request for information	0.14	0.27	0.00	0.81
23	Taking charge	Invites other to enter discussion	0.12	0.16	0.00	0.37
24	Taking charge	Prompts	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.21
25	Request	Spelling request for confirmation	0.07	0.19	0.00	0.53
26	Request	Work of others request for confirmation	0.06	0.12	0.00	0.34
27	Request	Request for opinion	0.05	0.15	0.00	0.43

