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ABSTRACT

This study explored how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in mainstream content classrooms and ESL students’ participation during the collaborative teaching sessions. This study is theoretically based on sociocultural learning notions that assume that teacher learning is a dynamic and complex process that occurs through teachers’ professional interactions (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This study uses positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as its theoretical lens, which affords the opportunity to investigate how reflexive and interactive positionings (Davies & Harré, 1990) shape the possibilities for content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and for ESL students’ participation during the collaborative teaching sessions in mainstream content classrooms.

Employing a case study research design, this study assumes the researcher’s dual participatory role as the ESL teacher. In doing so, I collaborated with four content teachers separately to show how collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms. Data collection included qualitative methods, such as semi-structured interviews, collaborative planning sessions, lesson planning artifacts, collaborative teaching sessions, collaborative viewing sessions, reflective journals, ESL students’ work samples, and field notes. Data analysis relied on Saldaña’s (2013) coding techniques and drew on Davies & Harré’s (1990) reflexive and interactive positionings. This study found that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced the content teachers’ learning to plan and teach ESL students because collaboration
became a space for teachers to learn by negotiating lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream content classrooms. This study also found that collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by creating space for both the ESL teacher’s increased role and the content teacher’s renewed student positionings. In addition, it shed light on how teachers’ collaborative planning and teaching acts enhanced or constrained ESL students’ participation. In light of the findings, the study calls for increased collaborative efforts between ESL and content teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study

The expectation to teach content in English/language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, and social studies to English as a second language (ESL) students increases in secondary classrooms (Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014), and the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) ushers in additional instructional changes that require teachers’ learning for diverse students (Kibler, Walqui, & Bunch, 2015). The CCSS aims to provide consistent standards in reading and mathematics among the states and seeks to ensure that students are college and career ready upon graduation from high school. Teachers feel added pressure to provide evidence of students’ content mastery on statewide achievement tests (Bell & Walker, 2012; Palmer, Henderson, Wall, Zúñiga, & Berthelsen, 2016).

To complicate matters further, ESL students historically do not participate in mainstream classrooms as often and as meaningfully compared to their English-speaking peers (Duff, 2001; Martin-Beltrán, 2010, Yoon, 2008) because of affective factors (Pappamihiel, 2002), content teachers’ student positionings (Yoon, 2008), and the classroom power dynamics in the mainstream content classrooms (Norton, 2002). This limited participation can constrain learning opportunities and ultimately serve to exacerbate the widening achievement gap between ESL students and their monolingual peers. Research accordingly argues that ESL students consistently underperform their English only-speaking peers in nearly every subject area (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2015b), and this underperformance intensifies teachers’ pressure to evidence ESL students’ adequate growth and achievement (Bell & Baecher, 2012; Staehr Fenner, 2014).
With their numbers continuing to increase at rapid rates in the United States (U.S.), ESL students currently comprise 9.8% of the student population in public schools (NCES, 2015a) and have culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Bell & Walker, 2012). Despite the growing number of ESL students in mainstream classrooms, content teachers are underprepared to teach these learners (Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014; Staehr Fenner, 2014), and they consequently contribute to ESL students’ limited participation (Yoon, 2008).

To address teacher unpreparedness, learning opportunities for teachers typically resemble more traditional approaches, such as the “sage on the stage” where a speaker delivers information to a group of teachers (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 7). Traditional professional development (PD) ultimately does not change teachers’ pedagogical practices because teachers are often given directives without practical and relevant considerations of classroom implementation (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, Gardner, & Espinoza, 2017; Smith, 2017). Teachers also are not given the needed space to experiment with learned information and reflect on their experiences, and this experimental space is crucial to teachers’ learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

More effective PD includes collaboration where teachers are afforded opportunities to discuss concerns in their “everyday routines” with professionals experiencing similar concerns (Bocala, 2015, p. 349). Teachers can share potential solutions and feel validated as experts (DuFour, 2004; Smith, 2017). This professional collaboration “can create communities that positively change the culture and instruction of their entire grade, department, school and/or district” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. v). Teachers, however, sometimes prefer to work in isolation (Bair, 2013) even though the collaborative benefits are widely documented (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010, Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). The pressures to show evidence of student achievement and growth also contribute to teachers
working in isolation (Bair, 2013) because teachers are afraid to make known their instructional practices (Smith, 2017).

Teachers’ learning in collaboration is unresearched (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). ESL and content teachers’ collaboration poses additional challenges in secondary schools, primarily because of strict departmental structures that separate subjects into four distinct content areas (e.g., science, mathematics, social studies, and ELA) (Bell & Baecher, 2012; Siskin, 1994). The ESL teacher may have many responsibilities across multiple schools, thereby limiting his or her contact with other teachers (Arkoudis, 2003). Subject specificity and separation both contribute to the ESL teacher’s relegated role because the ESL teacher cannot claim one content discipline (Bell & Baecher, 2012). Further, scheduling conflicts (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016), inconsistent administrative support (DelliCarpini, 2018), and limited planning time (Giles, 2018) can make collaboration more difficult to develop and implement in secondary schools (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010). Given these challenges related to collaboration, many mainstream content teachers in secondary education continue to work in isolation (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018), and they consequently struggle to teach academic language and content to ESL students (Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014; Staehr Fenner, 2014).

ESL students’ participation in mainstream classrooms is also underexplored (Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2008), with few recent known studies showing how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influences ESL students’ participation in mainstream classrooms (see for example Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019 and Spezzini & Becker, 2012). When ESL students’ participation is explored, the teacher can enhance or limit ESL students’ participatory actions in the mainstream content classrooms (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Gladman, 2015; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2008). Some studies point out how the teacher can position ESL students as outsiders (Kayi-Aydar, 2014), which serve to exclude them from conversations and discussions.
that could lead to their increased learning opportunities (Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2008). The connection between ESL students’ limited participation and learning opportunities is evidenced by the fact that ESL students consistently underperform their monolingual peers on achievement tests (NCES, 2015a).

**Statement of the Problem**

Content area secondary teachers are unprepared and unequipped to teach academic language and content to ESL students (Staehr Fenner, 2014; Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014). Traditional PD is not the most effective form of teacher learning because it does not always change pedagogical practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Smith, 2017). Content and ESL teachers’ collaboration can potentially provide ESL students with increased content and language learning (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014); yet, teacher preferences for isolation (Bair, 2013), separated content-area secondary departments (Bell & Baecher, 2012; Siskin, 2014), and limited contact with the ESL teacher (Bell & Baecher, 2012) can constrain collaborative efforts (Peercy, 2018).

Moreover, ESL students’ participation is often constrained in the mainstream classroom because of ESL students’ anxious feelings (Pappamihiel 2002) and the classroom power dynamics (Martin-Beltrán, 2010, Norton, 2002). The teacher plays a pivotal role in influencing how students participate in the mainstream classrooms (Yoon, 2008). As such, additional research is needed to explore how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influences content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation.

**Purpose of the Study**

In light of the above-mentioned problem, the study’s purpose is to explore how collaboration influences content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students, and how this collaboration influences ESL students’ participation in mainstream content classrooms.
Using positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as a theoretical framework, this study seeks to examine how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influences content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students. Lastly, this study aims to explore how content and ESL teachers’ collaboration influences ESL students’ classroom participation during the collaborative teaching sessions. The following research questions guide this study:

1. How does ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students at a suburban middle school in the Southeastern U.S?
2. How does ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence ESL students’ classroom participation during the collaborative teaching sessions?

Scope and Delimitations

This study focuses on how four secondary content teachers in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies collaborate with an ESL teacher in mainstream content classrooms at one suburban middle school in the U.S. Teachers’ collaborative activities primarily focus on teaching language and content to ESL students and working to promote ESL students’ classroom participation in the mainstream content classrooms. This particular middle school assigns students in the same grade to academic teams, which means that a group of students shares the same ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies teacher. Content teachers instructed the same ESL students and meet regularly to discuss pertinent information, including teacher concerns about students. This study does not include all thirty-six content teachers at this particular middle school because this inclusion would extend beyond the study’s purpose.

The study also includes one ESL teacher working in collaboration with four content teachers. This school employs one ESL teacher, and I am the ESL teacher serving as the researcher-participant in this study. As the researcher and participating ESL teacher, I
collaborated with four content teachers, designed the research study, collected data, and reported the findings. Therefore, this study is limited to both my perspective working in collaboration with four content teachers and my novice expertise as a researcher despite my meticulous efforts to understand how practicing content teachers learn in collaboration and influence ESL students’ participation. Likewise, data collection and analysis are also limited to my novice experience as a researcher to collect and analyze data even as I make every effort to document the procedures through analytic memos and utilize in-depth qualitative research methods for data analysis. My positionality will be discussed later in Chapter Three.

This study focuses only on ESL students’ classroom participation on one academic team and does not extend to include all forty-one ESL students at this middle school. ESL students’ classroom participation is limited to the work samples collected and verbal and nonverbal observable actions during the co-teaching sessions in mainstream content classrooms. Their participation does not extend beyond the co-teaching sessions to include student interviews about their perceptions regarding the collaborative instruction. The study also does not extend beyond the content classrooms to the ESL classroom where students also receive ESL instruction for one class period (about 55 minutes) each school day. This inclusion may have included additional information about how students participate to learn academic language and content.

In limiting this study to four content teachers and one ESL teacher, this study does not focus on other teachers (e.g., reading intervention teacher, special education teacher) who may also interact with the ESL students during the school day. This study also does not include the administration’s perspectives on collaboration despite the fact that administrators make curricular decisions and shape the school’s professional culture (Fink & Markholt, 2011), which might have provided more insight on how content and ESL teachers engage in collaborative planning and teaching. Similarly, this study does not include information from the district level,
which may have contributed a greater understanding of policies and procedures affecting ESL instruction at this particular school. These choices are based on the study’s purpose to explore the perspectives of four content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students with an ESL teacher in the mainstream content classrooms. This study also seeks to examine how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influences ESL students’ classroom participation (e.g., work samples, student actions/behaviors) during the collaborative teaching sessions.

**Theoretical Assumptions**

This study is conceptually based on sociocultural learning understandings. Shifting from the teacher’s cognitive knowledge, sociocultural theorists believe that learning is a social phenomenon. Vygotsky (1978) is among the earliest sociocultural theorists, articulating, “Human learning presupposes a specific social nature and a process by which children grow into the intellectual life of those around them” (p. 88). This learning conceptualization posits that children are social beings and bring their unique ways of being and knowing into the world through their social interactions. As such, children adapt their own ways of knowing to develop and learn new concepts. Lave and Wenger (1991) extend this theory and use the term “legitimate peripheral participation” to state the ways that individuals gradually become participating members in communities of practice. Individuals learn as they negotiate their identities and use mediated tools during social interactions in communities. Mastery becomes an organized endeavor based on how well individuals negotiate their identities and behaviors to suit those within the desired community.

Supported by sociocultural learning theory, collaboration necessitates social interactions in professional communities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Teachers’ learning potential is inherent through collaboration because collaborative efforts create space for dialogue, diverse expertise, critique, and reflection (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Teachers are considered
instructional experts and can make pedagogical decisions regarding relevant and practical instructional concerns (DuFour, 2004; Smith, 2017). Therefore, this study emphasizes collaborative learning rather than traditional forms of PD (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Similarly, it takes a situated learning approach that argues that learning takes place in professional communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

**Significance of Study**

This study seeks to contribute to the field of language teaching and learning in three specific ways. First, this study aims to contribute knowledge about how content teachers learn to plan for and teach ESL students in collaboration with an ESL teacher. Conceptualized by sociocultural learning theory, teacher learning happens in and through dialogue in professional interactions (Johnson & Golombek, 2016). This social learning theory recognizes teachers’ backgrounds and how their backgrounds shape their dialogue and professional interactions, which ultimately affect learning. Rejecting traditional learning notions, this study exemplifies how content teachers learn through collaborative, professional interactions in communities.

Second, this study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of secondary content and ESL teachers’ collaborative practices in a middle school in one suburban area in the U.S. There is a need to address these collaborative practices in secondary schools; hence, the study contributes additional research about content and ESL teacher’s collaborative planning and teaching practices in a secondary middle school. The middle school is part of a large school district and contained about nine hundred students. Forty-one of those students are labeled ESL students, which meant they received language instruction taught by me as the ESL teacher. Students received this ESL student classification when they marked an additional language on a home language survey dispensed at registration and make a qualifying score (e.g., 4.9 or lower) on the World-Class Instructional Design Assessment (WIDA) Screener. Regardless of students’
language score on the WIDA Screener, they were enrolled in four content classes (e.g., ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies) in the mainstream classrooms. Mainstream class sizes average roughly twenty-five students. Each ESL student takes the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 Assessment for English Language Learners each spring to monitor English language growth.

Third, this study adds research about how content and ESL teachers collaborate in the mainstream content classrooms to influence ESL students’ participation. This collaborative teaching will provide insight that describes how this collaboration enhances or limits ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms. There is a need to connect teachers’ collaborative practices to observable student outcomes. Thus, this study gives additional information about how collaborative teaching affects ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms.

**Definition of Terms**

This section defines terms frequently used throughout this study. It is crucial to provide definitions to clarify meanings, especially words that are used often, so that clear definitions are delineated and assumed definitions are avoided. Accordingly, the following list identifies this study’s frequently used terms and definitions:

- **Collaboration** involves teachers working together voluntarily for a shared purpose. This work includes shared planning and teaching. Collaboration varies in frequency and formality (Baecher & Bell, 2011). This study prefers to utilize Honigsfeld and Dove’s (2010) components to define collaboration, including “an emphasis on being engaged in collaboration voluntarily, having a common goal (e.g., enhancing instruction for students, school improvement), participating in interdisciplinary endeavors, and finding multiple creative solutions” (p. 6). This description specifies how teachers work together to create relevant and useful tools to aid instruction. For this study’s purpose, content and ESL
teachers collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms.

- **Collaborative teaching** refers to the co-implementation of instructional practices by different teachers. Teachers assume different roles but share instructional responsibilities. This term originated in the field of special education to characterize the ways that different specialty teachers instruct students in special education (Cook & Friend, 1995). Villa, Thousand, and Nevin (2008) define collaborative teaching, stating, “Co-teaching involves the distribution of responsibility among people for planning, instruction, and evaluation for a classroom of students” (p. 50). Collaborative teaching between content and ESL teachers is unexplored (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010); thus, for this study’s purpose, content and ESL teachers will collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms.

- **The content standards** refer to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English/ELA and mathematics. The state’s course of study outlines the standards for science and social studies.

- **The content teacher** refers to the teacher whose primary responsibility is to teach the content standards of one of the following areas: ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies. When used collectively (e.g., content teachers), it refers to all four ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies teachers in this study. The researcher specifies a teacher’s content (e.g., ELA teacher) when the aim is to describe information about that specific content teacher.

- **Differentiation** refers to the ways in which ESL and content teachers adapt their instruction to help the ESL students access and meet the content and language standards.
• **The English language development (ELD) standards** are the standards developed by the WIDA consortium. The state of this study has adopted the WIDA ELD standards. There is a strong emphasis on academic language (Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, 2014) instead of basic conversational English (Cummins, 1980).

• **English as a second language (ESL) students** is the terminology used to describe students who qualify for English language instructional services; their abilities to read, write, speak, and listen in English indicate they need additional language assistance to access and master the content and language standards in the mainstream content classrooms.

• **English as a second language students’ participation** refers to the ESL students’ work samples and verbal and nonverbal actions and behaviors during the co-teaching sessions in the mainstream content classrooms. This study emphasizes ESL students’ classroom participation and does not extend to include all students in the collaborative teaching sessions. Additionally, this participation does not go beyond the collaborative teaching sessions to include ESL students’ participation in every mainstream content classroom nor does it include participation in the ESL classroom.

• **The English as a second language (ESL) teacher** refers to the teacher whose primary responsibility is to teach the English language development (ELD) standards and advocate for ESL students (Staehr Fenner, 2014).

• **The mainstream content classroom** refers to the 55-minute instructional period in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies. The content teachers instruct in English during the instructional period.
Professional development (PD) refers to the ways that practicing teachers engage in ongoing learning opportunities formally or informally. Traditional PD includes an outside expert delivering information to practicing teachers (DuFour, 2004; Smith, 2017).

Secondary teachers refer to teachers who instruct grades six through twelve in the public-school setting. These teachers are typically distinguished by their subjects (e.g., ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies) and are separated into subject-specific departments (Bell & Baecher, 2012; Siskin, 1994). This study narrows secondary teachers to five secondary teachers working in a middle school in the Southeastern part of the U.S.

Situated Learning is terminology coined by Lave & Wenger (1991) and is foregrounded by a sociocultural learning perspective, which means that individuals learn through participation in collaboration or communities of practice in daily professional interactions.

Teachers’ learning is based on sociocultural learning theories that posit that learning is a social phenomenon that emphasizes how social factors and the culture precede and shape teachers’ cognition (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2016). Learning, then, necessitates professional interaction in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Team teachers refer to the middle school model in which a group of content teachers in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies teach the same student group. Team teaching in middle school was originally designed for interdisciplinary purposes (Wiles & Bondi, 1993); however, the use of this term does not mean that team teachers engage in interdisciplinary planning and teaching. For this study’s purpose, team teachers teach
the same group of students, and of particular importance is that they teach the same ESL students throughout the school day.

**Overview of Chapters**

This introductory chapter is followed by four chapters. Chapter Two reviews the literature relevant to this study’s purpose. It includes the history of PD as well as studies on PD for ESL students with an emphasis on secondary schools. After this review, the literature explains the powerful potential for collaboration as an effective form of PD and reviews studies on collaboration involving the ESL teacher and scrutinizes ESL students’ participation in the mainstream classroom. Chapter Two concludes with an explanation of positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as this study’s theoretical underpinnings. Chapter Three describes this study’s research design and methodology. This study employs Merriam’s (1998) interpretivist case study as its chosen research method and draws on Yin’s (2014) procedures for conducting case study research. This chapter will additionally describe data collection and analytic procedures. Chapter Four presents this study’s findings, concentrating on how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students, specifically with regard to how they negotiated lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role, to co-construct knowledge in collaboration. The study also found that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by showing how the ESL and content teachers’ positioning acts enhance (or constrain) ESL students’ participation. Chapter Five presents a discussion of how this study’s findings relate to earlier empirical studies, states the study’s theoretical contributions, and concludes with practical implications about initiating and sustaining collaborative partnerships in mainstream classrooms.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature pertinent to this research study. It begins with an explanation of the sociocultural framework for teacher learning, namely that learning emphasizes a social dynamic and takes place in and through social interactions. It also considers teachers’ individual differences and experiences in the learning process. Next, it reviews the history and characteristics of PD most conducive to learning. This discussion is followed by a review of relevant studies on content and ESL teachers’ collaboration and ESL students’ participation. Lastly, this chapter concludes with an explanation of positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as the research study’s chosen theoretical framework.

Accordingly, this literature review includes six main sections: (1) a sociocultural framework for teacher learning, (2) how a teacher’s individual characteristics affect learning, (3) the history and characteristics of PD, (4) a review of relevant studies on content and ESL students’ collaboration, (5) ESL students’ participation, and (6) positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as the study’s theoretical framework.

A Sociocultural Framework for Teacher Learning

Teacher learning in many respects is “the unstudied problem” in education (Freeman, 1996, p. 351). Freeman and Johnson’s (1998) seminal research on language teacher education sought to directly address this dilemma through sociocultural understandings. The researchers chronicled the history and necessity for a well-theorized understanding of teacher learning, beginning with the process-product paradigm, or what is otherwise known as the knowledge-
transmission perspective. This complicated quest to understand teacher learning yields unintended consequences in teacher education institutions today where an emphasis is often still placed on discrete skills. Yet when practitioners enter the classroom, they struggle connecting these discrete skills to effect student learning (Johnson & Freeman, 2001). In order to repair this disconnection, one must first understand teacher learning theorizations, beginning with the process-product paradigm.

**The Process-Product Paradigm**

Cognitive learning perspectives underpin the process-product paradigm and have been prevalent since the 1950s. This perspective focuses primarily on the “internal psychological process isolated in the mind” and hinges on the transmission of knowledge from one source to another (Johnson & Freeman, 2001, p. 54). Knowledge is transmitted through external sources, such as university lectures, demonstrations, and readings. As teachers are exposed to more knowledge, they transmit the knowledge to their students, thus applying the knowledge into classroom practice. Teachers are characterized as blank slates in need of knowledge and best pedagogical practices. Freeman (1996) describes the teachers’ cognitive processes once knowledge fills these blank slates. The teachers’ knowledge and thoughts lead to their other behaviors and actions, and these behaviors then impact the student’s knowledge and ultimately the student’s behavior and learning (Freeman, 1996).

Furthermore, this theorization leads to teacher education programs that include three separate features. The first feature includes knowledge learned through university coursework with the belief that more knowledge yields more effective teaching practices. The knowledge learned is also separated into two discrete knowledge bases: the content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Second, the teacher candidates observe another teacher’s effective practices to experiment with effective strategies through a practicum experience. Third, the
teacher candidates secure a teaching job where they become practicing teachers and develop the behaviors and strategies in practice (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). It is in this practice, where teachers embark on their careers and begin to refine their practices, where teacher learning is actually just beginning. Teacher learning, then, is not solely a result of the individual’s cognitive processes, but rather it is characterized in and through social interactions within communities. This social learning is the diverging point for cognitive and sociocultural theorists.

When applied to teacher learning, sociocultural theorists begin “to recast conceptions of who language teachers are, what language teaching is, and how language teachers learn to teach” (Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 401). Thus, rejecting the notion that teachers are blank slates, one recognizes that teachers have preexisting beliefs, attitudes, and perspectives, and these attributes influence their social interactions with colleagues and students, their approach to and through the school community, and their pedagogical practices. To offer a theorized knowledge base of teacher learning, Freeman and Johnson (1998) create a framework to explore the teaching activity with three domains that include the teacher-learner, the school/schooling context, and the pedagogical process. Whereas the teaching activity is crucial, it must be understood in light of the teacher-learner within a particular school and larger sociocultural community.

All three domains are interrelated and influence each other at varying degrees during the learning process. The teacher-learner underscores the teachers’ prior knowledge and background experiences. They develop knowledge diachronically as opposed to former conceptions because learning occurs in multiple interactions and communities. The second domain of the framework views the school/schooling context. Schools represent the physical environment where the teachers engage in social interactions. Schooling, on the other hand, represents the institutions embedded with social values, and teachers continuously negotiate these values in their schools. Third, the pedagogical process includes the language content, pedagogical activity, and language
learning. Considering the teacher-learner, the school/schooling context, and the pedagogical process, “learning to teach is a long-term, complex, developmental process that operates through participation in the social practices and contexts” (Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 402).

The Teacher-learner’s Individual Influences

Due to Freeman and Johnson’s (1998) exhortation to understand the teacher-learner’s nature, it is necessary to understand the teachers’ individual knowledge, and previous studies sought to do just that (Allen & Penuel, 2015; Bakkenes, Vermunt, & Wubbels, 2010; Borko, 2004; Cobb, 1994; Korthagen, 2016). Cobb (1994) differentiated between the “construction” and “enculturation” of knowledge (p. 13). The construction of knowledge referred to the teachers’ individual knowledge, while enculturation applied to the teachers’ negotiated knowledge in social interactions and workplace communities. Similarly, Korthagen (2016) referred to teacher competencies, or, more specifically, the core qualities that teachers knew and possessed in order to be considered good or effective teachers. Analyzing these teacher competencies further, Allen and Penuel (2015) emphasized the “prior knowledge” that teachers activated when they approached new learning experiences (p. 136). This prior knowledge referred to previous beliefs about content and pedagogy that teachers used to make sense of learning. van Driel, Beijaard, and Verloop (2001) categorized the teacher’s individual knowledge as the teacher’s practical knowledge.

Moreover, previous studies explained how teachers refined their practical knowledge (Bakkenes, Vermunt, & Wubbels, 2010; James & McCormick, 2009; Korthagen, 2016). Bakkenes, Vermunt, and Wubbels (2010) posited that teacher learning was refined and shaped by experimentation and reflection of practice primarily through interactions with others. Although limited to teachers’ learning perceptions, these research studies contributed to existing
literature by showing that teachers needed opportunities to take meaningful learning experiences and apply them to realistic classroom settings (Bakkenes, Vermunt, & Wubbels, 2010).

After the experimentation phase, teachers needed opportunities for reflection where they paused to critically analyze the new information. James and McCormick (2009) insisted that teacher experimentation and reflection in the classroom was elevated to its fullest learning potential when teachers had the opportunity to make sense of this new learning in collaborative communities where colleagues shared and reported their successes and failures. Korthagen (2016) affirmed this research as he presented teacher reflection using the “onion model” and believed that most of teacher learning comprised unconscious learning until the teacher took the time and/or had the opportunity to consciously become aware of good teaching and best practice (p. 9). Recognizing that teacher learning is multidimensional in that it involves cognitive, affective, and motivational behaviors, Korthagen (2016) emphasized the many different layers that teachers must peel in order to develop conscious awareness of classroom practice. The layers housed the teacher’s mission in the center of the onion with identity, beliefs, competencies and behaviors.

In order to critically reflect on learning, teachers understand their personal characteristics through participation in communities and connect them to the classroom environment in order to transform it. More specifically, the teachers’ beliefs, efficacy, behaviors, attitudes, patterns, ways of resistance, perceptions of change, and positionings as curricular gatekeepers impact their social interactions within the larger sociocultural community.

**Beliefs**

Language teachers’ pre-existing personal and professional beliefs impact their pedagogical and instructional practices (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017). While complex, beliefs are experience-based (Pehkonen and Pietilä, 2003) and involve personal
evaluation (Khader, 2012; Raymond, 1997). Beliefs do not develop all at once; rather, they develop over time based on the individual’s education and experience. Additionally, these beliefs “act as the background to teachers’ decision making and classroom actions” (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017; Richards & Lockhart, 1994).

**Efficacy**

Teacher efficacy is an extension of beliefs because it is the belief that one has the ability to perform a certain task (Bandura, 1997). Of particular importance is the belief that teachers can positively influence student outcomes (Guskey & Passaro, 1994). After reviewing one hundred and eleven articles since 1985, Kleinsasser (2014) concludes that teacher efficacy is “multi-faceted, multidimensional, and complex” (p. 176). Research additionally supports that PD can enhance teacher efficacy in teaching content across the subject areas (Fine, Zygouris-Coe, Senokosoff, & Fang, 2011) and that it is most enhanced when PD is collaborative (Durksen, Klassen, & Daniels, 2017). Fraser (2014) measured efficacy in general education teachers when teaching ESL students and found that teacher efficacy varied across grade levels. Elementary school teachers reported the highest efficacy in teaching ESL students, and middle school teachers were second. High school teachers reported the least efficacy. Similarly, when asked if teachers were powerful predictors of ESL achievement, elementary and middle school teachers reported high efficacy levels (Fraser, 2014), thus indicating their belief that they can powerfully impact the learning environment for ESL students.

**Attitudes and Behaviors**

These beliefs shape teacher attitudes and influence their classroom behaviors or actions. Based on a sociocultural learning conception, a one-size-fits-all list of effective teacher behaviors does not exist in language teacher learning (Prabhu, 1990). Situated learning acknowledges that complex behaviors function in different contexts, and teaching behaviors that
work for one student group may not work in another context. While one specific behavioral list may not be beneficial to determine best pedagogical practice, it can be beneficial to know content teachers’ attitudes toward teaching ESL students influence their pedagogical actions.

Reeves (2006) surveyed secondary high school teachers about their attitudes toward inclusion, coursework accommodation, PD, and language learning. Results from this study showed that secondary teachers had a welcoming attitude toward ESL students’ inclusion in their content classrooms, but not all students necessarily benefited from the inclusion. Teachers also showed a willingness to modify the coursework for ESL students yet felt apprehensive about grading ESL students on effort instead of the grade earned regardless of language ability. In addition to coursework accommodations, most teachers felt unprepared to teach ESL students. This lack of preparation is consistent with recent studies on content teachers’ preparation to work with ESL students (Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014). Yet, despite scant preparation, Reeves (2006) showed teachers were indifferent to more PD opportunities. Rubinstein-Avila and Lee (2014) explained that pressures related to accountability, insufficient monetary compensation, and job insecurity may have contributed to this ambivalence toward more PD opportunities. Most teachers also felt that ESL students should be able to use their home language to learn English. Despite research that points to positive attitudes regarding inclusion, research additionally points out that secondary teachers viewed ESL students with a deficit perspective (Mahoney, 2017; Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014). However, research supports that collaborative efforts (Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014) and embedded relevant topics (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017) in everyday routines (Bocala, 2015; Little, 2002) can counteract these negative attitudes.

Aiming to describe the impact of teachers’ professional knowledge and beliefs, Ellis (2013) examined the learning experiences of thirty-one ESL language teachers at seven Australian sites. Data collection included classroom observations, semi-structured interviews,
and language biographies. Most participants indicated that language learning or language experiences influenced their ESL teacher’s identity, and fourteen participants reported that they were elective plurilinguals, signifying that they learned the additional language(s) by choice. The other participants ranged from monolingual to circumstantial plurilingual–some of whom learned another language since childhood. The study’s findings showed that language learning experiences did influence their beliefs, and there were significant differences between plurilinguals and monolinguals. While both groups conceptualized language learning as an arduous task, monolinguals viewed language learning as a laborious task, one that emphasized their learner inadequacies. Plurilinguals saw language learning experiences (even difficult and unsuccessful ones) as a typical and natural part of daily life. Additionally, plurilinguals stated that they practiced trans languaging and/or code meshing.

**Patterns**

Teaching patterns are largely experienced, internalized, and reproduced from past experiences, thereby showing why teachers might evoke patterns that reflect their own experiences. Putnam and Borko (2000) explained that teaching patterns were automatic based on social experiences. When examining teaching patterns to impact learning for ESL students, mainstream teachers reduced the complexity of teaching ESL students to “just good teaching” (de Jong & Harper, 2005, p. 102). For this reason, de Jong and Harper (2005) created a framework that included the linguistic and cultural knowledge, practices, and sensitivity needed to instruct ESL students in the mainstream classroom.

**Change Resistance**

In light of the abovementioned beliefs, behaviors, attitudes, and patterns, it also is important to mention that teachers are resistant to change because their pedagogical practices and patterns are deeply intertwined with their personal and professional identities, beliefs, and
attitudes (Putnam & Borko, 2000). Sustaining change can also be difficult (Fullan, 2007). Due to this resistance and difficulty in sustainability, Putnam and Borko (2000) encouraged situated experiences in attempting to change an aspect in the school context. Similarly, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) stated that collaborative approaches to learning have also been effective in promoting change in schools.

**Change Perception**

Given teachers’ resistance to change and the overall difficulty to bring about change in pedagogical practice, it is important to explore teachers’ change perceptions. Le Fevre (2014) found that elementary teachers were unwilling to change their literacy practices when their perceptions of the risk were high. The teachers identified the publicity of classroom practices, the reduction of textbook dependence, and the increase in student voices as the three highest risks, implicating that researchers and practitioners should take steps to minimize risk and create a school culture where teachers feel safe in talking about risk taking (p. 59). Lasky (2005) articulated that the teacher’s identity and a reform culture are mediational tools utilized during reform efforts. It is crucial to encourage a school culture in which teachers feel they can discuss concerns and fears when implementing and sustaining reform efforts. Moreover, reformers should work to strengthen professional identities by fostering autonomy and agency (McGriff & Protacio, 2015).

**Curricula Gatekeepers**

Teachers are curricula gatekeepers because they plan, design, and implement the curriculum in their classrooms (Thornton, 1989). Siskin (1994) stated how content-specific departments were separated in secondary schools. The departmental separation into specific content areas classified teachers as specific content specialists. For example, a social studies teacher was an expert in history, and a language arts teacher was an expert teaching English
literature, grammar, and writing. In most secondary schools, content teachers have planning time together or at least departmental meetings to discuss curricular issues. Bell and Baecher (2012) noted that departmental specificity hindered collaborative learning efforts that involved the ESL teacher because the ESL teacher’s work was often spread across grade levels and curricula teams. Moreover, secondary teachers’ expectations that ESL teachers should have content knowledge in all areas can lead to the ESL teacher’s relegation (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2002) and/or lack of agency (McGriff & Protacio, 2015) in secondary schools.

**History and Characteristics of Effective Professional Development**

**Professional Development’s History**

Given that teacher characteristics influence how they negotiate and learn through social interactions, it is now important to discuss how PD created opportunities for teacher learning throughout history. In the early nineteenth century, students learned literacy and other skills in the home. Teachers with little to no formal education taught in common schools because the teachers’ educational level was only slightly above the grade in which teachers taught. Many towns had only one teacher working in the community, usually under the clergy or another local municipality member’s supervision. Hence, this structure led to teaching in isolation (Labaree, 2008; Cooper & Brown, 2013). Many educational advocates like Horace Mann supported stronger standards for teachers and argued for a free and public education for all people, which created training opportunities for teachers during the summer months; the training was more than likely the earliest PD for teachers (Labaree, 2008).

These PD institutes led to the creation of the normal school, modeled after the French in order to norm educational standards for teachers. The demand for teachers increased the necessity for normal schools, and the normal schools focused on teacher training as an apprenticeship where the aspiring teacher shadowed an experienced teacher. These programs
focused much attention on experiential training. The normal school programs eventually turned into public state universities by the early twentieth century (Labaree, 2008). In the 1950s, the normal school disappeared completely, and the only pathway to teacher certification was through the local university. States still generally grant certification to teachers, even though teacher certification is closely tied to local universities. A local university’s responsibility is to recommend certification for aspiring teachers upon program completion (Lieberman & Miller, 2014). Most universities concentrate mainly on preservice teachers’ training since teacher education programs became their responsibility.

Similarly, in-service teachers’ training became needed because so many teachers worked in isolation and felt they had little training in content and pedagogy (Lieberman & Miller, 2014). In the twentieth century, legislation required more standards for teachers, which led to more learning opportunities. Lieberman and Miller (2014) discuss three major educational reforms that forced teachers to increase their content and pedagogical knowledge. The first reform began with the Soviet Union’s launch of Sputnik in 1957 where the Soviet Union threatened U.S. space advancements. Teachers became the culprit for the U.S blunder, and this event led to increased obligations for teachers, particularly in mathematics and science instruction (Lieberman & Miller, 2014).

The second educational reform was due to fear concerning rapid economic growth in Japan. This reform became known as The Nation at Risk in 1983, urging schools to increase the rigorous student expectations in order to boost the placement of the U.S. in the global economy. Almost twenty years later, George W. Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001, which mandated that schools increase their reading and mathematics standards for students (Lieberman & Miller, 2014). Thus, NCLB required teachers to attend more trainings to help their students pull themselves out of this reading and mathematics deficit. State legislators passed the
CCSS in reading and mathematics in forty-three states in 2013; these standards also were put into practice as a way to increase student and teacher expectations, while at the same time standardizing the expectation for every student (Ravitch, 2017).

Most recently, Ravitch (2017) discussed the most recent reform effort, the reauthorization of NCLB became the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Implemented during the 2017-2018 academic school year, the ESSA included annual testing and increased each state’s involvement in accountability. State delegation decreased the federal government’s emphasis, yet Ravitch (2017) suggests this reauthorization will not positively impact student achievement. Despite the bleak outlook on student achievement, “teachers should work together in schools were collaboration and teamwork are prized” (Ravitch, 2017, p. xxxix). Even with new federal mandates, teachers are required to engage in PD to influence their pedagogical practices.

**Characteristics of Effective Professional Development**

In light of PD’s history and the necessity for teachers’ participation in PD, it is crucial to examine the research on quality PD. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) reviewed thirty-five studies in three decades to discern effective PD characteristics and stated that effective PD (a) is content specific; (b) incorporates active learning; (c) supports collaboration, typically in job-embedded contexts; (d) uses models and modeling of effective practice; (e) provides coaching and expert support; (f) affords opportunities for feedback and reflection; and (g) is of sustained duration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 4).

**Content-Specific**

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) found that most studies on quality PD related to the teachers’ content areas. This subject specificity made it relevant to the teachers’ needs. Fine et al. (2011) echoed that the most effective PD focused on content. Literacy examples were connected
to teachers’ specific content areas, and as a result, teachers reported a content focus increased the PD’s effectiveness.

**Active Learning**

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) relied on Trotter (2006) to argue that effective professional development engages adults in active learning. This adult learning development theory recognizes teachers’ authentic experiences, choice, and reflection as crucial components to their learning. In this way, they desire time to experiment and reflect on PD opportunities. Similarly, Durksen, Klassen, and Daniels (2017) reported that “time and space to think” were crucial reasons for PD (p. 58).

**Collaboration**

Effective PD involves professionals’ collaborative efforts (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010; Durksen, Klassen, & Daniels, 2017; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). Teachers learn through social interactions with other teachers and appreciate opportunities to engage in dialogue about relevant topics with colleagues. One teacher exemplified how she enjoyed collaborative efforts when she reported that “it’s nice to have somebody else to pick their brain” (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016, p. 8). Situated in collaborative communities, teachers grapple with challenges and engage in dialogue in relevant contexts with people who share similar concerns. Little (2002) provided an example of this everyday routine as teachers in a high school English department discussed feedback to students’ written assignments. These teachers wanted to grade consistently across the English department. As teachers worked together, they began to develop a consistent tool to help them provide feedback on future assignments.

In the same way that PD comprised relevant topics situated in everyday routines, the literature suggested that teachers learned through school-based communities (Bocala, 2015; Johnson & Golombek, 2016). Bocala (2015) pointed out the importance of teacher-led PD where
other teachers helped their colleagues. Riveros, Newton, and Burgess (2012) also highlighted the importance of teacher agency in collaborative professional environments, framing teacher learning using a situated approach where “professional knowledge is enacted in the teachers’ practices and actions” (p. 209). When teachers took an active role through leading and providing the content for professional learning sessions, teachers were more likely to listen to information when they knew the person sharing the information had actually undergone similar experiences.

Similarly, Levine & Marcus (2010) reiterated the impact of teacher vulnerability and willingness to share in collaborative settings with colleagues, and how this interaction directly influenced teacher learning. These researchers stated that the more frequently teachers had the opportunity to empathize and learn from colleagues’ experiences and expertise, the more meaningful the learning. Within these school-based teacher-led sessions, the research emphasized administrative support as an important determining factor in the PD’s success (DelliCarpini, 2018; Fink & Markholt, 2011). Without administrative support, teachers lost sight of the PD’s purpose. Administrative support also provided accountability to bolster the likelihood of implementation.

**Models and Modelling**

Quality PD also includes models and modelling. The models can include but are not limited to videos, classroom scenarios, demonstration lessons, and classroom observations (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Koellner & Jacobs, 2015; Levine & Marcus, 2010). Baecher, Rorimer, and Smith’s (2012) study asked seven high school teachers to participate in video-mediated PD sessions to learn pedagogical strategies for ESL students. Participating teachers made the videos and recorded actual teaching models in a classroom environment most applicable to the teachers’ needs. The findings implicated that teacher-made videos are effective forms of PD when teachers have an opportunity to engage in dialogue with other colleagues.
about pedagogy. Koellner and Jacobs (2015) similarly argued for an adaptive professional development model where teachers engage with other colleagues wrestling with a collective problem. Their model extended the cognitive model to practice where teachers were analyzing and developing a solution to an observable problem in teaching and learning in middle school mathematics classrooms through what they referred to as the Problem-Solving Cycle Model (PSC). This model used video observation and analysis to better understand instructional and student challenges in mathematics classrooms. Situating their understanding of teacher learning in communities of practice, Koellner & Jacobs (2015) found that sustained and cyclical approach to professional development led to improved instructional practice and student achievement.

**Coaching and Support**

Effective PD also involves opportunities for teachers to seek advice from experts on the particular PD topic. Follow-up coaching is also an effective way to sustain the PD implementation. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) articulated that teachers who were willing to lead PD can also be effective coaches because they know the teachers and school environment. This familiarity conveys the idea that teachers want to listen to experts who share similar experiences.

**Reflection and Feedback**

Reflection and feedback additionally were crucial to effective PD (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Durksen, Klassen, & Daniels, 2017). Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) articulated that it is not enough to provide only reflection opportunities at the end of a PD session. Instead, quality PD sessions “provide built-in time for teachers to think about, receive input on, and make changes to their practice by providing intentional time for feedback and/or reflection” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 14).

**Sustained Duration**
Quality PD also engages teachers in learning opportunities of sustained duration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, Desimone, 2009). Episodic or fragmented PD decreases learning opportunities; rather, teachers needed multiple opportunities to engage in dialogue, experiment, and reflect. While research does not unanimously quantify how long effective PD lasts, it indicates anywhere from twenty hours (Desimone, 2009) to forty-nine hours (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007) and possibly lasting up to one semester (Desimone, 2009). The objective with sustained duration is not to meet a certain number of hours or a particular time-frame. Instead, effective PD includes multiple sessions around one topic during a reasonable time period. With an understanding of the characteristics of PD, this chapter now moves to discuss PD from the teacher’s perspective, highlighting teachers’ voices to explain their thoughts on PD.

**Teacher PD Expectations**

DeLuca, Bolden and Chan (2017) surveyed elementary school teachers across fifteen school districts and reported characteristics that influenced collaborative PD sessions. The positive characteristics included release time to participate in PD, school-embedded opportunities, teachers’ choice in inquiry, time necessity, teachers as experts, and contribution to student success. The PD challenges include a rapid shift between initiatives, missed instructional time, and the time commitment to sustain these PD opportunities.

Likewise, Penner-Williams, Díaz, and Worthen (2017) surveyed elementary and secondary school teachers about their perceptions on PD effectiveness. Participants participated in a federally funded two-year PD opportunity in Arkansas specifically related to ESL instruction. It is important to note that teachers received endorsements in English as a Second Language upon completion of the PD. Teachers overwhelmingly reported that they learned information and strategies to help them teach ESL students. Thus, it can be inferred that teachers
wanted opportunities to increase their content knowledge since the PD was related to increasing knowledge of working with ESL students as a stipulation for their endorsements.

Other studies reported that teachers wanted to engage in reflective dialogue about shared practice (Schneider & Kipp, 2015). Collaborative teaching was also perceived as effective PD because teachers enjoyed working collaboratively to meet students’ needs (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010). Teachers perceived a renewed energy to improve instructional practice, develop curriculum, and change professional practice (Gallo-Fox & Scantlebury, 2016).

A synthesis of these studies shows that the characteristics of quality PD parallel practicing teachers’ expectations of PD. Therefore, practicing teachers stated they wanted PD opportunities related to their content area in relevant job-embedded opportunities. Teachers also wanted choice in selecting PD. A desire for collaborative efforts as PD is the largest similarity across multiple studies (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010; Gallo-Fox & Scantlebury, 2016; Penner-Williams, Díaz, & Worthen, 2017); thus, PD opportunities that emphasize collaboration are typically referred to as professional learning communities (PLCs). This chapter will now discuss PLCs as a PD trend across many schools and districts.

**Professional Development’s Current Trend**

The current educational trend is to design and structure PLCs in which teachers assemble in groups or communities to improve their instructional practice and impact student learning. PLCs are popular because they involve collaboration and offer a unique form of PD in job-embedded contexts (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). PLCs function in schools in various ways to the point where researchers and practitioners use this term to refer to any collaborative effort between teachers (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008; Watson, 2014). This overuse can lead to ambiguous definitions and representations in school contexts and potentially cause PLCs to lose their meaning altogether (DuFour, 2004).
Due to PLCs’ popularity and their potential positive impact on improved instructional practice and student achievement, it is important to define PLCs at the outset as collaborative learning groups where teachers refine their practice to impact increased student learning in order to guide this discussion. DuFour (2004) described five components of PLCs, including a) a focus on student learning, b) collaborative efforts, c) a commitment to remove the barriers, d) a concentration on student results and achievement, and e) a persistence and commitment to achieve shared goals.

**Student Learning**

The first characteristic of PLCs is to focus on student learning rather than teaching. In classrooms across the U.S., teachers focused on teaching the curricula, and while they knew that every student did not actually learn the material, they felt compelled to move on to the next concept or skill for a variety of reasons (DuFour, 2004). Yet, for PLCs to be effective, teachers needed to focus on what the student actually learned from the content.

**Collaboration**

In order for PLCs to be effective, they must be collaborative. However, teachers actually preferred to work in isolation (Bair, 2013) for fear of making their practice public (Le Fevre, 2014). Focusing on student data helped alleviate this pressure because the attention was taken off the teacher and placed on the students’ observable actions (DuFour, 2004).

**Removal of the Barriers**

The participating members in PLCs should also resist giving excuses and instead provide opportunities for improved practice in PLCs (DuFour, 2004). This effort involved both administrators making space for collaborative opportunities and teachers taking advantage of these opportunities by actually engaging in dialogue with their colleagues.

**Concentration on Student Results**
The goal of effective PLCs is improving student achievement; thus, all discussions are data-driven (DuFour, 2004). This data focus eliminated extraneous topics that did not directly relate to student results.

**Commitment and Persistence**

Participating members in effective PLCs commit to the shared goal and duration of the PLC (DuFour, 2004). This commitment involved resilience, hard work, and dedication. Persistence characterized effective PLCs because evidence of student results may not be automatically visible. For meaningful change, teachers persisted and applied different researched strategies until evidence of student results was observable.

Given the above characteristics of effective PLCs, a review of the literature is needed to synthesize the commonalities of PLCs across the U.S. Teaching and learning are cultural activities (Kennedy, 2016; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999), so this search has been delineated to include studies related to PLCs in the U.S. There is also a need to focus on in-service teachers, so the studies described below reflect these parameters. A synthesis of the literature reveals two broad categories of similarities in previous studies. These categories include an emphasis on instructional practice and barriers in PLCs.

**An Emphasis on Instruction**

Popp and Goldman (2016) examined the discourse in PLCs in elementary schools to determine whether the meeting task led to an increase in student learning in ELA. The findings showed that most topics focused on teacher instruction, which revealed less learning. However, when the teachers focused on assessment, they provided evidence from student results. These findings are consistent with earlier studies that encourage a focus on student learning rather than teaching (DuFour, 2004; Slavit, Nelson, & Deuel, 2013).
Similarly, Farrell and Marsh (2016) explored how teachers utilized data to drive instruction in five middle schools. Their findings revealed that most schools showed no instructional change. Yet, some schools did have instructional change when there were internal data sources and a committed school culture. The teachers in schools that showed instructional change used school data to drive instruction. In the schools that did not show instructional change, teachers had access only to external data sources and were not part of a committed school culture. These findings implicate that school data might be more effective in bringing about instructional change. DuFour (2004) suggested the creation of common assessments that teachers create. The teachers could then use the data from the common assessments to drive instructional practice. Furthermore, these findings highlighted the significance of the school culture in forging instructional change, particularly school leadership. The schools with no instructional change felt that their school leaders did not explicitly encourage or hold teachers accountable for data-driven instruction.

Baecher, Rorimer, and Smith (2012) studied how high school teachers in a PLC engaged in video-mediated inquiry to increase their knowledge of differentiation strategies for ESL students. The teachers reported that they feared teachers watching their videos initially for fear of judgment, indicating a brief desire to keep their instruction private (Bair, 2013). Nonetheless, as teachers began to focus on observable student behaviors, they established trust in professional relationships. Thus, all teachers perceived positive feelings toward reflective dialogue in PLCs. This participation brought about teacher learning for ESL students. The success in providing opportunities for teachers’ learning is most likely attributed to the shift to discuss observable student behaviors.

**Barriers in PLCs**
Another common theme in this literature review showed how barriers in PLCs can hinder their success. The main barrier identified in the literature is administrative support (Craig, 2013; Farrell & Marsh, 2016; Garcia & Gomez, 2017). Craig (2013) utilized qualitative narrative inquiry to explore a first-year teacher’s unsuccessful membership in a PLC. Administration forced participation in this PLC, which ultimately led to teachers leaving or changing schools. These findings highlighted the school culture’s impact, particularly involving the school leader, on the success of the PLC.

Similarly, Garcia and Gomez (2017) explored how high school teachers incorporated games into the curriculum through their involvement in a PLC. This emphasis on gaming was part of a larger district initiative to incorporate game theory in classrooms. After their year-long involvement, the teachers began to shift their focus from the district-level curricular expectations to teacher engagement, which mostly consisted of fun activities. Additionally, the school leader did not support the district initiative, which perpetuated the teachers’ tendency to engage in fun activities rather than the district’s focus. These findings implicate that school leadership does affect the overall PLC’s success. As such, the school leader creates and maintains a school culture that focuses on student outcomes. In light of PLCs’ barriers and instructional purpose, it is important to focus on studies on content and ESL teachers’ collaboration.

**Relevant Studies on Content and ESL Teachers’ Collaboration**

The benefits of content and ESL teachers’ collaboration are documented (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018), yet these collaborative efforts also have their challenges, such as lack of planning time, hectic schedules, different epistemological beliefs, and inconsistent administrative support (Arkoudis, 2003; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010). Collaborative models and efforts are two main categories from previous studies on ESL and content teacher collaboration.

**Collaborative Models**
Collaborative models draw on previous studies from special education and research on second language teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Cook and Friend’s (1995) models concentrated on content and special education teachers’ collaboration and included team teaching, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, and one teach-one assist approaches (Cook & Friend, 1995). In team teaching, both teachers instruct and share responsibility for students. More specifically, “the teachers might take turns leading a discussion, or one may speak while the other demonstrates a concept, or one might speak while the other models note taking on a projection system” (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 8). The shared responsibility necessitates a strong relationship and a willingness to work together for students. Additionally, teachers must be willing to plan together because both teachers are instructors and need to plan teaching roles. When teachers instruct using station teaching, “teachers divide instructional content into two, three, or more segments and present the content at separate locations within the classroom” (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 7). In this model, both teachers need to know the instructional content and feel comfortable delivering the information to students. As with team-teaching, teachers need a strong professional relationship.

Cook and Friend’s (1995) third model was parallel teaching. In this model, “the teachers plan the instruction jointly, but each delivers it to a heterogeneous group consisting of half the class” (p. 7). This model reduces the number of students, but both teachers are responsible for instruction; thus, they need to know the content well. Since both teachers are teaching, they need to engage in many planning sessions to discuss teaching roles and instructional materials. In alternative teaching, one teacher instructs a student group in a separate classroom, while the other teacher teaches the other students. This model can be effective prior to teaching if certain students need prior knowledge before instruction. It can also be effective after instruction if some students need additional practice or someone to re-teach the material. When using the alternative
teaching model, teachers must be strategic because “the greatest risk in this approach is stigmatizing students with disabilities by grouping them for re-teaching repeatedly, with or without other students included as group members” (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 8). In order to minimize the stigma students might experience, Cook and Friend (1995) recommended that teachers choose different student groups for each activity and vary the student grouping often.

The fifth co-teaching model was the one teach-one assist model. Two teachers are the instructors, but one teacher is the clear leading teacher while the other teacher assisted in a facilitating role. The one teach-one assist model takes the least planning time and works most effectively with different schedules; however, the risk is that when one teacher took a leading role, he/she might assume the most responsibility. Cook and Friend (1995) reiterated the risks, stating, “When one teacher only observes or assists, especially if this role is assigned to the special educator, he or she may feel like a glorified teaching assistant. Students might question that teacher's authority in the classroom, too” (p. 7). This facilitative position can lead to the co-teacher’s relegated instructional position. To avoid the relegation, Cook and Friend (1995) suggested that teachers alternate teaching roles frequently where both teachers assume the leading and assisting role at different times.

When applied specifically to second language teaching, similar collaborative teaching models exist (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Dove and Honigsfeld (2018) presented the following seven models for content and ESL teachers:

1. **One Group: One Leads, One ‘Teaches on Purpose’**: “One teacher assumes a leading role and the other a supporting one” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 57). This supporting role is carefully delineated to include the supporting teacher’s “purpose” in the classroom to assuage the supporting teacher’s relegation, which means that this teacher must have a specific role in the classroom.
2. **One Group: Two Teach the Same Content**: “[Teachers] may remain in front of the whole class to deliver instruction or, alternatively, may occupy different places in the classroom. In either context, each teacher has different roles and responsibilities to support student learning” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 75).

3. **One Group: One Teaches, One Assesses**: “One teacher leads the instruction for the entire group while the other teacher collects formative assessment data by circulating around the class, observing students to evaluate their skills and abilities, most often according to some criteria that have been set” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 96). This model was in response to the accountability demands specified in ESSA.

4. **Two Groups: Two Teach Same Content**: “Students are set into two groups for instruction that are fairly equal in size. However, the main objective for each collaborative teaching team is to maintain high expectations and develop rigorous lessons for all students as instruction is planned for two separate group” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 115).

5. **Two Groups: One Preteaches, One Teaches Alternative Information**: “The purpose of the class configuration [two groups] is to allow one group of students to engage in a minilesson with one teacher to gain the essential knowledge, strategies, or skills for successful completion of the set of objectives for the scheduled lesson. In turn, the other group of students is exposed to alternative information, which might also include previewing the topic with the second teacher using various materials not part of the main lesson to explore the subject matter” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 137).

6. **Two Groups: One Reteaches, One Teaches Alternative Information**: This model is similar to model five because the student configuration still consists of two groups. As the name implies, one teacher reinforces the material after instruction while the second
teacher teaches additional material. “[Teachers] begin to devote more attention to the
development of critical skills through reviewing and practicing what has already been
taught, as to afford ESL students—and others who need it—more explicit teaching of target
skills” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 160).

7. **Multiple Groups: Two Monitor/Teach:** This model places students into smaller groups,
and the two teachers monitor group work or instruct in smaller groups. “This model sets as
a priority cooperation or collaboration of student learning together in teams under the
supervision of one or more teachers, or small groups of students working under the direct
instruction and guidance of one of the teaching partners” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p.
185).

Dove & Honigsfeld (2018) stated that one particular model will not work for every
teaching situation; instead, teachers should adapt the models to suit their instructional needs in
consideration of their students’ needs. When teachers divide students into smaller or multiple
groups, they should not target ESL students only (e.g., ESL students’ homogeneous grouping).
Rather, groups should include all students so that one student group is not isolated, and all
students receive the needed instruction.

Davison (2006) deepened understanding of the collaborating teachers’ attitudes and
actions during collaboration. Placing these stages on a continuum, Davison (2006) created
Pseudocompliance, Compliance, Accommodation, Convergence, and Creative Co-construction
to evaluate effectiveness of collaboration. The beginning stages (e.g., Pseudocompliance)
described teachers most resistant to collaboration, while the latter stages described teachers
frequently engaging in collaborative efforts (e.g., Creative Co-construction). The Pseudo-
compliant teachers showed a willingness to collaborate initially, but after a brief time period,
they did not demonstrate collaborative actions. These teachers also may exhibit an outright
rejection of collaboration. Collaboration may or may not have been forced (e.g., school initiative, administration), and the teachers showed “little or no real investment of time or understanding” (Davison, 2006, p. 467). Exhibiting a willingness to collaborate, “compliant teachers believe that they should support the idea because it was best for the children although they were not convinced that it was necessarily best for them” (Davison, 2006, p. 466). These teachers explicitly agreed that collaboration is best for ESL students, yet they may not have believed it wholeheartedly. They also may not know what was best for ESL students because they had never been directly taught and/or had no prior experience working with ESL students (Rubinstein-Avila & Lee, 2014).

Continuing to move along the continuum, the Accommodating teachers eagerly collaborate but exhibit little theoretical knowledge about collaboration and/or second language instruction. Hence, these teachers try “to accommodate” the collaborating teacher (Davison, 2006, p. 467). The Accommodating teachers see the collaborative benefits but need additional experimentation/practice to collaboratively teach with another teacher. These teachers may seem emphatic on specific co-teaching roles. On the other hand, the Convergent teachers willingly collaborate and positively acknowledge the collaborative benefits. Teachers have a positive attitude and collaborate frequently together. However, there are still conflicts that hinder collaborative fluidity. Teachers still may have contradictory views about collaboration and/or ESL instruction.

Davison’s (2006) most collaborative stage is Creative Co-construction. The Creative Co-constructing teachers have a positive attitude, collaborated willingly, and know how to resolve conflicts as they arise. In this stage, the teachers’ roles are shared and mutually divided. Contrasted from Compliant teachers, the Creative co-constructing teachers engage in conflict resolution and accept conflicts as a healthy, productive part of the teaching partnership. There is
also a strong professional relationship where both teachers trust one another to make instructional decisions to instruct ESL students.

Similarly, Bell and Baecher (2012) relied on their Continuum of Collaboration that included frequency and formality (Baecher & Bell, 2011). The researchers found that most surveyed respondents used and favored a “pull-out” approach to ESL instruction. Honigsfeld and Dove (2010) define the pull-out and push-in instructional models, stating:

As indicated by their names, the ESL specialist either (a) provides ESL services in a designated area outside the classroom (usually in a specially equipped ESL classroom)—thus the name pull-out, or (b) he or she offers language support in the general-education classroom, also referred to as inclusion or plug-in ESL. (p. 10)

Most interactions were informal. When teachers used the “push-in” model, they did not indicate more frequent interactions. Participants were from various national and international contexts, including this study’s state.

**Collaborative Efforts**

In addition to research on collaborative models, earlier research reported that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration can make evident challenges, such as inconsistent schedules (Giles, 2018; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016), an unsupportive school culture (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; McClure, 2012; Pawan & Ortloff, 2011; Samuelson, Pawan, & Hung, 2012, Schneider, Huss-Lederman, & Sherlock 2012; Russell, 2012), teachers’ personality conflicts (Arkoudis, 2003; Turner, 2015), and the ESL teacher’s relegated role (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; Arkoudis, 2003, Creese, 2002; Flores, 2012; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). However, ESL and content teachers’ collaboration can lead to teachers’ learning (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014; Peercy, Martin-Beltrán, Yazan, DeStefano, 2017), a strengthened collegial partnership (Bell & Baecher, 2012), and
increased ESL students’ learning outcomes (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Gladman, 2015; Spezzini & Becker, 2012) if collaborating teachers are willing to share common teaching goals (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2012; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016; Peercy & Martin-Beltrán, 2012) and enact agency (Arkoudis, 2006; Giles, 2018) to work through the collaborative challenges.

**Inconsistent Schedules**

ESL and content teachers’ different schedules can pose challenges in collaboration where more time is needed to sustain collaborative partnerships (Giles, 2018; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). While ESL and content teachers’ enjoyed collaboration, they were unable to establish a “consistent routine” (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016, p. 18), which made collaboration more difficult. This inconsistent schedule is most likely attributed to the ESL teachers’ schedules (Giles, 2018; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016) because they usually teach multiple grades; these schedules make collaboration challenging because the ESL teachers may not always be available to co-teach with the content teacher, which might put more work on the content teacher (Giles, 2018).

**Unsupportive School Community**

An unsupportive school community can constrain opportunities for ESL and content teachers’ collaboration (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; Arkoudis, 2003; DelliCarpini, 2018; Hargreaves, 1994; Pawan & Ortloff, 2011; Schneider, Huss-Lederman, & Sherlock 2012; Russell, 2012). Coerced collaborative efforts compel or force teachers to collaborate. This collaboration can be a result of school-based initiatives (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016) or policy reform (Arkoudis, 2003; Hargreaves, 1994) in which one attempts to manufacture a collaborative teaching partnership without the willingness of both teachers to collaborate (Ahmed, Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016). The school leadership shapes the school community’s
attitude toward collaboration (DelliCarpini, 2018) to the point where “administrative support for the practice was the most powerful predictor of a general educator’s positive feelings toward [collaboration]” (Villa, Thousand, Nevin, & Liston, 2005, p. 43). This means that school leadership needs to create a school community that supports yet does not force collaboration because teachers appreciate collaborative efforts when their expertise is validated (Walker & Edstam, 2013); however, forced collaborative efforts constrained opportunities and alienated teachers to where they would rather work alone or in isolation (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; DelliCarpini, 2018; Hargreaves, 1994). Finding the balance between supportive and voluntary collaborative efforts can be challenging but necessary if ESL and content teachers are to form and sustain partnerships.

**Teachers’ Personality Conflicts**

Teachers’ divergent epistemological beliefs (Arkoudis, 2003) or different personalities (Turner, 2015) can make collaboration more difficult. For example, the science teacher’s beliefs that the ESL teacher’s contribution to the mainstream classroom led to “frilled-up science” when the ESL teacher suggested a more constructivist approach made obvious that the science teacher feared that a different teaching approach reduced the rigor of the science curriculum (Arkoudis, 2003, p. 171). This difference can make ESL teachers question how much responsibility they should take in the mainstream classroom or conclude that personality differences constrain (or prevent) collaboration (Turner, 2015).

**The ESL Teacher’s Relegated Role**

Another major challenge in collaboration is the ESL teacher’s relegated role in the mainstream classroom (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2002; Flores, 2012; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Without a distinct subject to claim, the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream classroom can take the form of a classroom assistant (Peercy,
Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016) or resemble a relationship where the ESL teacher’s expertise is ignored altogether (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016). To illustrate, the ESL teacher, the fifth-grade classroom teacher, and the literacy specialist co-taught reading strategies during the language arts section of the class. Due to this literacy focus, the ESL teacher reported that she felt unvalued and even sometimes ignored because the fifth-grade teacher favored the literacy specialist’s suggestions over hers (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016). Students also recognized these unequal roles between teachers. Creese (2002) reported how a student viewed the ESL teacher as the less proper teacher because of their different explanatory styles. Even when the mainstream teacher tried to suggest otherwise, the student still recognized the hierarchical positions in the classroom (Creese, 2002). McClure and Cahnmann-Taylor (2010) also found that these professional interactions created a hierarchical structure that led to the ESL teacher’s relegation. The findings challenged traditional push-in approaches because the ESL teacher was not treated as a respected collaborating teacher. Rather, she was treated as a bilingual classroom assistant. The researchers examined nineteen elementary classrooms where the content teachers told the ESL teacher what to teach without asking for the ESL teacher’s input. This role was mediated and exacerbated by language, race, and ethnicity because most of the classroom teachers were white middle-class teachers. The ESL teachers were bilingual, and the classroom teachers frequently called on the ESL teachers to translate and exhibit cultural knowledge. However, the classroom teachers did not exhibit a genuine willingness to learn about cultural differences or help the elementary ESL students. The roles were separate, and the ESL teacher was responsible for ESL instruction, mainly because of her bilingual abilities.

**Overcoming Challenges in Collaboration**

The above-mentioned challenges can be overcome if teachers work through them to sustain the collaborative partnership. When teachers share teaching goals (Peercy, Ditter,
DeStefano, 2016; Peercy & Martin-Beltrán, 2012) and instructional tools (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2012; Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014; Martin-Beltrán, Peercy, & Selvi, 2012), they can make collaboration work. Tools included, but were not limited to, technology, lesson plans, pacing guides, assessment tools, and shared calendars. Challenges were even overcome within strict directives to meet curricular frameworks and new CCSS (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2012).

An additional study showed that teachers can learn new instructional ideas (i.e., written assignments, multimodal presentations, vocabulary methods) in co-planning and co-teaching the CCSS even while also recognizing the difficulties of implementation (Peercy, Martin-Beltrán, Yazan, & DeStefano, 2017). Peercy, DeStefano, Yazan, and Martin-Beltrán (2016) also argued that the CCSS could create more equitable learning opportunities for Emergent Bilinguals (EBs), because this curricular reform necessitates collaborative efforts between the ESL and content teachers.

**Teacher Agency**

Teacher agency is a crucial factor in sustaining collaborative partnerships (Arkoudis, 2003; Giles, 2018; Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; McGriff & Protacio, 2015). I view agency as “[the teacher’s] ability to make choices, take control, self-regulate, and thereby pursue their goals as individuals leading, potentially, to personal or social transformation” (Duff, 2012, p. 417). These choices, however, are always “socioculturally-mediated” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112), which means that sociocultural influences constrain the teacher’s actions. For example, in Arkoudis’ (2003) study, the ESL teacher asserted agency and maintained authority by frequently questioning the science teacher’s beliefs about science. The teacher’s agency and authority sustained the collaborative planning session despite different epistemological beliefs. Similarly, McGriff and Protacio (2015) used a multiple case study in which an ESL middle school teacher primarily exercised agency through a school-wide initiative to teach content-specific vocabulary.
Her self-positioning as someone capable of offering helpful strategies and equipping teachers and administrators to participate enhanced her colleagues’ positioning acts. The content teachers viewed the ESL teacher as a resource and solicited her feedback when making decisions, thus, implicating how the ESL teacher’s agency might overcome these relegated positions.

Teachers’ Learning

There is evidence to support that teachers learn in and through ESL and content teachers’ collaboration when they work through the challenges (Giles, 2018; Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014; Peercy, Martin-Beltrán. Yazan, & DeStefano, 2017). Collaboration created “mediational spaces” (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014, p. 5) where ESL and content teachers used tools (e.g., a curricular framework, co-created lesson plans) to co-construct knowledge about teaching goals and classroom roles even when disagreement arose. This means that ESL and content teachers drew on each other’s knowledge-base and expertise (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2017). This learning can lead to the content teacher’s renewed understanding about the ESL students’ language differences and language strategies (e.g., sentence frames, paragraph scaffolds) in the mainstream classroom (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019) and/or the ESL teacher’s learning to initiate and sustain collaborative partnerships with content teachers (Giles, 2018).

ESL Students’ Increased Outcomes

ESL and content teachers’ collaboration can lead to increased ESL students’ outcomes (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Gladman, 2015; Spezzini & Becker, 2012). These outcomes can mean that ESL students participate more when ESL and content teachers collaborate (Gladman, 2015) or lead to increased learning opportunities (Spezzini & Becker, 2012). High
school ESL students’ participation in a summer book club program contributed to higher graduation rates for ESL students (Spezzini & Becker, 2012), and teachers’ planning and teaching acts created increased opportunities for ESL students’ participation (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019). ESL students’ increased outcomes, and more specifically, ESL students’ participation will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

ESL Students’ Participation

The study defines ESL students’ participation as the ESL students’ observable classroom behaviors and work samples in mainstream middle school classrooms. Drawing on positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999), ESL students’ classroom participation depends on the students’ multiple and dynamic reflexive and interactive positions made available to them in the mainstream classroom. Their positions lead students to act in particular ways made obvious through their observable behaviors and work samples. An exploration of ESL students’ participation reveals insights into learning opportunities for ESL students with the assumption that increased ESL students’ participation creates more opportunities for learning (Duff, 2001; Kayi-Aydar, 2014; Harklau, 2000; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2008). However, there is little known recent research that examines ESL students’ participation in the mainstream classroom (Duff, 2001; Gersten, 1999; Harklau, 2000; Klingner & Vaughn, 2000; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Miller, 2000; Pappamihiel, 2002; Yoon, 2008).

Participation in Mainstream K-12 Classrooms

Duff (2001) found that ESL students faced challenges in two social studies mainstream classrooms because of the content’s orality demands and ESL students’ difficulty understanding narrative without visuals. The social teachers’ reference to pop culture without explanation hindered ESL students’ participation, and affective factors (e.g., lack of confidence and fear) made ESL students’ participation more difficult because they were afraid to ask for clarification.
Pappamihiel’s (2002) findings support Duff’s (2001) findings in that middle school ESL students were more anxious in the mainstream classroom than in the ESL classroom based on ESL students’ perceptions from survey and focus group interviews. When asked to explain their anxiety in mainstream classes, participants responded, “The ones who know English and Spanish get impatient. They don’t want to work with [ESL students]...if I say something wrong, they laugh” (Pappamihiel, 2002, p. 340). ESL students were reluctant to participate in the mainstream classroom for fear of other bilingual students not having the desire to assist ESL students and for ridiculing them when they did not understand. Miller (2000) showed similar findings in her study of Asian immigrant newcomers at an Australian high school. The ESL students were reluctant to participate because they feared their classmates would not understand or ridicule their accent.

On the other hand, Harklau’s (2000) finding showed how student and teacher positionings of ESL students as hardworking made students eager to participate in the high school classroom. However, the ESL students’ experiences were not the same at the university level. When ESL students wrote narratives about their experiences coming to the U.S in high school, they felt that their teachers admired their perseverance and determination despite their linguistic mistakes. However, when the ESL students enrolled in universities, they experienced different student representations. Even though the ESL students lived in the U.S. for several years and considered themselves part of the U.S. culture, they received the label as newcomers because they took ESL classes and were not born in the U.S. This student representation constrained their participatory actions in the university to the point where they resisted by not completing assignments in some cases, which fueled the teachers’ perceptions that the ESL students needed more assistance and were not adequately prepared to take university courses.

Martin-Beltrán (2010) echoed the teachers’ influence in contributing to ESL students’ participation in a fifth-grade dual language classroom where she examined the ESL students’
perceived English proficiency. The ESL students’ proficiency based on teachers’ and students’ perceptions related to ESL students’ participation because ESL students with higher perceived proficiency exhibited more participatory actions than those with less perceived proficiency. Students formed social networks based on these perceived proficiency constructions, and these constructions shifted in different social and academic settings. This study’s findings implicate how participation in socially-constructed and pinpoints the teacher as a powerful contributor to shaping an ESL student’s English proficiency and subsequently ESL students’ participation in the mainstream classroom.

Yoon (2008) also focused on how the content teacher’s beliefs and pedagogical practices related to ESL students’ participation in three English mainstream classrooms. To illustrate, Mrs. Young’s stated belief that “I am a teacher of children” led her to incorporate culturally-relevant pedagogy into her instruction, which made ESL students feel powerful in her classroom (Yoon, 2008, p. 505). The ESL students’ powerful feeling contributed to increased participation in the language arts classroom. Contrasted with Mrs. Young’s case, Mr. Brown viewed himself as “a model of an English speaker” and did not consider himself a teacher of ESL students (Yoon, 2008, p.509). These beliefs led to pedagogical choices that privileged an assumed American monolingual culture (e.g., references to football in the U.S.), which constrained ESL students’ participation because they did not always understand Mr. Brown’s cultural references and ultimately felt powerless. The third teacher, Mrs. Taylor, viewed herself as an English/content teacher who failed to distinguish ESL students’ language and content needs. She consequently focused on the English/language arts content and often viewed ESL students’ struggle in ELA as a problem with language. For this reason, ESL students felt invisible in Mrs. Taylor’s class and did not seek out participatory opportunities.
Klingner and Vaughn’s (2000) findings are similar to Yoon (2008) in showing how teachers’ pedagogical choices impact ESL students’ participation in a fifth-grade classroom with sixteen ESL students. The teacher used cooperative groups and arranged heterogeneously in mixed ability group. Within these groups, students focused on a specific reading strategy (i.e. cooperative strategic reading) in which students reviewed, clarified, discussed the gist, and made concluding remarks on a difficult science reading passage. Most students participated when they engaged in helping behaviors (e.g., comprehension check, elaboration, explicit instruction, vocabulary translation), and they spent the most time clarifying information and/or providing a vocabulary translation for ESL students. There was some evidence to support participation in these cooperative groups impacted student performance on a vocabulary test because some ESL students made a higher grade on later vocabulary tests.

**Participation in University Contexts**

Some studies extend beyond the mainstream K-12 classroom to include ESL settings in university contexts (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Harklau, 2000; Kayi-Aydar, 2014; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012) and/or mainstream university settings (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Morita, 2004). Ellwood & Nakane (2009) exemplified how speech or talk is privileged in university settings, suggesting that university professors appreciate when students contribute to classroom lectures and discussions based on student and teacher perceptions. However, the professors were less likely to create opportunities for increased talk if they perceived students were quiet or did not want to talk. Professors in ESL classes were more likely to create opportunities for ESL students to talk.

Kayi-Aydar (2014) problematized the notion that students’ talk creates similar learning opportunities for all students in an ESL university course. Two ESL students were talkative and disruptive in an oral skills classroom. While both students exhibited similar classroom
participation, they developed opposite “positional identities” over the course of the semester, meaning that the students’ acts create a particular label (e.g., hard-worker, disruptive student) over time (Kayi-Aydar, 2014, p. 688). That is, one student became an outsider and the other an accepted classmate despite their unruly and talkative classroom behaviors. These different positional identities can be explained because the accepted student used humor and classroom norms (e.g., raising hand when the teacher talked), which showed he respected the ESL teacher’s authority. Therefore, multiple factors (e.g., students’ actions, personality, classroom norms, the teacher’s positioning) contribute to ESL students’ participation and positional identities.

Fewer studies scrutinized how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influences their participation in the mainstream classroom (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Gladman, 2015; Spezzini & Becker, 2012). For example, Gladman (2015) explored university students’ perceptions of team-teaching across the curriculum at a private college in Japan. Drawing on questionnaires, Gladman (2015) identified six categories (e.g., understanding, questions, participation, caretaking, partner relationship, complementary improvement) to show that team-teaching increased students’ understanding and ability to ask questions to two teachers committed to improve their own pedagogical practices and impact students’ learning. While team-teaching increased students’ participation, team-teaching also “work[ed] more effectively when the students themselves [asked] their team teachers questions actively when they [did] not understand something” (Gladman, 2015, p. 137). This suggests that ESL students’ participation and teachers’ collaboration impact each other, are linked in a complex way, and bring out particular consequences in the classroom.

A synthesis of studies on ESL participation in mainstream and ESL classrooms in K-12 and university contexts highlights the teacher’s role in influencing ESL students’ participation (Gersten, 1999; Harklau, 2000; Kayi-Aydar, 2014; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Morita, 2004; Yoon,
2008). More specifically, teachers position ESL students in complex ways based on their stated beliefs about teaching (Yoon, 2008), their notions concerning ESL students’ classroom behavior and performance (Harklau, 2000), their perceived constructions of ESL students’ English language proficiencies (Martin-Beltrán, 2010), and their own creations of student identities (Kayi-Aydar, 2014). Furthermore, the teacher’s pedagogical choices can enhance or constrain the ESL students’ classroom participation. Affording students opportunities to work in cooperative groups (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000) and use of home languages (Duff, 2001; Klingner & Vaughn, 2000) can encourage students to participate. Alternatively, using references to pop culture (Duff, 2001; Yoon, 2008) and teaching complex content topics (Duff, 2001) without adequate explanation and language strategies to help the ESL students access and master the content constrain ESL students’ participation. Students’ identities (Harklau, 2000; Kayi-Aydar, 2014) and affective factors (e.g., confidence, fear) (Miller, 2000; Pappamihiel, 2002) impact students’ willingness to participate.

Building on the above-mentioned studies of ESL students’ participation and how collaboration influences this participation (Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Gladman, 2015; Spezzini & Becker, 2002), the current investigation aims to address the literature gap on few known recent studies on how ESL and content teachers’ collaborative practices influence ESL students’ classroom participation in mainstream middle school classrooms.

**The Study’s Relation and Relevance**

Given the literature presented above, there are powerful opportunities to explore teacher learning in and through collaboration and how this collaboration positively affects ESL students’ classroom participatory outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). As such, collaborative efforts engage teachers in learning opportunities more effectively than more traditional teacher learning (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Further, teacher learning through
collaborative efforts is underexplored and undertheorized (Peercy, 2018), especially in
noted that departmental structures created an academic community with defined boundaries
marking the subject matter. This departmental structure can limit ESL and content teachers’
collaboration (Bell & Baecher, 2012), and the emphasis on content can create unequal roles
between teachers (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016) and make obvious different
epistemological beliefs (Arkoudis, 2003). Inconsistent planning time and different schedules can
additionally complicate content and ESL teachers’ collaborative efforts in the secondary
classroom (Dove and Honigsfeld, 2010; Giles, 2018; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016).

Thus, this study aims to investigate how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration
influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in mainstream content
classrooms. Building on sociocultural learning notions, the study seeks to show how content
teachers’ learn to plan for and teach ESL teachers in relevant, authentic collaborative
communities. Given the necessity to connect teacher learning to ESL students’ academic
outcomes, the study additionally seeks to show how content and ESL teachers’ collaborative
efforts influence ESL students’ classroom participation in the mainstream content classroom.

**Theoretical Framework**

This section presents the theoretical framework that undergirds the study. This section
begins with sociocultural learning theories and examines positioning theory (Davies & Harré,
1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as the study’s theoretical
framework. After explaining positioning theory as the theoretical lens, this section presents a
literature review and concludes with the study’s application of the theoretical framework in this
research design.

**Theory Defined**
Anfara and Mertz (2015) stated that many theoretical research definitions exist, and researchers should consider the theory’s impact on the overall research design. Crotty’s (1998) definition articulated that a researcher’s epistemologies and subjectivities provide the lens for the theoretical framework and methodology. Patton (2002) likewise believed that a researcher’s theory should inform her methodological choices, explaining, “How [the researchers] study the world determines what [they] learn about the world” (p. 125). This urges researchers to acknowledge the theory’s impact on the research design.

While Crotty (1998) and Patton (2002) assume that a theoretical framework should underpin the research methodology, others believe that a particular theory should underpin every aspect of the research design to the researcher’s positionality, methodologies, and findings. Bentz and Shapiro (1998) support this notion, stating:

Research is always carried out by an individual with a life and a life history...a personality, a social context, and various practical challenges and conflicts, all of which affect the research, from the choice of the research question or topic, through the method used, to the reporting of the project’s outcome. (p. 13)

Utilizing Bentz’s and Shapiro’s theoretical definition, I rely on Merriam’s (1998) notion that a “theory permeates the entire process of the case study research” (p. 60). Hence, I rely on Merriam’s notion and use positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as guides in this research design.

**Positioning Theory**

The study uses positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as its theoretical lens. Based on social psychology, an individual’s position “can be looked at as a loose set of rights and duties that limit the possibilities of actions” (Harré & Moghaddam, 2003, p. 5). Intertwined with their personal
beliefs, a person’s responsibilities shape their positions and actions. Harré & Moghaddam (2003) describe further a person’s actions when they distinguish between “logically possible actions” and “socially possible actions” (p. 5). A person’s positioning constrains all possibilities to socially appropriate actions.

More specifically, a person’s positions exist in two broad categories: reflexive (self) and interactive positions (Davies & Harré, 1990). The reflexive positioning refers to how people position themselves in the community and is always directed toward their social interactions. Interactive positioning provides an explanation of how one positions another person in the discursive community which describes the person’s social relationship. Taken together, positions and actions create storylines which are “established patterns of [social dynamic] development” (Harré & Moghaddam, 2003, p. 6). While storylines are repeated social interactions, they are not static and can change as individuals negotiate their reflexive and interactive positions in the discursive community. Thus, storylines are “episodes” that reveal multiple yet seemingly similar positions and actions (Harré & Moghaddam, 2003, p. 6).

In regard to this research study, ESL and content teachers’ reflexive and interactive positions set the parameters around the extent to which they collaboratively plan for and teach ESL students in the content classroom. The ESL and content teachers’ various positionings influence their collaborative actions and ultimately the content teachers’ learning possibilities. Similarly, since the teachers’ positions affect the collaborative activity, they also contribute to ESL students’ classroom participation during the collaborative teaching sessions. Hence, a detailed description of content teachers’ reflexive and interactive positions in co-planning for and co-teaching ESL students provides a lens in which to describe the possibilities for ESL students’ classroom participation.
Previous studies use positioning theory to understand how practicing teachers’ positions influence their pedagogical practices (Pinho & Andrade, 2015; Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2014), collegial relationships (Plaisance, Salas, & D’amico, 2017), and motivational classroom strategies (Kim & Viesca, 2016). There was also evidence on how teachers’ positions affect ESL students’ classroom participation (Yoon, 2008), and language proficiency classroom construction (Martin-Beltrán, 2010). An ESL teacher’s positions can additionally enhance or limit the school’s attitude toward ESL instruction (McGriff & Protacio, 2015). Earlier studies described practicing teachers’ positions and their influences. Yet, what is lesser known is how practicing teachers’ position themselves (reflexive positioning) and each other (interactive positioning) in collaboration with an ESL teacher. Thus, this study intends to examine content and ESL teachers’ positions, and how this collaborative positioning influences content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ classroom participation.

Chapter Two Summary

This chapter began with sociocultural explanations of teacher learning that emphasized learning through social interactions. This sociocultural view prioritizes the importance of the teacher learner, so an explanation of how teachers’ individual characteristics affect their learning approach was discussed. Next, this chapter explained the history of PD in the U.S. and described the characteristics of effective PD. Due to the use of PD for practicing teachers’ learning, it was also important to articulate the teachers’ perspectives on effective PD. In this way, these teachers wanted relevant content-specific PD opportunities in job-embedded routines. They also wanted choice in selecting PD. After discussing PD in the U.S., this chapter focused on PLCs because it is a popular form of PD that seeks to give teachers content-specific learning opportunities in job-embedded situations. This chapter also explored relevant studies on content and ESL teachers’
collaboration and ended with a discussion of positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) as the study’s theoretical framework
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the study’s methodology. It begins with the methodological assumptions and research questions that undergird the study. An explanation of the research design and a rationale for case study follow the research questions. The chapter explains the research setting, co-participants, and my dual participatory role as the ESL teacher and researcher. Lastly, this chapter includes the data collection procedures and data analysis methods.

Methodological Assumptions

Before explaining this research study’s methodology, it is crucial to articulate my own methodological assumptions that foreground the study. My personal inclination leans toward qualitative inquiry as the appropriate research framework for educational settings. Quantitative and other statistical methods show what is normative and rather obvious: ESL students underperform their monolingual peers. This consequently cannot interrogate the unfair standard that initially creates this assumed achievement gap nor provide a nuanced understanding into the complexities that influence this underperformance (García & Otheguy, 2017). It also cannot shed light on the possible ways that teachers are and have intervened to make a difference in the lives of ESL students. deMarrais (2004) describes the educational context for qualitative researchers and proceeds to argue for quality qualitative research that appeals to people’s emotions. She states, “Researchers and teachers live and work in contexts that are culturally, politically, interactionally, and emotionally messy, complex, and challenging” (deMarrais, 2004, p. 286).
This “complex” educational setting requires a research design that enables inquiry into teachers’ “messy” interactions, relationships, and practices.

This study also assumes that the researcher is not neutral. Denzin (2016) acknowledges the researcher’s position in a qualitative study, stating:

The qualitative researcher is not an objective, politically neutral observer who stands outside and above the study of the social world. Rather, the researcher is historically and locally situated within the very processes being studied...This self, as a set of shifting identities, has its own history with the situated practices that define and shape the public issues and private troubles being studied. (p. 23)

Relying on this assumption, I assume multiple identities as the ESL teacher and researcher, which make it impossible for me to separate myself from the research study. I have formed relationships within my professional world, and these relationships shape my interests and make inquiry possible. In doing so, my relationships with colleagues, life-histories, and identities influence and shape my approach to inquiry and research.

Third, the study aligns itself most closely with the critical paradigm in qualitative research that seeks to assume responsibility for the researcher’s positions in the social world and act to change practices for the betterment. Due to the abundant use of the term, critical, it is important to clarify its meaning and significance. Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) define this critical orientation, stating:

They are de facto critical in that they aim to understand why things are the way they are and to imagine and enact ways to make them better. They are also critical because they involve groups of people (usually positioned in different ways, such as public school teachers and university researchers) changing their practices, evaluating the processes and effects of these changes, and entering into new cycles of change. (pp. 43-44)
This study’s use of critical qualitative research signifies my desire to act in ways that positively change the educational context around me. In this way, I aim to collaborate with content teachers to influence how content teachers plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classroom and show how collaboration influences ESL students’ participation.

**Research Design**

In light of the above stated methodological assumptions, this research study employs an interpretive case study with four embedded units (Merriam, 1998; Yin 2014). Drawing on Merriam’s (1998) and Yin’s (2014) definitions for case study, this study defines interpretive case study as a “rich, thick description [of the phenomenon] to develop conceptual categories or to illustrate, support, or challenge theoretical assumptions” (Merriam, 1998, p. 28). Yin (2014) uses a single case study when the researcher investigates one phenomenon and defines embedded units as “a unit lesser than the main unit of analysis” (p. 238).

This study intended to provide thick description of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration and ESL students’ participation at a suburban middle school in the Southeastern U.S. The four embedded units included the ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies’ collaborative practices with me as the ESL teacher. I collaborated with each content teacher separately during the research process. More directly, this study aimed to show how content and ESL teachers’ collaboration practices influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students, and how this collaboration influenced ESL students’ classroom participation during the co-teaching sessions in mainstream content classrooms. Aligned theoretically with a sociocultural learning perspective, this study argued that learning occurs in and through professional interactions in communities of practice (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Building on earlier studies on ESL and content teachers’ collaboration and ESL students’ participation, this study relied on positioning theory to understand ESL and content
teachers’ collaboration and the consequences of this collaboration on content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation during the co-teaching sessions.

**Research Questions**

Based on a sociocultural framework for teachers’ learning and positioning theory, the following research questions guided this study:

1. How does ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students at a suburban middle school in the Southeastern U.S?

2. How does ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence ESL students’ classroom participation during the collaborative teaching sessions?

**Rationale for Case Study**

In light of the above-mentioned research questions, it is important to provide a rationale for a case study research design. Yin (2014) provided two rationales for a single case study that are pertinent to this research study. First, Yin (2014) mentioned the common case as a reason for a single case study. The common case study seeks to “capture the circumstances and conditions of the everyday situation” (p. 52). This research study aimed to show how content and ESL teachers’ collaboration influence the content teacher’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classroom, which is part of the teachers’ “everyday routines” (Bocala, 2015, p. 349). This research site was a realistic and authentic environment in which to describe this collaboration and collect data concerning collaboration.

Second, Yin (2014) argued for a single case study when the case is revelatory. A case study is revelatory when the researcher can “uncover some prevalent phenomenon” that has not been studied previously (Yin, 2014, p. 53). Content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in and through collaboration with an ESL teacher is underexplored (Peercy, 2018),
especially in secondary mainstream classrooms. Further, understanding the consequences of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration on ESL students’ participation provides new understandings to the field of second language teaching and learning (Martin-Beltrán, 2010, Yoon, 2008). Therefore, both foci make this case study a relevant research topic.

In the same way, Merriam (1998) justified the qualitative case study as an appropriate research design. She insisted that “qualitative case study is an ideal design for understanding and interpreting observations of educational phenomena” (p. 2). Merriam (1998) delineated a qualitative case study as an appropriate research design in education because it allows for the exploration and description of multiple contextual factors that cannot be controlled (p.7). This research study took place in an educational setting and acknowledged the numerous contextual factors in content and ESL teachers’ collaboration, which ultimately influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation. Hence, in this particular study, I sought to investigate how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students at a suburban middle school in the Southeastern U.S. I also aimed to show how this collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation during the co-teaching sessions.

**Defining the Case**

Just as providing a rationale for case study is important, defining the case is also equally important in qualitative research (Dyson & Genishi, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). Yin (2014) defines the case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) in depth and within a real-world context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (p. 16). Yin’s (2014) definition emphasizes description and a realistic setting that makes space for inquiry of a particular phenomenon. Merriam (1998) focuses on the qualitative case study. In defining a case
study, she articulates, “A case study is an examination of a specific phenomenon such as program, an event, a person, a process, and institution, a social group” (p. 9). She proceeds to emphasize the case as a “bounded system” in which the researcher should clearly identify the research interest, problem, and unit of analysis in order to narrow and define them (p. 9).

In defining the case’s boundaries, I chose to focus on how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation during the co-teaching sessions. This investigation did extend beyond the boundaries of this middle school nor did it include other school personnel (e.g., administration, instructional support teachers and staff) who also interacted with ESL students. In this way, the study focused specifically on how collaboration influenced content teacher learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ classroom participation during the co-teaching sessions in mainstream content classrooms.

**Research Setting**

Starcreek Middle School (pseudonym) is the research setting and is located in the Southeastern U.S. District personnel and school leaders granted me permission to conduct research at Starcreek. The school is one of the three middle schools in the school district and has 888 students. 41 students were classified as ESL students during the 2017-2018 academic school year. Students qualified for ESL services if they marked an additional language on a home language survey dispensed at registration and made a qualifying score (e.g., 4.9 or below) on the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Screener. The WIDA Screener is a computerized English language assessment that measures listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Starcreek had the largest student population classified as ESL students in the district with about 13% of the population indicating an additional language on the district’s home language
survey. From the first day of enrollment, ESL students were enrolled in four content classes and received ESL services through a pull-out instructional model taught by me as the ESL teacher. ESL students received pull-out ESL services in one 55-minute class period. Each ESL student took the WIDA ACCESS for English Language Learners 2.0 to measure their English language proficiency each spring semester until the student scored an exiting score (e.g., 4.8 or higher).

Some ESL students who also required special education services in reading and mathematics did not take the ESL class period. The reading and mathematics services in the ESL student’s Individualized Education Plan (IEP) determined whether the student took the ESL class period. There were 10 out of the 41 ESL students who also required special education services. Two ESL students’ IEP only required reading intervention services, so they were able to take the ESL class period. The remaining eight students required both reading and mathematics intervention services, so they did not take the ESL class period. With only one ESL class period for ESL students, the majority of language instruction took place in mainstream content classrooms. I consequently began to offer collaboration to content teachers in efforts to help plan and teach language and content to ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms.

Co-Participants

The study’s primary purpose was to show how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students at a suburban middle school in the U.S. This study also aimed to show how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation during the co-teaching sessions. There were 36 content teachers and one ESL teacher total employed at this middle school. There had been five different ESL teachers in the last eight years, and most served in part-time positions. When I became the ESL teacher in 2015, I was hired as a part-time Spanish/part-time ESL teacher. At the time of the study, I was the full-time ESL teacher.
During the 2017-2018 school year, the study’s four teacher participants and I were employed at this middle school and collaborated to plan for and teach five ESL students in mainstream content classrooms. I sought the district’s and the Institutional Review Board’s approval (IRB) for conducting research (See Appendix A for the IRB approval letter). ESL students voluntarily participated in the study. One ESL student declined participation in the study yet accepted my presence and assistance in the mainstream content classrooms. This student’s data was not used in any way.

I purposefully selected the four co-teacher participants because they were on the same academic team in the eighth grade. An academic team was comprised of four content teachers (e.g., ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies), and team teachers taught the same students. This meant that the four participants were content teachers who instructed the same ESL students in the eighth grade. The teachers taught the most ESL students in the eighth grade, which totaled five ESL students. As mentioned, one ESL student declined participation. The co-teacher participants agreed to participate in this research study by signing a consent form (see Appendix B for a sample). They were Emily (ELA), Kassie (social studies), Carol (mathematics), and Shawn (science).

I also purposefully selected the study’s four student participants because they were taught by the four content teachers and were on the same academic team in the eighth grade. Three student participants identified Spanish as their additional language, and one student participant identified Chinese/English as her additional language. Three student participants required special education services, and three students took the additional ESL class period taught by me as the ESL teacher. Marisa, Li, Juan, and Leo are the four student participants in this study. Their parents were informed about the study and assented to their child’s participation in the study. I also read the script to each student after receiving parental permission, and the students agreed to
participate in the study (See Appendix C for a sample parental assent form and script). More detailed information about the co-teacher participants and student participants are provided below.

Co-teacher Participant One: Emily

Emily, a white female in her early thirties, taught eighth grade ELA (See Table 1 for co-teacher participant information). She had been teaching at Starcreek for three years and had a total of seven years of teaching experience. She was hired at Starcreek to replace me when I transitioned into my position as the ESL teacher. Before teaching at Starcreek, Emily taught at a high school in another Southeastern state. She majored in English and Spanish in college and had her master’s degree in Curriculum and Instruction. She became a National Board Certified Teacher during the study’s duration. While she majored in Spanish, she reported that she “learned a lot of Spanish and double majored but [did] not frequently speak Spanish” (Emily Interview #1). She volunteered to teach adult ESL to Chinese students but did not think students should use Chinese to help them learn English. Drawing on her past experiences learning Spanish, she believed the adult ESL students should be immersed completely in English.

She also did not have any formal training on planning for and teaching ESL through university course work. She also believed that formal PD opportunities were limited and ineffective at equipping content teachers to teach ESL students. She equated earlier PD trainings to a “kind of quick tetanus shot that [was] not effective” (Emily, Interview #1). Her metaphor explains that she thought one training for all four content teachers failed to adequately understand the distinctions in each content area despite well-intended efforts. As a result, she did not learn to plan for and ESL students in the trainings; instead, she received generic strategies without relevant application to the ELA content. She also reported that she did not have experience working with ESL students or collaborating with the ESL teacher before teaching at
Star Creek. She cited infrequent interactions with former ESL teachers, mostly to sign paperwork about the ESL students. The ESL teacher did not volunteer to help create lessons for ESL students nor did they ask her to share teaching responsibilities. She reported she first began planning for and teaching ESL students when she came to Star Creek. When asked if she felt equipped to teach the ESL students in her classroom, she responded:

I feel I can run to Amanda’s room and she’ll help me. I don’t necessarily know if I’m doing an effective job at what I want… I don’t know if I’m being super effective, but I do, but if there is one thing I can do for [ESL students] is that I want them to feel like they have a home in my room where if they mess up speaking something, they are not penalized for it. (Interview #1, Emily)

This shows that she had a desire to include the ESL students in the ELA classroom and wanted to create a safe space where ESL students could make mistakes without fear of judgement; however, it is also clear that she did not feel equipped planning for and teaching ESL students without assistance. The fact that she felt she could “run to Amanda’s room and she’ll help me” suggests that she initially positioned me as someone willing and capable to help her plan for and teach ESL students.

Given her limited training and experiences working with ESL students and collaborating with previous ESL teachers, it is no surprise that she conceptualized her role in working with ESL students in strictly content related terms. When asked to describe her role in helping ESL students learn content and language, she stated, “I hope my job as their language arts teacher is to help them love stories and so part of loving a story is being able to read it and understand it” (Emily, Interview #1). Her references to “languages arts” “stories” “read and understand [the story]” strongly positioned her as a content/ELA teacher without understanding about how to make the language accessible.
Despite her content teacher positioning, Emily expressed a willingness to engage in collaboration because she knew that I would help her, and she wanted to create a safe space for ESL students in her ELA classroom. When asked why she agreed to collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students, Emily said,

> Initially, you’re my friend, and you asked me to. And I wanted to help. But after our first collaborative planning session and the first teaching session, I realized how good it was for the kids and how good it was for me. It was fun, and it was so helpful for everything we were doing in class. I saw their progress as we went through the whole thing.

(Interview #3, Emily)

Emily’s reasoning aligns with earlier statements that she agreed to participate initially because of our relationship. Throughout the collaborative process, however, she understood that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration could contribute to her own professional learning to plan for and teach ESL students and influence ESL students’ “progress” in the ELA classroom.

**Co-teacher Participant Two: Kassie**

Kassie, a white female in her mid-twenties, was the social studies co-teacher participant in this study. She had been teaching at Starcreek for three years and had three years total teaching experience. When she graduated from college with her bachelor’s degree in Education with a concentration in social studies, she began working at Starcreek. She took three years of high school Spanish and two courses in college, yet she reported that she did not know “enough to help anybody” (Interview #1, Kassie). Nonetheless, she expressed a willingness to learn Spanish to communicate with the ESL students in her classroom. During her first year of teaching, she remembered teaching a beginning English speaker who had just arrived in the U.S. when the student enrolled in school. When asked about her formal learning experiences learning to plan for and teach ESL students, she commented:
I went to [the university’s name] and we did not, I mean there was not a whole lot of focus. I think I was way more exposed to it when I got to [Starcreek] about learning how to cater to ESL students and how to work with them because that was not at all a focus [at the university]. So, I think at [the university’s name] anything we were taught kind of clumped them together to accommodate them as we would a special ed student to a certain extent. Accommodation is good but I don’t think it necessarily, it’s a whole different version of accommodations, and I never really learned how to do that at [the university’s name]. (Interview #1, Kassie)

Kassie’s description of her lack of formal training serves two purposes. First, being a new teacher, Kassie did not recall specific formal training about working with ESL students. Her collegiate training consisted of accommodations for students in special education. Second, her learning about planning for and teaching ESL students began when she started working at Starcreek. Through these experiences, she recognized that accommodations for ESL and students in special education are distinct. She also did not remember any formal PD opportunities except for meetings and conversations with me as the ESL teacher. She explained, “I’d say way more of the PD comes from talking to you and getting the ESL teacher’s perspective because I think because [of my limited training] I would say that I don’t feel very well equipped” (Interview #1, Kassie). Due to insufficient college training, she did not feel equipped to plan for and teach ESL students; nonetheless, her words (e.g., “talking to you and getting the ESL teacher’s perspective”) exemplify that she reflexively positioned me as someone willing and able to help. Her only experiences with an ESL teacher included talking and collaborating with me.

In light of her training and experiences working with ESL students and collaborating with me as the ESL teacher, she commented on her role in teaching content and language to ESL students in the following way:
I see myself having a big role in that because they do spend an hour of their day in my class, so if it’s just a wasted hour where I’m not focused on them learning the language or the content, then like why are they in my classroom? But, at the same time, I think that’s where it’s huge to have the collaboration of the ESL teacher because you obviously can’t be in the [social studies] room every single day, so I think I would be kind of lost in how to accomplish that without the help of the ESL teacher, but again I think it goes back to the importance of collaboration, because if I have a goal and a purpose and I know what my expectations should be and I know how I’m going to assess them at the end of the unit, then I can better prepare them to do that. So, my time in the classroom is much more productive and well spent rather than just being like, “I hope you figured this out.” So, I think us talking and communicating about where I should hold them, and how I can help them makes my time much more directed and purposeful, and I need to take on a big role in helping them accomplish that; it’s part of my job as a teacher, I guess. (Interview #1, Kassie)

Kassie initially reflexively positioned herself as a co-teacher of content and language. She also took responsibility for assessing the ESL students’ content and language skills. While she did not feel equipped, she recognized her limited training and willing engaged in collaboration to plan for and teach ESL students.

**Co-teacher Participant Three: Carol**

Carol was the mathematics co-teacher in this research study. She had 19 years of total teaching experience, and 18 years were at Starcreek. Earning her bachelor’s degree in Business, Carol became a teacher through an alternative master’s program where she specialized in Mathematics Education. She also had her Educational Specialist degree (Ed.S) in Teacher Leadership. She was a National Boards Certified Teacher and had been four nine years. She
spoke English-only and had no experiences learning an additional language. When asked about her formal training through collegiate coursework or PD trainings, she stated that parts of her coursework for her Ed.S related to ESL instruction, yet she could not recall any specific information except for empathy building activities. She also stated that all activities “you could do help anybody” (Interview #1, Carol). She explained further what she meant by “anybody,” commenting:

Anything you do for an ESL student would benefit any other student; I don't distinguish between the two, really. But I think the whole idea of filling in notes, giving things partially done so that they can fill it in, but again that helps everybody. (Interview #1, Carol)

Her explanation makes obvious that Carol self-reportedly did not distinguish an accommodation specifically for ESL students prior to the collaborative process; instead, she categorized accommodations with one label, “help anybody.” In doing so, she failed to understand that ESL students needed language accommodations or strategies to access the mathematics content. Therefore, she assumed an appropriate language strategy might be “filling in notes” for the ESL students, which does not necessarily make the language accessible for ESL students.

Carol’s stated beliefs about accommodations for ESL students paralleled her stated role in teaching content and language to ESL students. While she stated that she needed to teach content and language, she did not identify language as a potential factor that might make the content more challenging aside from learning the English vocabulary words. She explained, “In math, learning English is just learning English math words, which again, is not all that different a lot of times it already called it the same thing, you know, but I think it's most vocabulary and just catching up with mathematics” (Interview #1, Carol). For this reason, she initially positioned
herself as a content mathematics teacher who did not know how to accommodate for ESL students in the mathematics classroom.

Even though Carol had limited training and misguided assumptions about how to accommodate for ESL students, she felt equipped to work with ESL students. Carol proclaimed, “I do [feel equipped]. I also feel like there's plenty of help. I think you're available. I think there's plenty of other people with ideas” (Interview #1, Carol). She credited her colleagues and I as people who could assist her if she needed assistance. While she knew we were able to assist her, she did not report previous experiences working in collaboration with an ESL teacher before volunteering to participate in this study. Her only reported experiences in collaboration were with other mathematics teachers, but the mathematics teachers did not offer to teach a lesson with her. She also cited working with the special education teacher who attended her class daily, yet she did not plan and teach lessons with this teacher. In commenting on experiences collaborating specifically with former ESL teachers, she stated:

I would have found a whole lot of other people to ask first. You're always willing to help with the students in any way you can, so yeah, I'd go to you in a heartbeat, and you can teach the math, some people are afraid of math. And if they're just plain afraid of math, they can't work one on one with the student because they're gonna make the student afraid of math. That's a biggie there. (Interview #1, Carol)

Carol distinguished my willingness to help content teachers and my knowledge of mathematics as the attributes that distinguished me from former ESL teachers. Based on these qualities, Carol volunteered to collaborate with me based on her confidence that I could “teach the math,” and my willingness to assist in planning for and teaching ESL students.

**Co-teacher Participant Four: Shawn**
Shawn, a white male in his forties, was the collaborating science teacher in this study. He had 12 years of total teaching experience. Before he started teaching at Starcreek, he taught two years in high school and one year in a university setting. Shawn learned Spanish “on the fly” when he lived in a Spanish-speaking country for a few years when he served as a missionary (Interview #1, Shawn). He spoke Spanish, but when he described his Spanish speaking abilities, he stated, “I do speak Spanish, but not as well as you do” (Interview #1, Shawn). Based on Shawn’s description, he was not as confident speaking Spanish when compared to other Spanish-speakers. If needed though, Shawn explained, “If it happens to be a Spanish-speaking student, then I will use my ability to speak Spanish to help them with the content with the concepts” (Interview #1, Shawn). In this way, Shawn did use his Spanish to help students understand science.

In addition to his language background, Shawn began a doctoral program and completed most of his coursework in physics prior to deciding to become a teacher. His obtained his bachelor’s degree in physics and an alternative master’s degree in Education, which allowed him to teach secondary science. He did not recall formal training through university coursework, but he did participate in a Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) training during his first few years at Starcreek. This training was a two-year series of PD opportunities aimed to help content teachers make the content and language accessible to ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms through the SIOP teaching model. While informative, Shawn did not think this training significantly impacted the way he planned for and taught ESL students in the mainstream content classroom.

He viewed himself as a content and language teacher when asked to describe the content teacher’s role in helping the ESL students learn content and language early in the research study. He explained:
[The science teacher’s role] can be a little tougher, but I really believe that the key to that one is still to help them with those language skills and acquiring the new vocabulary so that then we can use that to work toward the content standard, so I think they are very related. (Interview #1, Shawn)

Shawn understood that language and content are not mutually exclusive, so he had difficulty explaining the content teacher’s role. His stated beliefs suggested that he thought language (e.g. “language skills,” “acquiring new vocabulary words”) was most important because ESL students could not access the content standard without understanding the language. He also believed that the ESL teacher’s role needed to included content, general language, and academic language, which additionally suggested that Shawn distinguished between conversational and academic language. Additional responsibilities of the ESL teacher were to support the content teacher and to serve as an advocate between the ESL student, parent, and content teacher, which might require Spanish-speaking skills.

While Shawn had the strongest language background and experiences working with ESL students, he was reluctant to collaborate and stated that his ideal collaborative experience with the ESL teacher would be “infrequent” (Interview #2, Shawn). When asked to describe this opinion, he stated:

I couldn't do it day in and day out because I don't stick to a plan very well, which I think is a benefit to students. Now, infrequently, meaning like every other week, do a day, or once a month, or something like that in order to see the other’s ideas and learn the things like I have from you doing this a few times. I would see that as being a good thing.

(Interview #2, Shawn)

Shawn cited that he did not always follow schedules (e.g., “I don’t stick to a plan very well”) based on students’ learning needs as his reasoning. Shawn’s words were supported by his actions
during the collaborative process. I had to on at least three different dates reschedule appointments with Shawn to the point where eventually we had to meet when I had the ESL class periods, which meant another teacher had to watch my class. Shawn’s self-reported “negative experiences” with earlier co-teachers contributed to his collaborative planning and teaching ideals. He described:

I've never had someone come in, and they've really contributed. A lot of times before doing collaboration instead of me coming away with a feeling of wow that lesson with really well, I come across, or I come away with a feeling of wow that was a lot of extra work and didn't improve anything, so I think part of that is due to your knowledge and what you brought to the table, and you were willing to step up and share. And the other part was just an effort level that you wanted to be a contributor, you were here by choice. (Interview #3, Shawn)

Shawn did not believe that earlier experiences with collaboration influenced his instructional practice. In earlier places in the interview, he positioned earlier co-teachers as “just a warm body” (Interview #3, Shawn). Hence, he did not think they were worth his time. He attributed the success of our collaborative partnership to my “knowledge,” “willingness to step up and share,” “effort level,” and “choice.” Despite the fact that he viewed our collaborative experience as the best, he still was not convinced that he would collaborate in future collaborative efforts. He explained, “It does depend on who's asking me…But with the way we followed this thing all the way through, that makes me a lot more likely to say yes to you” (Interview #3, Shawn). Shawn’s willingness to collaborate depended on his co-teacher because of his “negative experiences” with collaborative teaching.
Table 1. Co-teacher Participants’ Professional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassie</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The co-teacher participants’ languages reflect any language in their background; it does not necessarily reflect the co-teacher participants’ perceived proficiency.*

**ESL Student Participant One: Juan**

Juan, a 15-year-old male student in the eighth grade, was born in the U.S. (See Table 2 for student information). Juan lived with his father who was from Mexico and managed a local restaurant. Juan’s mother still lived in Mexico, and Juan’s home language was Spanish. Juan enjoyed soccer, videogames, music, and Netflix. He aspired to be a disc jockey when he was older. I often observed Juan with headphones in his ears and nodding his head to music before, during, and after school. Juan enrolled in kindergarten when he was five years old in another district in the same state and qualified for ESL services at this time. Juan moved into the study’s district when he was in the fifth grade. Juan qualified for special education services when he was in elementary school because of his weaknesses in reading and writing.

Juan attended Starcreek for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. He met me two years prior to this study when he was in sixth grade, but he did not take my ESL class period at the beginning of his sixth-grade year. His sixth grade ELA teacher reached out to me for assistance when Juan did not complete a reading assignment for her class, which was significantly impacting his ELA grade. The ELA teacher wanted me to call his father to explain in Spanish that Juan risked failing ELA early in the first grading period. Instead of calling home, I wanted to
meet Juan first. I introduced myself to Juan as the new ESL teacher and asked him why he did not complete his reading response. He responded that he did not complete this assignment because he did not find or read a book. I assured him that I could remedy this situation and asked if he would like to go to my room and start this assignment. Juan agreed, and we selected an audio book appropriate for his reading level. Juan and I developed a plan to finish the response in the ESL classroom, and by the end of the week, he submitted this assignment and earned a passing grade.

Shortly after, Juan asked if he could be in my ESL class period. I rearranged Juan’s schedule and found a way for him to attend the ESL class period with other sixth grade students. From his sixth-grade year to his eighth-grade year, Juan attended my ESL class period. Without my intervention, Juan more than likely would not have received language services in the ESL class period. Juan’s language score at the beginning of his eighth-grade year (2017) was 2.5 based on the state’s WIDA ACCESS for English Language Learners 2.0 language proficiency test. Juan’s score improved to 3.0 by the end of the year (2018); however, Juan still required ESL services in high school. Because he had spent the majority of his schooling receiving ESL services, he was considered a long-term ESL student.

In addition to his reading and language issues in school, Juan also had issues with behavior and had goals in his IEP related to improving his behavior. While he was at Starcreek, he attended alternative school two different times for violating the district’s code of conduct. His team teachers (e.g., Emily, Kassie, Shawn, and Carol) recognized Juan’s academic struggles and behavior issues, yet no teacher stated that he was a major classroom disruption. They mostly cited off-task behaviors (e.g., not completing assignments, listening to music during class) but understood that Juan’s language and academic struggles contributed to these behaviors. Kassie stated:
Juan is difficult. I mean I love him, so kind, whatever. He semi lacks any sort of motivation to do anything, so it's difficult sometimes to see where he's at. I think my biggest struggle with him is, do you genuinely not understand what the expectation is for you to do, or are you just like very lazy and just don't feel like doing it? (Interview #1, Kassie)

The other team teachers shared Kassie’s opinion and positioned him as the most “difficult” ESL student. As Kassie’s words suggest, the team teachers struggled to get Juan to complete assignments and were not able to exactly pinpoint the cause of his academic underperformance.

**ESL Student Participant Two: Leo**

Leo, a 15-year-old male in the eighth grade, was born in the U.S. Enrolling in kindergarten at age five at an elementary school in the same district, Leo qualified for ESL services. Leo’s mother spoke Spanish, yet Leo reported that he did not know Spanish. He once told me that he spoke one percent Spanish, and 99 percent English to prove that he did not identify himself as a Spanish-speaker. Because he had an additional language in his background and made a qualifying score on an initial English language assessment, he qualified for ESL services in kindergarten. In addition to ESL services, Leo also qualified for special education services in elementary school because of his reading and writing difficulties. Leo’s reading level was at least three grade levels below his peers. Despite his academic difficulties, Leo wore a large smile on his face. He reported that his favorite subject was mathematics. While he struggled in reading, he also enjoyed reading if he found a book he enjoyed. Leo also enjoyed playing videogames and spending time with his family. He frequently talked about visiting his cousins on the weekends.

Leo attended Starcreek for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. When Leo first met me, he attended my ESL class period when he was six-grade student. He was the only student enrolled
in this class period because the administration believed I could help him learn to read. He also took a reading intervention class based on his IEP. During this ESL “reading” class period, Leo selected books at his reading level, and I listened as Leo read aloud the book. When Leo struggled with a particular word, I helped him with the word, developed a list of these words, and combined this list with sight words and phonics to help Leo improve his reading. After this year, he was enrolled in my ESL class period along with other students for seventh and eighth grades. He also attended the language tutoring program taught by me during the summers of his sixth and seventh grade years where we continued to work on Leo’s reading.

Leo’s language score was 2.6 on the state’s WIDA ACCESS for English language Learners 2.0 language proficiency test at the beginning of the eighth grade (2017). His score improved to 3.9 by the end of his eighth-grade year. Despite this significant growth, Leo’s score at the end of the year still showed he still needed ESL services in high school. Leo is considered a long-term ESL student due to the time spent in the ESL program.

The team teachers frequently lauded his diligent work ethic and warm personality. He was awarded “Student of the Month” from his team teachers and a team award at the end of his eighth-grade year. The team teachers also believed that Leo’s friendship with Juan contributed to Juan’s positive classroom behavior because they shared the same academic classes. The team teachers positioned Leo in similar ways. For example, Emily described Leo as a student in her class during our initial interview in the following:

Leo is always very just, he's happy. He's a happy kid, and so whatever we're doing he wants to participate. He's eager to learn. He seems generally happy to be around his peers, so as far as participating in class, I can see that he wants to. It's just sometimes he doesn't know how to get started on something because he hasn't been able to work through the directions. (Interview #1, Emily)
This shared positioning characterized Leo as a determined, enjoyable student with motivation to learn. While the teachers recognized his academic and language struggles (e.g., “He doesn’t know how to get started), they thought Leo’s personality helped him cope with his academic struggles in reading. While they understood why he was an ESL student, they believed he knew how to speak English well, and they never struggled to understand his oral speech. In this way, they recognized that his reading and writing were the areas in which Leo struggled most.

**ESL Student Participant Three: Li**

Li, a 15-year-old female student, was born in China. Her parents, both born and raised in the U.S., adopted Li when she was five years old, and she moved to the U.S. at this young age. She enrolled in a private school for kindergarten. Li had one brother, whom her parents had before they adopted Li. Li and her brother were in the same grade in school. Li transferred to Starcreek at the beginning of her eighth-grade year and indicated Mandarin Chinese as an additional language on the home language survey. However, she did remember speaking Mandarin Chinese and spoke English only with her family, friends, and teachers since her adoption. She also did not receive ESL services when she attended earlier private schools. Since she indicated an additional language, I had to administer the WIDA Screener to Li based on state and district regulations despite my own personal reservations. I called Li’s mother prior to the assessment to explain, and she was excited about this possibility because she noticed Li struggled with oral speech even though her difficulties did not impede intelligibility. Her mother’s interest and enthusiasm alleviated my concerns. Li scored 3.0 on the WIDA Screener in 2017, which qualified her for ESL services. Her schedule was also changed to include the ESL class period at the beginning of August. At the end of the year, Li scored 4.7 on the WIDA ACCESS for English Language Learners 2.0 language proficiency assessment, which reflected that she would continue to receive ESL services in high school. Li excelled academically in her
content classes making straight As each grading period. She also took advanced mathematics (e.g., Algebra I), and she received high school credit for this course. Even though she was new to Starcreek, she made friends easily and made the school’s basketball team.

Her team teachers noticed Li’s academic abilities and passion for sports so much that they were surprised when they discovered that she qualified for ESL services because they did not believe she needed language assistance. She received the “Student of the Month” award and received a team award at the end of the year. When describing Li, the team teachers had positive comments about her classroom performance and participation in class. To illustrate, Carol described Li as a student in Algebra I class with the following:

She is amazing. She is such a hard worker, and I don't think she has any language issues really. I know she came from a private school, and I don't even know what kind of mathematics background she had. She and her brother are both in [Algebra I]. But neither one of them seem to have the right mathematics background for advanced math. But she took it and ran with it. She does all the homework. She does the work in class. She will go above and beyond what I've asked them to do. She doesn't ever seem to miss an assignment. You know, she just really works hard to do it all. And I think that's allowed her to get caught up, very quickly. (Interview #1, Carol)

Carol’s description of Li (e.g. “She is amazing.”) was a shared opinion among the team teachers. All discussed and admired her determined personality and perseverance. Carol was the only team teacher to mention a possible academic limitation (e.g., “But [Li does not] seem to have the right mathematics background for advanced mathematics.”), but even Carol believed that her work ethic helped her compensate for her supposed limited mathematics background. All teachers also made similar statements about Li’s typical classroom behavior and work ethic with a shared belief that she did not have “any language issues really,” which suggested that they believed Li
possessed a high command of academic and conversational English that did not interfere with her academic performance in the mainstream content classrooms.

**ESL Student Participant Four: Marisa**

Marisa, a 14-year-old female student in the eighth grade, was born in the U.S. Her family was from Mexico and immigrated to the U.S. before Marisa was born. Marisa’s home language was Spanish. Enrolling in kindergarten at an elementary school in the district, Marisa qualified for ESL services based on her home language and initial English language assessment. She also qualified for special education services in elementary school with difficulties in reading, writing, and mathematics. While she attended Starcreek for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, she did not take the ESL class period in middle school because her IEP required that she take mathematics and reading intervention. Marisa did not report needing ESL services based on the ELA teacher’s perceptions. According to Emily, Marisa declared, “I’ve lived here forever; I don’t need English help” when she mentioned ESL or language services to Marisa. Since she was born in the U.S., attended school since kindergarten, and did not take the ESL class period, she more than likely claimed English and Spanish as her home languages based on her statements to Emily.

Of the four ESL student participants, Marisa and I interacted the least during her three years at Starcreek. This is most likely attributed to the fact that Marisa did not take the ESL class period. She and I met when she took the annual language proficiency test as a sixth grader. I communicated with Marisa’s mother frequently about school information in Spanish and collaborated with Marisa’s seventh grade teachers during the previous academic year. This meant that I was in most of Marisa’s mainstream content classes for two years. In these classes, Marisa frequently asked for help, accepted my assistance with all classwork, and greeted me often when we passed each other in the hallway.
Like the other ESL students, the team teachers shared similar opinions about Marisa’s classroom performance and behavior. Shawn described Marisa in the following way:

Marisa is sweet as pie, always on task, very shy, and very hard to hear. She talks so softly. Smiles a ton. Always gets her work done. Very successful with her grades not necessarily As but she is a B level kid that works hard and gets it done. (Interview #1, Shawn)

The team teachers agreed with Shawn that Marisa’s diligent work ethic (e.g. “works hard and gets it done”) and good-natured personality (e.g., “sweet as pie”) made her enjoyable to teach. While they thought Marisa performed well in his class, they recognized that she needed ESL services. All teachers expressed a desire to hear Marisa talk more in the classroom; this desire was made evident when they described her quiet voice (e.g., “very hard to hear”). Emily and Kassie noticed her difficulties in reading and writing in addition to her oral skills. To exemplify, Emily reported, “She doesn't use complete sentences with regularity. Sometimes they are. Sometimes they're not. Spelling is an issue for her, but I have a lot of kids with spelling issues so that doesn't trigger anything to me” (Interview #1, Emily). However, since she earned passing grades in their classes and did not exhibit atypical academic performance based on their perceptions, she was not a major academic concern (e.g., “that doesn’t trigger anything with me”). At the beginning of her eighth-grade year (2017), Marisa’s language score was a 3.6 on the WIDA ACCESS for English Language Learners 2.0, and she showed slight improvement with a score of 3.8 at the end of her eighth-grade year. Her language score still reflected that she required ESL services in high school, and due to this extended time frame, she was labeled a long-term ESL student.
Table 2. ESL Student Participants’ Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student participant</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of years in ESL program</th>
<th>ESL class period</th>
<th>Special education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ESL student participants’ language reflects the additional language that qualified the student for ESL services. It does not necessarily reflect the students’ perceived home language or the most frequently spoken language in the home.*

Data Collection Methods

In selecting a qualitative case study as the research design employed in this study, I chose data collection methods within this framework to enable inquiry about how collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation. Both Merriam (1998) and Yin (2014) encourage researchers to conduct interviews, observations, and field notes as appropriate data collection methods for a case study research design. Patton (2002) states, “Qualitative data must include a great deal of pure description of people, activities, interactions, and settings” (p. 28).

Considering the necessity for direct quotations from co-teacher participants and ESL student participants and observations, I included the following methods: a) semi-structured interviews, b) collaborative planning sessions, c) lesson planning artifacts, d) collaborative teaching sessions, e) collaborative viewing sessions, f) reflective journals, g) ESL student participants’ work samples, and f) field notes. Since this study answered two research questions on the collaborative influences on a) content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms and b) ESL students’ participation, it used the above stated data collection methods for both questions because I conceptualized the two research foci as interrelated. For instance, the video recorded collaborative teaching sessions
enabled an exploration into how ESL and content teachers enacted their teaching roles in practice based on the collaborative planning sessions. Their collaborative teaching practices influenced the content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students, which answered research question one. At the same time, the video recorded collaborative teaching sessions showed ESL students’ observable classroom behaviors and actions in addition to their spoken words in the mainstream classroom, which answered research question two. In this way, the video recorded collaborative teaching sessions answered both research questions. More specific information about each data collection method and purpose follows this discussion (See Table 3 for data collection methods).

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews provided me with data that included co-teacher participants’ direct quotations, which included their perceptions of ESL student participants’ academic performance, English language abilities, and their classroom participation. It also provided me with the co-teacher participants’ background and experiences working with ESL students and engaging in collaborative teaching. Roulston (2010) states that semi-structured interviews require the researcher to have an interview guide, yet this guide varies based on the interviewee’s response. The researcher’s follow-up questions become important because the questions probe for “further detail and description” (Roulston, 2010, p. 15). Talmy (2010) also encourages researchers to problematize the traditional interview in which he refers to as the interview as research instrument. The interview as a research instrument views the interview data as a final product instead of a social process in which the interview becomes a site where meaning is co-constructed and negotiated.

Additionally, Talmy (2010) draws on Holstein and Gubrium’s (2003) active interview conceptualization to explain the interview as a social practice, stating, “...The interviewee is
transformed from a ‘passive vessel of answers’ to someone who not only holds facts and details of experience, but, in the very process of offering them up for response [during the interview], constructively adds to, takes away from, and transforms the facts and details (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003, p. 70; Talmy, 2010, p. 131). The interviewee co-constructs meaning with the researcher, and rather than strictly viewing interviews as a means to collect data, the researcher and interviewee take an active position in meaning-making, negotiation, and ultimately, meaning transformation.

Given the above-mentioned research on interviews, I conceptualized the interview as a social site for meaning co-construction. I also used semi-structured interviews in order to guide the interview’s topic to ensure that this data answered the study’s research questions. I interviewed each co-teacher participant three times individually. The first interview lasted between forty-nine minutes to one hour and took place after the co-teacher participants signed the consent form. I asked the co-teacher participant to describe their learning about ESL students through formal training (e.g., university coursework or professional development sessions) or informal learning (e.g., conversations and/or collaboration with other teachers). The first interview also asked them to describe their experiences working with ESL students in the mainstream content classroom and explain their beliefs about instructing ESL students in the content classroom, their thoughts on collaboration, and their opinions regarding the ideal roles of the content and ESL teachers in helping ESL students learn content and language. In addition to information about the co-teacher participants’ background, the co-teacher-participants commented on the ESL student-participant’s ability to meet the language and content standards as well as their typical classroom participation (See Appendix D for protocols).

After we engaged in the collaborative planning and teaching sessions and the co-teacher participant wrote a reflective journal (method explained later), we had the second interview. The
second interview lasted twenty to fifty minutes and clarified the co-teacher participants’ responses in the reflective journal. More specifically, I asked questions about the co-teacher participant’s learning about how to plan for and teach ESL students and additional reflections on the ESL student-participants’ classroom participation.

The third interview took place after the second cycle of collaborative planning and teaching. The third interview lasted twenty-one to thirty-two minutes and clarified the co-teacher participants’ responses in the second reflective journal and recorded final thoughts regarding the content and ESL teachers’ collaborative planning and teaching. Each interview took place in a space most comfortable to the co-teacher participants and at a time most convenient for them, which took place in either my or the co-teacher participants’ classrooms. Conceptualizing the interview as social practice (Talmy, 2010) and acknowledging my participatory role in the study, I took an active role in the interview and shared my own opinions because it was necessary for me as the ESL teacher to share my expertise and thoughts, especially since the co-teacher participant often asked me to weigh in on a particular issue. For example, during the third interview, I asked Kassie for concluding remarks about the ESL student-participants’ classroom participation. The following conversation illustrates how I took an active part in the discussion, and how we co-constructed meaning:

Kassie: To me participation is probably different for every student, so like Juan doing his work is him participating, but to another student, like I would say you didn’t really participate if they weren't like raising their hand and speaking, and so I think it's an objective or subjective whichever one it is based on the student. The bare participation would be like you are engaged; you are focused, and you have completed your work. And I think anything else other than that depends on who they are as a student. I mean, right, what do you think?
Amanda: I just think sometimes participation is tricky. I mean I feel like I'm very quick to say, if you would have asked me, hey, Amanda, define student participation. What would you say? Oh, I would have said, they're engaged. They're focused and they're doing their work. That's what I would have said. Just like you did. But, I think we saw how in student participation, it's tricky to come up with a definition. It's probably me struggling to come up with a definition of student participation, but it's tricky, because we saw how Li was talking to [another student’s name] during the collaborative viewing session but she redirected her behavior, got back on task, and she was one of the only ones that finished all three reasons on a shortened schedule. So, I would not look at that and say she's not participating or that she's not on task because she did, right?

Kassie: Yeah, exactly, but no, but I think that goes with, I was never like she's not doing what I'm asking her to do. (Interview #3, Kassie)

Kassie and I co-constructed our own definition of Li’s participation. We problematized Li’s participation because there were moments when Li chatted with another student for a moment during the second collaborative teaching session. At the same time, Li completed her work and fulfilled our expectations, so we both agreed that the ESL student participants’ participation depended more on their work samples.

**Collaborative Planning Sessions**

Collaborative planning sessions afforded the opportunity for the co-teacher participants and I to plan lessons for ESL students in the content classroom based on the content and language standards. Qualitative researchers discuss the affordances of video as a data collection tool (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Patton, 2002; Pink, 2001; Ratcliff 2003; Steeg, 2016), especially when researchers “might be willing to collaborate with...their informants” (Pink, 2001, p. 597). Steeg (2016) utilized video as a method to explore how fifth grade teachers in a PLC
Table 3. Data Collection Methods Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi structured interview #1</td>
<td>to describe the learning and experience of content area teachers as they work with ESL students and explain their initial perceptions of ESL students’ participation</td>
<td>January-February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative planning sessions #1 and #2</td>
<td>to plan and design the first lesson activity for ESL students to address the content and language standards</td>
<td>March-April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative teaching session #1</td>
<td>To teach the first lesson activity in the mainstream content classroom and record ESL students’ participation</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative viewing session #1</td>
<td>To watch the first collaborative teaching session and reflect on content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective journal #1</td>
<td>To reflect on the collaborative planning and teaching sessions and ESL students’ participation</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi structured interview #2</td>
<td>to clarify responses in first reflective journal and discuss further the content area teacher’s approach to planning for and teaching ESL students</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative planning sessions #3 and #4</td>
<td>to design the second lesson activity for ESL students based on the content and language standards</td>
<td>April-May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative teaching session #2</td>
<td>To teach the second lesson in the mainstream content classroom</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative viewing session #2</td>
<td>To watch the second collaborative teaching session and reflect on content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective journal #2</td>
<td>To reflect on the collaborative planning and teaching process and ESL students’ participation</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi structured interview #3</td>
<td>To clarify responses in second reflective journal and discuss further the content area teacher’s approach to planning for and teaching ESL students</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning artifacts</td>
<td>To document the created lesson plan and evidence the planning sessions</td>
<td>April-May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL students’ work samples</td>
<td>To evince ESL students’ participation during the collaborative teaching sessions</td>
<td>April-May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>To record my approaches and experiences during the collaborative process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflected on literacy instruction; the PLC’s objective was to learn literacy practices from each other in an effort to improve teachers’ literacy instruction. The findings showed that using video as a method allowed teachers to scaffold each other’s learning and receive constructive feedback in a collegial environment. The teachers also developed a more nuanced understanding of students’ needs, including the importance of prior knowledge and feedback from teachers. Based on research that indicated the possibility for using video as a method, I chose to video record the collaborative planning sessions in order to document how ESL and content teachers collaborate to plan a lesson based on the content and language standards. I conducted four collaborative planning sessions with each co-teacher participant.

During the first collaborative cycle, the planning sessions took place after the first interview and lasted between twenty to forty minutes. The first planning session discussed and co-created the lesson plan, while the second session discussed the collaborative teaching roles in the upcoming collaborative teaching session. During the second planning session, I adapted a collaborative lesson plan template based on Dove & Honigsfeld’s (2018) suggestions for collaborative lesson planning (See Appendix E for the lesson planning template). The third and fourth collaborative planning sessions took place after the second interview. Similar to the first two planning sessions, the co-teacher participant and I co-created the lesson plan activity together during the third session and discussed teaching roles during the fourth collaborative planning session.

Lesson Planning Artifacts

Qualitative researchers also encourage documents or other written material as data collection tools (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). Merriam (1998) distinguishes three document types: public records, personal documents, and physical traces. Unlike reflective journals that described the co-teacher participants’ written accounts of
collaborative planning and teaching, the lesson planning artifacts documented the collaborative planning sessions based on the content and language standards. The lesson planning artifacts provided a before and after lesson activity as well as a detail record of the lesson, co-teaching planned approach, and teaching roles. I began with a lesson plan developed by the co-teacher participants so that they saw collaboration as relevant to the instructional objectives (Darling-Hammond et al, 2017). In collaborating to plan for and teach ESL students, I sought to add language objectives based on the English proficiency standards developed by the WIDA consortium.

**Collaborative Teaching Sessions**

I video recorded the collaborative teaching sessions and used them in place of classroom observations for four reasons. First, given my participatory role as the ESL teacher, I had a teaching role in the collaborative teaching session that demanded more than observation. Second, video recording the collaborative teaching session was less obtrusive than a classroom observer who was not typically in the classroom. This maintained an authentic and typical classroom environment for the co-teacher and student participants. Patton (2002) explains the possible advantages of video over a researcher’s traditional classroom observation because a video “can sometimes be less intrusive,” and “the use of technology can greatly increase the quality of field observations” (p. 308). Applying Patton’s (2002) suggestions, I did not disrupt the teaching and activity in the mainstream content classrooms. Third, video recording the classroom teaching session allowed the co-teacher participant and me to watch the video after each collaborative teaching session to discuss our collaborative teaching roles and the ESL student participants’ classroom participation.

Fourth, this video recording allowed me the opportunity to analyze the ESL student participants’ classroom participation at a later date. Ratcliff (2003) cautions researchers to focus
on aspects of the video pertinent to the research questions in order to manage the enormity of video data. Hence, I chose to specify the ESL student participants’ classroom participation and did not focus on all students in the mainstream content classrooms. Each collaborative teaching session lasted forty-five to fifty-five minutes each, and each co-teacher participant and I had four collaborative teaching sessions total. Three of the four ESL student participants (e.g., Juan, Leo, and Marisa) followed the same schedule, which meant they had all their content classes at the same time. However, one student (e.g., Li) took advanced mathematics, so she was not able to follow the same schedule as the other three. This meant that the co-teacher participant and I had to co-teach each lesson two different times in order to record all of the ESL students’ classroom participants. After the co-teacher participant and I planned the lesson together in the collaborative planning sessions, we taught the lesson together in two different class periods. Each collaborative cycle included two collaborative teaching sessions with each co-teacher participant.

**Collaborative Viewing Sessions**

The collaborative viewing session was a space for co-teacher participants and I to view collaboratively the teaching session. More directly, we commented on how we enacted our collaborative teaching roles in practice and the ESL student participants’ classroom participation. Steeg (2016) argues for video-based reflection in case study research because of its potential to create opportunities for teacher learning. Steeg (2016) explains, “Video-based reflection embodies professional development ideals of a) community-building, b) inquiry-based thinking about one’s teaching, and c) “critical colleagueship,” a space in which teachers trust one another enough to constructively critique themselves and one another” (p. 129). In other words, video-based reflection can edify collaborative partnerships, stimulate reflection on teaching practices, and strengthen professional relationships.
Video as a method describes events that interviews cannot and “enables a teacher to relive the elements of a teaching scenario and verbalize previously unarticulated ideas about teaching” (Steeg, 2016, p. 125). The teachers’ verbalizations shed light on their learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL student participants’ classroom participation during the collaborative teaching sessions. By commenting on observable actions and ESL students’ classroom participation, we create opportunities to co-construct learning and meaning during the collaborative viewing sessions. I engaged in two collaborative viewing sessions after each collaborative teaching session with each co-teacher participant. To alleviate the enormity of video data for the co-teacher participant especially given that each one had four collaborative teaching sessions, I watched both collaborative teaching sessions alone in their entirety before watching it with the co-teacher participant. As I watched, I developed conversation topics and questions to ask if they were not discussed during viewing session to guide our discussion. We watched the video with the three ESL student-participants (e.g., Juan, Leo, and Marisa) in its entirety, and I chose segments from Li’s video.

At the beginning of each collaborative viewing session, I gave the co-teacher participants’ a choice as to whether they wanted to watch both collaborative teaching sessions or watch one and segments from the second. All co-teacher participants’ chose the latter, which meant we watched one collaborative teaching session in its entirety and segments from Li’s classroom participation. In addition, I made copies of both collaborative teaching sessions during each collaborative cycle for the co-teacher participants to watch if desired at a later date. To my knowledge, they did not watch the video at a later date. The collaborative viewing sessions lasted eighty to one hundred and twenty minutes and took place after the collaborative teaching sessions.

**Reflective Journals**
Reflective journals served as a method to allow space for the co-teacher participants to reflect individually on the collaborative planning and teaching sessions. According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), co-participants’ journals complement interviews and help participants articulate their “experience in the participants’ own words” (p. 93). Steeg (2016) reiterates the value of teacher reflection as “one of the most significant ways teachers examine and change their professional selves and their practice” (p. 124). Dove and Honigsfeld (2018) also state that reflection in co-teaching is necessary because it helps teachers resist working in isolation, and it fosters a collaborative mindset when thinking about pedagogical practice (p. 236). Due to the necessity for reflection, I asked each co-teacher participant to write at least two reflective journals in a space that was most comfortable for them and at a time that was most convenient for them. I shared the reflective journal with them on Google Drive after the collaborative viewing sessions, and the co-teacher participant answered the questions in their own private space. The reflective journal contained guiding questions to help generate responses (See Appendix D for reflective journal prompts). While I provided guiding questions on the reflective journals, I did not prescribe reflective techniques or tell them how to answer the questions. Each co-teacher participant wrote a reflective journal before an interview, and each co-teacher participant had two reflective journals total.

**ESL Student Participants’ Work Samples**

ESL student participants’ work samples served to document the ESL student participants’ participation during the collaborative teaching session. This study defines student participation as the ESL student participants’ classroom behavior and actions, which can be observed in the collaborative teaching sessions and the collaborative viewing sessions. Part of this participation also includes ESL student-participants’ work during the collaborative teaching sessions. The work samples are document data, which “provide the evaluator with information
about many things that cannot be observed” (Patton, 2002, p. 293). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) delineate two criteria or using document data state that “a researcher can ask whether [the document] contains information or insights relevant to the research question and whether it can be acquired in a reasonably practical yet systematic manner” (p. 180). Since the ESL student-participants’ work samples answered the second research question pertaining to their participation and was collected in a systematic way, they were a useful data collection method. Further, Merriam and Tisdell (2016) distinguish this type of document data as researcher-generated documents. In this study, these documents were ESL students’ work samples that were “[collaboratively] prepared by the researcher” and “for the researcher by participants after the study [had] begun” (p. 174). These documents can “provide insights into the phenomenon under study,” which contributed to how collaboration influenced the ESL student-participants’ participation during the collaborative teaching sessions.

The ESL student-participants’ work samples included the activities completed by the ESL students’ participants during the collaborative teaching sessions. More directly, these documents showed how ESL student-participants completed the activities assigned during the collaborative teaching session. The work samples contained various activities, including paragraphs, exit slips, graphic organizers, mathematics problems, and notes (See Table 4 for a detailed list of each work sample for each co-teacher participant’s collaborative teaching session). In this way the student work samples afforded me the opportunity to explore the ESL student-participants’ participation in a way that could not be observed.
Table 4. ESL Student Participants’ Work Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Content area</th>
<th>Work Sample from Collaborative Teaching Session #1</th>
<th>Work Sample from Collaborative Teaching Session #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Language Arts</td>
<td>Collaborative group handout Student paragraph</td>
<td>Skit Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassie Social Studies</td>
<td>Question on the Five Pillars Exit Slip</td>
<td>Joan of Arc Argumentative Paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Mathematics</td>
<td>Notes and practice problems on scientific notation Study guide on quadratic equations</td>
<td>Notes and practice problems on parallel lines/transversal Notes on scatter plots and associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Science</td>
<td>Notes on covalent bonding and exit slip</td>
<td>Notes on waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner discussion (video-recorded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit ticket on waves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Field Notes**

Qualitative researchers encourage the use of field notes as a crucial component of the data collection process (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2014). According to Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (2011), ethnographers “note concrete details of everyday life that show, rather than tell, about people’s behavior [and actions]” (p. 23). This description on observable behavior and actions creates a visual image or story instead of mere explanation. Field notes are beneficial as a data collection tool because they help the researcher remember the events and emotional reactions. Patton (2002) strongly suggests that writing field notes “is not optional” (p. 303).

Furthermore, “it’s the nature of our intellects that ideas about the meaning, causes, and significance of what we experience find their way into our minds, and qualitative researchers need a tool to record these mental insights and thought processes (Patton, 2002, p. 304). For this reason, field notes should begin as early as possible in the research process (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011) and be an ongoing part of the research process (Patton, 2002). Given the necessity of field notes, I wrote field notes often throughout the entire study. I heeded the suggestions of
previous researchers by recording setting descriptions, co-participants’ observable
actions/behaviors, salient dialogue, and my own emotional responses throughout the research
process.

Data Analysis

Data analysis helps the researcher make meaning from the data (Marshall & Rossman,
2011; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). Qualitative data analysis is an iterative process, and as such,
begins as soon as data collection begins (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 1998). While
data analysis begins with data collection, the analysis does not end with data collection; rather
“analysis becomes more intensive...even though data analysis has been an ongoing activity”
and dynamic” process (p. 123). To offer a helpful starting point, Yin (2014) advises researchers
to begin with the researcher’s questions in mind, even though flexibility is needed to revise the
research questions as the data collection and analysis inform the study and impact the findings
(Marshall & Rossman, 2011). See Table 5 for how I answered each research question using the
data collection methods.

In organizing the data, it is important to recall that the research design is a qualitative
single case study with four embedded units. For the data analysis’ purposes, the four embedded
units refer to each co-teacher participant’ data. As a consequence, I analyzed each co-teacher’s
participant’s data separately first and then looked for similarities between them. More
specifically, I saved each co-teacher’s participant’s audio and video data in a separate folder on
my password-protected computer.
I transcribed all semi-structured interviews, collaborative planning sessions, collaborative viewing sessions, and parts of the collaborative teaching sessions. Ratcliff (2003) argues the difficulty in transcribing the entirety of the video data and insists that researchers focus their analysis on a particular aspect of video data. I immersed myself in the data as soon as I began data collection and as frequently as possible. I read these transcripts, wrote analytic memos to record my thoughts, and continuously reflected on the study’s research questions. Analytic memos were useful in helping me think aloud during the data analysis process in order to articulate choices regarding coding, categories, and theme-ing the data (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Maxwell, 2013; Patton, 2002, Saldaña, 2013; Yin, 2014). Maxwell (2013) also states that analytic memos can be the first draft in writing the research report because the content reveals the researcher’s mental processes during data analysis. Maxwell (2013) also encourages researchers to write informally during analytic memos, and more specifically, “when [they] write, don’t put a tuxedo on [their] brain” (p. 21). Written in an informal style, analytic memos helped me reflect on the data, articulate analytic procedures, and facilitate insight during
the research process. I refined the categories and themes until theoretical sufficiency was reached; that is, I generated “categories well described by and fitting with [the] data” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This immersion continued after data collection until the study’s completion.

To begin initial coding, I used Saldaña (2013) in vivo and descriptive codes. In vivo codes include “the participant’s voice” (p. 91). Since I valued the co-teacher and ESL student participants’ voices, I wanted to include the participants’ actual words. Descriptive codes also helped “summarize in a word or short phrase - most often a noun - the basic topic of a passage of qualitative data (Saldaña, 2013, p. 88), which helped me ascertain the conversational gist (See Table 6 for sample initial codes from each co-teacher participant). I also used Davies & Harré’s (1990) reflexive and interactive positioning to explain the rights, duties, and responsibilities enacted in collaboration. Reflexive positioning refers to how one positions oneself. Interactive positioning refers to how someone positions the other person, so these positions explained how the co-teacher participants positioned the ESL students and me in collaboration.

For instance, in the first collaborative viewing session, Shawn stated, “Same as your role. I think we were both teaching about covalent bonds” when I asked him to comment on his teaching roles during the first collaborative teaching session (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn). Given this data segment, I coded the data “self-positioning as a content teacher” to indicate Shawn’s reflexive positioning. In this same data segment, Shawn acknowledged my content teacher’s role, thereby simultaneously positioning me as a content teacher. As such, I also coded this data segment with “Shawn positioning me as a content teacher.” In coding each embedded unit separately, Emily’s data had ninety-seven initial codes, and Carol’s data had sixty-six initial codes. Kassie’s data had forty-three initial codes, and Shawn’s data had fifty-five initial codes.
Table 6. Sample Initial Codes from Each Co-teacher Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample initial codes</th>
<th>Emily</th>
<th>Kassie</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Shawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking to change parts of the lessons</td>
<td>Challenging to differentiate lessons</td>
<td>Assessing student work through practice</td>
<td>Collaboration needs to be of value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing ESL students’ work</td>
<td>Choosing student groups</td>
<td>Attempting to create lesson</td>
<td>Dividing teaching roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is a partnership</td>
<td>Collaboration is easy</td>
<td>ESL teacher knowing the mathematics content</td>
<td>Good professional relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a paragraph scaffold</td>
<td>Empathizing with ESL students</td>
<td>Learning a teaching tip</td>
<td>Interactions are smooth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL teacher acting as a content teacher</td>
<td>Kassie’s learning to chunk reading</td>
<td>Learning a vocabulary strategy</td>
<td>Negotiating lesson activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish language objectives</td>
<td>Lesson makes students think and is difficult</td>
<td>Notions of ideal students</td>
<td>No challenges because we planned it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning Emily as the ultimate content authority</td>
<td>Negotiating changes to the lesson</td>
<td>Positioning Marisa as a quiet, hard worker who is low in mathematics</td>
<td>Positioning as a traditional teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting ideal coteaching</td>
<td>Positioning ESL teacher as a resource</td>
<td>Relying on previously made resources</td>
<td>Teaching acts influencing participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also used document analysis to analyze the written words in the lesson planning artifacts and ESL student participants’ work samples. Qualitative researchers suggest that document analysis can be helpful in discovering participants’ attitudes and beliefs (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 1998). I combined document analysis with other qualitative analysis methods (e.g., Saldaña’s (2013) coding techniques to triangulate my data across multiple sources (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). For instance, Emily stated in the first reflective journal and second interview that Leo participated in class because he completed his work during the collaborative teaching session. I used his completed work sample (e.g., collaborative viewing guide, paragraph) to triangulate Leo’s classroom participation in ELA.

During the second coding cycle, I organized the initial codes by research questions, which meant that I organized the codes according to how collaboration influenced a) the content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and b) the ESL students’ participation in the collaborative teaching sessions. I began to notice that the codes for research question one
could be classified into five categories (e.g., lesson design, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment, and the ESL teacher’s role), which the four co-teacher participants’ had in common. For research question two, I saw how each co-teacher participants’ initial codes fit into three similar categories (e.g., ESL teacher’s increased role, content teacher’s student positionings, and planning and teaching acts).

The last step required me to practice “theme-ing the data” Saldaña, 2013, p. 175). In theme-ing the data, I relied on my categories to tell the analytic story. That is, for research question one, I noticed that collaboration was a space for content teachers to negotiate different meanings (e.g., lesson design, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment, and the ESL teacher’s role). By negotiating these various meanings, content teachers learned to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms. For research question two, the categories shed light on the fact that collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by creating space for the ESL teacher’s role in the content classroom, highlighting the content teachers’ perspective on ESL students’ participation and emphasizing the collaborative planning and teaching acts.

**Positionality Statement**

My role was crucial in conceptualizing, designing, and conducting the research study. I began my teaching career as an eighth grade ELA teacher. Having majored in English and Spanish in college, I taught the majority of ESL students in my ELA classroom and was often asked to interpret during parent conferences and other school meetings. I often delivered instruction in Spanish to help my Spanish-speaking students and found books written in Spanish to strengthen their home language and foster a love for reading despite the fact that English was still the primary instructional language. My personal beliefs compel me to know that each student is unique and has knowledge to contribute to the classroom environment. I also think that
I have a professional responsibility to meet students where they are academically and help them grow. In this way, I wanted to create a classroom environment that makes students feel welcome to communicate in any language and develop a classroom culture of learners who discover their interests and thrive in their strengths.

I became the ESL teacher during my sixth year of teaching and have remained in this position for the past four years. My content teacher background influences my approach to teaching ESL students, because it helps me understand the emphasis on academic language and importance of differentiated instruction for ESL students, which involves making the content and language accessible. Academic language and content knowledge are not mutually exclusive; nonetheless, teachers can determine their instructional purpose and assess content or language according to this purpose (Mahoney, 2017). When I accepted the position of ESL teacher, I felt I was a “new” teacher again despite my teaching experience in the same school. With this position, I worked with all ESL students in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades and had to understand additional content areas in which I did not hold certification. I quickly learned that I needed to collaborate with content teachers to teach academic language in the content areas. ESL and content teachers’ collaboration has powerful potential to help ESL students learn academic language and content. In my collaborative efforts with teachers, I began to understand that content teachers needed more information about second language learning to help ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms.

Chapter Three Summary

This chapter began with my methodological assumptions and preference for qualitative research. Considering these assumptions and preferences, I chose an interpretive case study with four embedded units (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). A single interpretive case study is the appropriate research design because of my aim to scrutinize how collaboration influenced
content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms. I also investigated how collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation during the collaborative teaching sessions. The four embedded units refers to the four co-teacher participants’ collaborative practices with me as the ESL teacher. I assumed a dual participatory role as the researcher and ESL teacher.

Applying positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) and drawing on sociocultural learning notions (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2016), I collected data from semi-structured interviews, collaborative planning sessions, lesson planning artifacts, collaborative teaching sessions, collaborative viewing sessions, reflective journals, ESL students’ work samples, and field notes. I used Saldaña’s (2013) in vivo and descriptive codes are part of the data analysis process and analyzed the data until the data researched theoretical sufficiency.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This research study examined how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and scrutinized how this collaboration impacted ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms. To this aim, the following research questions guided this study: (1) How do ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students at a suburban middle school in the Southeastern U.S.?, and (2) How does ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influence ESL students’ classroom participation during the collaborative teaching sessions?

Positioning theory enabled the exploration of ESL and content teachers’ social interactions and professional relationships in collaboration, which was crucial to make sense of how these interactions led to certain collaborative acts. A detailed understanding of collaborative acts provides a more informed explanation of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration. A sociocultural framework for teacher learning complements an exploration into teachers’ interactions because sociocultural researchers emphasize the social nature of learning, whereby teachers learn in and through their participation (e.g., their actions and practices) in professional communities of practice (e.g., ESL and content teachers’ collaboration) (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In other words, content teachers learn through participation in ESL and content teachers’ collaboration. More specifically, content teachers learn through negotiation or wrestling with their views about their own roles, their students, and the actual teaching activity (Johnson & Golombek, 2016).
Similarly, ESL students’ participation is defined by the students’ work samples and observable classroom behaviors and actions in the mainstream content classrooms. ESL students likewise learn through their participation in the mainstream content classroom; thus, this participation evidences ESL students’ learning outcomes.

In answering the first research question, this study found that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration is a space for content teachers’ learning, and, more specifically, collaboration is a space where content teachers learn by negotiating various meanings in collaboration with an ESL teacher. These meanings refer to the ways in which content teachers grapple with lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, and assessment techniques as they collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classroom. Thus, as content teachers engage in collaboration with an ESL teacher, they learn through continually negotiating lesson designs, teaching roles, and language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role. As such, this section will discuss how each content teacher negotiated lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment strategies, and the ESL teacher’s role in order to learn to plan for and teach ESL students. Each section (e.g., lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role) will be discussed for each content teacher separately and conclude with a description of distinguishing characteristics for each section.

**ESL and Content Teachers’ Learning through Negotiation**

**Negotiated Lesson Designs in Language Arts**

Emily, the ELA teacher, and I collaborated to plan and teach two lessons on Acts I and IV of Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. In doing so, for the first lesson, Emily wanted to have students read closely lines from Act I, Scene 1. Before the first collaborative session, Emily shared the folder with me that contained all original lesson planning templates for the entire unit. The original lesson template for Act I, Scene 1 contained three sections with the
first section containing eight selected lines from Scene 1; the students had to examine the lines and think about the commonality between the selected lines. Emily wanted the students to discover that the selected lines all referenced eyes and sight, which were motifs in the play. In section two, students chose three lines from the first section and explained the significance of each line. Lastly, for section three, students had to use three examples and write an explanatory paragraph to discuss how Shakespeare uses references to eyes and sight to represent love. After establishing the lesson objective early in the first collaborative session, Emily did not specify how she wanted to design the lesson for ESL students. I used Emily’s unawareness and relied on our past collaborative experiences to help Emily recognize that we needed to change the lesson for ESL students:

Amanda: Do you want to do something similar to what we did with Jekyll and Hyde and chunk together and-

Emily: And the vocabulary words and the images. That'd be really helpful.

Amanda: And then put them in groups and have them, so let me look, Act I, Close Read. Let me go back to the document.

(Amanda is looking for the document on her computer. Emily is right beside her).

Emily: Yeah. I feel like this lesson kind of lends itself to that already. It just needs some tweaking. (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Emily)

This excerpt illustrates how Emily and I used the original lesson planning template to negotiate changing the lesson to plan for and teach ESL students. My suggestion to “chunk together” the selected lines indicates my own reflexive position of a co-teacher of language and content to ESL students because I was comfortable adjusting the lesson to fit ESL students’ need for content and language in the mainstream classroom. At the same time, I interactively positioned Emily as a willing and flexible teacher who wanted to make changes to the lesson. Emily
accepted this position and added her own suggestion (e.g., images for vocabulary words). Emily’s suggestion shows that she wanted to reflexively position herself as a co-teacher of content and language to ESL students despite her previous limited training and experience working with ESL students. My boldness to make suggestions (e.g., chunking and collaborative groups) and Emily’s willingness to accept my suggestions as beneficial (e.g., “That would be really helpful”) led Emily to admit that we needed to “tweak” the lesson. Creating the opportunity for Emily to see on her own that the lesson needed to be “tweaked” led to a fruitful collaborative planning session at the onset because she recognized that we needed to change the lesson to include language strategies. If I had taken control and changed the lesson entirely without Emily understanding my reasoning, then I might have shut down Emily’s learning opportunities in collaboration; instead, she might have felt forced to change and, therefore, have been less likely to contribute to a positive and productive collaborative experience.

Later in the first collaborative session, Emily and I further negotiated the lesson template, objectives, and overall structure. Still taking the lead in the collaborative planning session, I asked to change the lesson template altogether; this question began the next selection:

Amanda: Okay, so what I'm thinking, and do you mind if we, do something different than this? I mean–
Emily: Yeah, for sure.
Amanda: Or, do you want to use this?
Emily: The ultimate goal is to get them to see that Shakespeare talks about eyes and makes eye references.
Amanda: Okay.
Emily: And then like trying to extract meaning from things that are obscure basically.
Amanda: So, do you want to use these lines [Amanda reads the line numbers on the page and directions]? Okay, think about what they have in common.

Emily: Yeah. They have all, they all mention eyes in some way, but they're all like obscure references.

Amanda: Okay, perfect. How many scenes are in Act I?

Emily: Well, this is just Scene 1. Act I, Scene 1.

Amanda: This is just scene I. Oh, okay.

Emily: Act I, Scene 1 only.

Amanda: Okay, so maybe if we can do what we did with *Jekyll and Hyde* and chunk Scene 1 and like pay attention specifically to these lines.

Emily: Yes, instead of having it grouped like this, we can restructure it.

Amanda: And have them say something in groups specifically what we're looking for and have them do some of this part too.

Emily: The references–

Amanda: Yeah, some of this part too.

Emily: Mmhmm.

Amanda: Is that okay?

Emily: Yeah, I like that [idea] even better anyway. (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Emily)

In asking to change the lesson, I continued to reflexively position myself as someone capable of adjusting the lesson for ESL students based on the content objectives. Emily’s response (e.g., “Yeah, for sure!”) shows that she completely accepted my suggestion and reflexive position. In almost every line, I attempted to validate Emily’s position as a content teacher. My questions (e.g., “Do you mind?” “Do you wanna use this?” “Is that okay?”) show that I ultimately
positioned Emily as the teacher with decision making power in the mainstream ELA classroom because I continuously deferred to her authority, even while I felt capable to make the necessary changes without assistance. My deference to Emily’s authority made the negotiation run smoothly, led to Emily’s satisfaction (e.g., “Yeah, I liked [that idea] even better anyway.”), and ultimately, created a lesson plan designed for ESL students in mind.

In negotiating the lesson design during the first collaborative cycle, Emily and I also had to solidify the lesson goals/objectives and the overall lesson structure, which are evidenced in the earlier selection. In response to my question, “Do you wanna use this?” Emily assumed her position as the content teacher because she reiterated that the lesson goal was to have students understand Shakespearean references to eyes in Act I, Scene 1. Further, I accepted Emily’s position as a content teacher because I asked her questions related to the play, which led to Emily delineating the lesson objective to Act I, Scene I only. In focusing the lesson to only Act I, Scene 1, we returned to our earlier decision to restructure the lesson planning template by drawing on our shared understanding of how to group the lines together (e.g., chunking the lines) based on an earlier collaborative experience. Emily’s words (e.g., “Yes, instead of having it grouped like this” “we can restructure it”) additionally shows her desire to change the lesson based on my earlier suggestions to group the selected lines and have students work in collaborative groups. To ensure that Emily felt comfortable changing the lesson, I asked, “Is that okay?” Emily’s response (e.g., “Yeah, I liked that [idea] even better anyway”) indicates her complete satisfaction with the outcome of the negotiation, which is working together to change the lesson based on our agreement for the remainder of the collaborative session.

During the second collaborative cycle, Emily wanted all students to show their knowledge of Act IV by creating and performing an interview skit in collaborative groups. In designing a lesson plan template to achieve this lesson objective, we had to grapple mostly with
time constraints and my desire to ensure that students performed their created skits. More specifically, Emily only wanted to spend one class period (e.g., fifty-five minutes) on an activity that could have potentially spanned across multiple days. Prior to this next example, I asked Emily to consider that this lesson might span multiple days. This possibility contradicted Emily’s intention that the lesson only needed to last one day because she needed to cover additional material before the semester ended. In addition, there were also days (e.g., field day, choir performances) that interrupted classroom instruction. Due to Emily’s desire to only spend one day on the lesson, she explained her conflicted feelings in the following conversation:

Emily: I think whatever we do with this, this was just our original idea, at the beginning of the unit, so this needs to be so [cut down so it'll fit in one class period]. It needs to go like this. I think.

Amanda: So, it needs to be enough where they can plan [the interview] and perform it in one class period?

Emily: In one class period.

Amanda: Well I think we could do this in one class period.

Emily: I think if they're in groups of three, and you have one person who is Willy Shakes and the others are each character–

Amanda: I think that's good.

Emily: And I think when I say short interview, Willy Shakes has to ask them four questions. And they have to respond. Do you think that would be short enough?

Amanda: Yeah, that's what I would say.

Emily: (typing on document) Willy Shakes will ask four questions, and the couple will answer.
Amanda: Because I would really like for them to present this, be able to present this to the class if possible because it opens up possibilities for participation. Do you know what I mean?

Emily: Yeah. Yeah. Why don't we just say, ask them three questions?

Amanda: Okay.

Emily: That way they can for sure write it and present it in one class period.

(Collaborative Planning Session #3, Emily)

In designing the second lesson, we had to negotiate student tasks and ensure that each collaborating teacher’s goals were included for the lesson. When Emily expressed that she wanted to teach the lesson in one class period only, she validated my concern that the original lesson could potentially span multiple days. In order to accomplish her desire for the timing of the lesson, she suggested that students could perform their skits with their groups only. I worried that having students present in groups instead of in front of the class would be overlooked by the end of the class period, and students would not have an opportunity to present their scripts. Hence, here, I mostly agreed with Emily; however, my words (e.g., “opens up possibilities for participation”) highlight my desire to include a language standard (e.g., speaking) into the lesson plan. Glossing over the performance part of the lesson contradicted my view of the content objective, which was having students perform an interview skit. Additionally, it potentially threatened the inclusion of a language standard in the lesson if the class period ended before students presented in groups. In order to ensure that both collaborating teachers included their goals for the lesson, we agreed to change the criteria from four to three questions.

The above examples describe how Emily and I had to negotiate the lesson design of the lesson planning template in order to collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream classroom. In this negotiation, we learned how to adjust the lesson based on content
and language standards as we relied on our expertise and past experiences. We also learned how to deal with time constraints and ensure that both teachers’ goals were met for the lesson activity. In this way, the created lesson planning template mediated this learning so that Emily understood how to create lessons which included content and language standards. More specifically, Emily had to learn how to change her original lesson to include language objectives even while still maintaining her focus on the content. My suggestions and decision to draw on our shared past experiences contributed to Emily’s learning and led to a fruitful collaborative experience where both teachers showed a willingness to position themselves and each other as co-teachers of language and content for ESL students rather than maintaining a fixed position assigned to them by their respective subject areas.

**Lesson Design in Mathematics**

Carol learned to plan for and teach ESL students in the mathematics mainstream classroom by negotiating lesson designs with me. Creating lessons for ESL students in mathematics meant that Carol and I had to design two lessons, one for Pre-Algebra (Marisa, Juan, and Leo) and one for Algebra (Li). During the first collaborative cycle, Carol wanted to find previously created online lessons (e.g., TeachersPayTeachers, Pinterest, Kuta Software), which constrained my ability to make suggestions for language strategies in designing the lesson. For example, Carol informed me in the early stages of planning that she wanted to explain scientific notation with her Pre-Algebra students. Carol and I decided that we would design a starter activity, notes page, and practice sheet for students to satisfy the content objectives. I attempted to contribute to the planning session by offering to share responsibilities for lesson creation in the following excerpt:

Amanda: So, do you want me to help you create this practice sheet?
Carol: No, I'm gonna do it in the Kuta software program. All I have to do is pull up scientific notation, and it'll give me some parameters about how big the numbers are, but yeah, no, that's easy.

Amanda: Okay. (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Carol)

By asking to create the practice sheet, I reflexively positioned myself as a mathematics content teacher capable of sharing planning responsibilities in the mainstream classroom. Carol rejected this positioning and denied me this opportunity to include language strategies into the lesson, thereby positioning herself as the mathematics content teacher. Her denial is most likely attributed to her belief that using the Kuta software was easier based on her statement, “No, that’s easy.” It is unlikely that she rejected my positioning because she did not believe I knew the mathematics content or doubted my ability to design lessons. She made several statements throughout the collaborative process where she praised my ability to teach mathematics. For example, in the first interview, she interactively positioned me as a resource who helped students and could teach the mathematics content. Her denial during the planning session was related to her desire to make things easy and not because she rejected my mathematics content teacher positioning.

Nonetheless, her denial in the conversation illustrates how Carol’s reliance on previously created lessons constrained my ability to include language strategies into the lesson and share planning responsibilities during the first collaborative cycle. By relying on alternative resources, Carol continued to use what she had used in the past, which did not include planning lessons with ESL students in mind. I did not attempt to challenge Carol’s reliance because I simply said, “Okay.” By responding that it was “okay,” I allowed Carol the opportunity to use the Kuta software and thus continue her lesson design approach without changing it. Had I challenged
Carol’s approach, I might have created increased opportunities for Carol’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in regard to lesson design.

Similarly, in the same session, Carol and I negotiated the lesson design for Algebra students. Carol stated that we would review quadratic equations in preparation for a test, asserting, “We'll be reviewing, and I'll have the study guide for them to work on [which she copied from the book chapter]” (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Carol). This early lesson design negotiation illustrates why Carol’s reliance on previously created materials made it challenging for me to include language strategies in the first collaborative lessons. It also shows why negotiations and, ultimately, learning is complex and processual. Carol had to learn to share lesson design responsibilities with me in order to learn to plan for and teach ESL students. Carol stated that my input on the lesson designs was helpful during the first collaborative viewing session. When asked to explain my input and how it was helpful, Carol responded:

Carol: I don't think you gave any input on this one. It was already kind of structured out.

The one before with the vocabulary, and what you showed me was on the vocabulary, and how to put an example problem with it was really big as far as seeing something different.

Amanda: Yeah, you had an example problem. You had their notes, and you had practice problems.

Carol: This was already set up that way. This lesson was already done that way.

(Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

Carol admitted that my input was absent due to the lesson’s structure. Carol’s phrasing interactively positioned me as a teacher without input; however, she did reference earlier lessons that we created, which suggests she knew I would help her if given the opportunity. She credited the earlier lesson as “really big as far as seeing something different.” Her words signify that she
began to realize that her lesson design approach needed to change in order to include my suggestions for ESL students. Further, I followed Carol’s admittance with agreement and highlighted how the lesson structure created an unequal division of responsibilities, stating, “Yeah, you had an example problem. You had their notes, and you had practice problems.” In responding in this way, I positioned Carol as a teacher who assumed all responsibilities. Carol accepted my interactive positioning because she reiterated that “this lesson was already done that way,” which stated how using previously created lessons without making any changes constrained my input about lesson design during the first collaborative cycle. Carol’s admittance was productive in approaching the second collaborative cycle because she did learn to accept my reflexive position as a mathematics content teacher who was capable and willing to create lessons.

To exemplify this change and ultimately Carol’s learning to negotiate lesson designs, I resolved to create parts of the lesson that would contribute to the lesson plan during the second collaborative cycle. Like the earlier planning sessions, Carol set the lesson objectives to explain content vocabulary related to parallel lines cut by a transversal for Pre-Algebra students and to describe scatter plot associations for Algebra students. For Pre-Algebra students, we decided we would create a teaching guide for vocabulary, a Kahoot game for review, a coloring sheet for application, and a game for further application. We knew that doing all these activities might take an additional class period, but we both were committed to planning and teaching both lessons. After we made this decision, we negotiated lesson design responsibilities where I offered to create parts of the lesson. This next excerpt shows how we negotiated these responsibilities during the third collaborative session:

Amanda: I can help you create [the vocabulary teaching guide]. And I can also do the Kahoot.
Carol: Okay.

Amanda: If you want me to?

Carol: Yeah.

Amanda: Great.

Carol: There may be one already made.

Amanda: There probably is. (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Carol)

Here, I again reflexively positioned myself as a mathematics content teacher who wanted to share planning responsibilities with Carol. I offered to design the activities when I asked to create the vocabulary teaching guide and the Kahoot game. Carol accepted this positioning, most likely because, as mentioned previously, she remembered my contribution during an earlier collaborative experience. It is also likely that Carol did not have a previously created lesson about vocabulary, which further supports my claim that Carol was not accustomed to planning lessons with ESL students in mind. For this reason, she afforded me the space to create lessons designed specifically for ESL students. Her words, “There may be one already made,” shows Carol’s tendency to use again materials previously created. My response did not challenge this tendency because she asked me to create the Kahoot game. With this invitation, I could create the game in whatever way I thought would best deliver the content to students while focusing on ESL students; thus, I did not need to challenge her claim in this conversation.

For Algebra students, Carol thought these students struggled with justifying their reasonings for the scatterplot associations when given a realistic example. Likewise, I volunteered to help Carol create a scaffolded activity with sentence frames to help students understand the content in the following conversation:
Amanda: Could we use sentence frames to help them explain it? Give them a model where we show and then use sentence frames to model how we want them to explain their reasoning?

Carol: Oh, that'd be a good idea.

Amanda: We could do that.

Carol: I like that, so I think you're right, so just something to get them started.

Amanda: I can do that because they would need this. I guess that's what I was meaning, to use the vocabulary to guide them in how they would [write their explanation].

Carol: Right.

Amanda: That's what I was meaning. yeah. okay. I can do that. (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Carol)

My initial question positioned myself as a language teacher who knew how to use language strategies to teach content. My words (e.g., “We could do that” and “I can do that”) show my persistence in attempting to create a lesson for Algebra students because I insisted on three different lines. Carol, like before in the Pre-Algebra lesson, accepted my reflexive position when she said, “that’d be a good idea,” which signifies her satisfaction with my suggestions. Therefore, this conversation explains how teachers negotiate the lesson design in order to plan and teach ESL students; this negotiation is not always a smooth or easy process. However, the ESL teacher’s persistence and willingness to create multiple lessons for a variety of classes highlight how Carol ultimately afforded me the opportunity to design lessons specifically for ESL students.

Carol recognized my persistence and the extent of my contribution during the fourth collaborative planning session. After I created the activities, I shared them with Carol. Carol began the final planning session in the following way:
Carol: Do you always do this much work for everyone else, or is it just me?

Amanda: I always try to do as much as I can to help.

Carol: Wow, because what you did was incredible.

Amanda: Thank you. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Carol)

Carol’s question signifies that she interactively positioned me as a teacher who was willing to go above and beyond to help teachers plan for ESL students in the mainstream mathematics classroom. In response, I accepted her positioning because I stated, “I always try to do as much as I can to help.” Carol continuously used phrases (e.g., “Wow, ‘what you did was incredible’”) to show how impressed she was with my contribution to the lesson plan design. This exchange exemplifies an instance where the ESL teacher’s negotiation ultimately creates space for Carol to learn to plan and teach lessons designed specifically for ESL students. In doing so, she also learned to collaborate and share lesson design responsibilities with the ESL teacher.

**Negotiated Lesson Design in Social Studies**

Kassie learned to plan for and teach ESL students by negotiating lesson designs with the ESL teacher. More specifically, Kassie and I collaborated to design two lessons on the Five Pillars of the Islamic Faith and Joan of Arc. In planning the lesson, we had to negotiate the content and language objectives as well as the lesson activity in order to create two lessons based on the social studies and language standards in order to accomplish our goal. In both lessons, Kassie positioned me as the lesson creator and co-teacher in the social studies classroom. Our negotiations in designing two lessons contributed to Kassie’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students because she gained a better awareness of how to structure the lesson so that ESL students could more appropriately access and master the content objectives.

During the first collaborative cycle, Kassie explained the curricular plan for the rest of the grading period, which involved teaching the three major religions (e.g., Islam, Christianity,
and Judaism). Prior to designing the collaborative lesson, Kassie instructed about Judaism and Christianity, and she was beginning to discuss Islam. She wanted to collaborate to plan and teach the lesson on the Five Pillars of Faith because she had a large, difficult reading passage that she feared ESL students would struggle. Once we decided on the content objective, we negotiated planning responsibilities, which involved creating the actual lesson activity for the students. In doing so, when asked how she wanted to divide responsibilities, Kassie responded, “How about we do what we've done in the past where you've just kind of figured out what we're going to do?” (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Kassie). Kassie’s words (e.g., “what we’ve done in the past”) suggest that she drew on our past experiences in collaboration to negotiate the planning duties in designing the lesson. In practice, this meant Kassie supplied the reading text on The Five Pillars of Faith and gave me complete control to “[figure] out what we’re going to do,” implying that we would design the lesson from scratch without a previous lesson template. In giving me complete control to plan and design the lesson, Kassie positioned me as a content co-teacher. Even while Kassie assumed the reflexive position as a content teacher, she also simultaneously positioned me as a content teacher with authority to design and create social studies lessons. By positioning me in this particular way so early in the collaborative cycle, Kassie created a tremendous opportunity for me to share how I would help ESL students access and master the content and language objectives. I accepted this interactive positioning by stating, “Yes, we can,” agreeing to assume the primary responsibility of designing the lesson for students in the mainstream classroom (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Kassie).

While Kassie afforded me the opportunity to have complete control over the lesson design, she needed to specify the content objectives as we planned the lesson on The Five Pillars of Faith so that we shared similar lesson objectives. With no previous experience teaching social
studies, I would have had a difficult time making this decision without Kassie’s input. For this reason, the next conversation begins with defining the lesson goals:

Amanda: Okay, so what would you like for me to do?

Kassie: Um, I just emailed you the reading, so I think– I guess the biggest thing would be how we should lay out the document to ensure that it is like the one we did on the *Epic of the Gilgamesh*. I just liked how, because you're so much better at thinking through this. These words are going to trip them up. This is how we need to organize it. Don't you think?

Amanda: Yes, there is vocabulary that we need to teach.

Kassie: Yeah, the vocabulary and the scaffolding to make sure that they get it.

Amanda: I'm trying to remember what we did before, but here's what I'm thinking. I guess I don't have to find the *Epic of Gilgamesh* or what we did in groups to explain to you what I'm thinking. Like if you want to do the video and whatever discussion questions or whatever you want to pre-teach, and then how about I work on the five pillars and I'll look at [the reading] to see what we can chunk and put together. Even if I can find like a video or a picture to go with what we're doing, then I'll see what I can put together.

Kassie: That's perfect. And we can use this reading as the basis for it if that's okay.

Amanda: Yeah, yeah, yeah. (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Kassie)

My initial question shows my acceptance of Kassie’s interactive position as the one with primary responsibility of the lesson design. Kassie’s positioning highlights two crucial points in negotiating this lesson. First, Kassie emailed me the reading text for The Five Pillars of Faith, thereby sharing the necessary content needed to create the lesson. Second, she mentioned a previous lesson (e.g., *The Epic of Gilgamesh*) that we designed in a previous collaborative
experience. In the activity for *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, we pre-taught the vocabulary/characters, divided the passage into smaller segments, assigned the various reading segments to different groups, and asked questions related to each segment to ensure comprehension.

This is significant because Kassie wanted a similar lesson design approach based on our previous lesson. In this way, she knew that she wanted to pre-teach the vocabulary and scaffold the reading to better suit the ESL students’ comprehension of the reading text. Perhaps, more importantly, it is in collaborating to design this lesson that Kassie developed the notion that “[I’m] so much better at thinking through this,” thus positioning me as the one better suited to scaffold the lesson and pre-teach the vocabulary. From the conversation, it is obvious that I needed time to refresh my memory and reflect on how to best deliver the lesson objectives; however, I stated, “we can chunk and put together” the lesson. In making this statement, I aligned my priorities with Kassie’s objectives that we create a similar lesson design as the previous one. I promised that “I’ll see what I can put together,” suggesting that I would make this decision before the next collaborative planning session. Kassie expressed her satisfaction with my plan of action and stated her only non-negotiable was that “we can use this reading [that she emailed] as the basis” for the lesson. My response (e.g., Yeah, yeah, yeah”) assured her that we would use the reading in designing the lesson.

Before the second collaborative planning session, Kassie contributed to the lesson design by including a table on the lesson activity to review the three major religions. I added a YouTube video to introduce the lesson activity, divided the reading text into smaller segments, developed questions for each group to answer about the assigned pillar, and specified the language objective as writing complete sentences. During the second collaborative planning session, when asked if she watched the video and/or examined the lesson contents, Kassie replied, “I trust you that whatever it is, it will be amazing” (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Kassie). Kassie’s
response not only highlights Kassie’s satisfaction with my contribution, but it also suggests that Kassie was so confident in my contribution to the lesson that she did not have to examine the contents before teaching the lesson. In reflecting on the ESL teacher’s role and contribution during the planning sessions, Kassie explained:

Your role as the ESL teacher was how we could manipulate the information to ensure understanding of the English language. You used the content that I brought as a baseline and then set the lesson up that would require the students to read a passage, answer questions in a complete sentence, and participate by speaking in class. Your role was the structure and format of the lesson, while mine was the information. (Reflective Journal #1, Kassie)

Kassie’s description positioned me as the lesson designer and creator during the first collaborative session, which paralleled our earlier negotiation when we divided planning responsibilities. She specified how she brought “the information” only to the planning sessions, while I “used the content” to make the content accessible to ESL students in the mainstream social studies classroom. She indicated that our negotiation of lesson design responsibilities further contributed to her understanding that we needed to break the reading passage into smaller segments to increase the ESL students’ comprehension. By positioning me as lesson designer, she simultaneously positioned me as someone willing and able to help her refine her understanding about how to best teach ESL students in the social studies classroom.

Similar lesson design negotiations were also evident during the second collaborative cycle. In this particular lesson, Kassie stated that the lesson objective was for students to evaluate Joan of Arc’s character to decide whether she was a positive or negative historical figure based on primary informational sources. While students would read primary sources, she wanted to focus on writing; that is, she wanted students to formulate their opinions in a well-organized
paragraph. To this aim, Kassie and I began to negotiate the lesson structure in the next conversation:

Kassie: But I'll find the reading or like the place where I got the information for her and then I can work on scaffolding what I want them to take out of the reading.

Amanda: And I can help you with the paragraph. As far as making a task, an argumentative task for them to write and use to justify when they talk in their groups. So they're writing it out and then, so it won't be an official paragraph, but it'll be, but it'll go together like a paragraph, but I'll make it probably like something [pulls up an example from her computer] So something like what we did here with [pulled up the paragraph from the sentence frames with Emily] so like we'll want them to say, but we'll give them questions to kind of frame what they're saying and then sentence starters here to give them a way to formulate their thoughts. But anyways, you get the point. It would be similar to [Emily’s activity] so we would say like, I mean I'd have to read your sources to see your sources to see how you want to phrase the first one. So, like was Joan of Arc positive or negative and why, and then have them support what they think from specific examples, and I may not have them cite specifically because they're talking about, but you know what I mean, something like that, and then we could create this and use this as a formative assessment and also their exit slip.

Kassie: I think that's great [still looking for readings]. (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Kassie)

In offering to help create the paragraph scaffold with sentence frames, I reflexively positioned myself as the lesson designer and the one who could make decisions regarding the lesson structure. I assumed this position without having read the primary sources or fully knowing Joan of Arc’s historical contribution and significance, which is evidenced by my statement, “I have to
read your sources.” Nonetheless, our previous collaborative experiences enabled me to assume this position. Further, I used a previous collaborative experience with another teacher (e.g., Emily) as a model to operationalize my thoughts so that Kassie would know my intentions. Kassie accepted my reflexive position when she stated, “I think that’s great.” This conversation paved the way for me to help Kassie concentrate on another language objective (e.g., writing), which was a new addition. In prior collaborative experiences, we focused on reading rather than writing. Thus, I was afforded the opportunity to create opportunities for ESL students to “formulate their thoughts” in writing.

In the fourth collaborative cycle, Kassie and I negotiated the actual lesson sequence. In doing so, I assumed the position as an instructional coach, walking Kassie through how I envisioned the actual lesson sequence. As such, this next conversation highlights my reflexive positioning and Kassie’s satisfaction with the lesson design:

Kassie: So, they'll do their part, like if I'm assigned positive, I will find three things...like I'll do this three times for three different reasons from here [referring to the readings]. Correct?
Amanda: That's exactly right.
Kassie: Okay, and then when we do round two, technically.
Amanda: Okay, so let's say, we're in your class. Okay, you're doing positive, and I'm assigned negative, then during round two, we're paired together, and we both share what we found. You'll talk about your positive, and I'll talk about the negatives, and here I'd write partner’s name, Kassie, and character trait you wrote military leader because you're doing leader, evidence that's the same, like she fought in the wars and then you explain it. Here I'm going to say in your own words because we don't really expect them to type it all out. We just want them to get the idea.
Kassie: Right, just get the gist.

Amanda: We're just going to have them get the gist and then you evaluate. Strong or need more information. So, I would write strong. Right?

Kassie: Yeah.

Amanda: And then, you would write your partner is Amanda. Character trait, she was a disloyal traitor. And then I'd show how an Englishman thought she was disloyal. And when you evaluate, you'd probably say needs more information because I didn't give you a solid piece of evidence, but they'd have this to help them, so at the very least they could read their sentences. So, this would give them a frame to set up their argument but then also would give them a frame to talk about it, you know what I mean? And then you pair them with another person. I didn't do three different partners for round two because I was like sometimes it might be the same reason, you know what I mean, so you want them to have at least two.

Kassie: Yeah and pick your two best or like which one you think.

Amanda: Right and then do that there. This gives them something to do so that they're listening with a purpose. So then they can go back and see oh okay, I have to listen for information, whereas like the other time, they didn't really have to listen because it was all there but this they really do, and then here their exit slip is where they'll decide, so they have to decide and then explain their choice, she was a positive or negative historical figure because and then, Yes, true, they could just pick one from here but still that's an intelligent way to formulate an argument. You're using your resources available to make a decision.

Kassie: I think that is so great. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Kassie)
This conversation shows how I negotiated the lesson structure to include three different parts or rounds. During the first round, students were assigned primary sources that state that Joan of Arc’s positive or negative character traits. Half of the students were assigned positive, and the other half were assigned negative. Given their assignment, students became experts on the positive or negative traits of Joan of Arc. Round two involved sharing this information with a partner. Here, in order to negotiate these roles, Kassie and I assumed the positions of students, talking through how students would practically complete the lesson objective. Round three included the exit ticket and culminating activity where students had to “make a decision” about Joan of Arc.

This negotiation contributed to Kassie’s understanding of the lesson structure, which afforded students the opportunity to accomplish all content objectives as well as satisfy language objectives (e.g., reading, writing, speaking, and listening). By positioning myself as a lesson creator, I structured the lesson clearly so that students could easily follow the different parts of the assignment and facilitate Kassie’s understanding about the lesson sequence. By positioning ourselves as students, we were able to see the assignment through the students’ lens which refined our plan to teach ESL students in the social studies classroom. Kassie’s interactive positions of me as the ESL teacher and acceptance of my interactive positions enabled a smooth collaborative process. This smooth collaborative process also paved opportunities for Kassie to learn to incorporate all language objectives when planning to teach content objectives to ESL students in the mainstream classroom. Kassie’s learning, hence, speaks to the importance of negotiation as a crucial factor in designing lessons for ESL students and the tremendous potential for ESL and social studies teachers’ collaboration to be a space for this learning.

**Negotiated Lesson Design in Science**
The ESL and science teacher negotiated lesson designs in collaboration, which influenced the science teacher’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream classroom. In order to create the actual teaching activity, we had to grapple with Shawn’s traditional teaching notions and decide planning roles. These negotiations involved Shawn acting as a content teacher to explain how he typically designed lessons and me acting as the primary lesson designer; both teachers’ planning acts were crucial in sustaining collaboration. The negotiated outcome resulted in the creation of two lessons that helped Shawn become more aware of how to create lessons with ESL students in mind.

During the first collaborative cycle, Shawn and I planned to teach a lesson about electron sharing in covalent bonds, which built on previous lessons about ionic bonding. In the first collaborative planning session, Shawn brought one practice problem that bonded potassium with another element on the periodic table. The next conversation explains how our lesson negotiations began:

Amanda: Okay, covalent bonding, what do you normally do with covalent bonding?
Shawn: Well, yeah, here's the thing. Let me look (Shawn looks on his computer with Amanda sitting beside him) As far as on paper, I've just got some practice problems that we could work on.
Amanda: Okay.
Shawn: Okay. That's gotta say with. [changing a misspelled word to with on the practice problems] What I'm thinking about doing because I teach it on the board. And they're taking notes, and with practice problems, I even have kids go up and work on the board, and then they do a practice sheet on their own for a grade and then of course there comes a quiz and then a test. But, maybe somehow in the notes, rather than me giving them off the board, maybe if we could do some kind of sheet maybe, maybe even that would go
along with the assignment that just has problems. Maybe the front of this assignment could have an introductory page or a notes page or something that would add to their notes, something that would supplement what they're writing down to make sure they've got exactly the right stuff and to make sure that it is effective for all the students. That's where you would come in.

Amanda: For sure. I can do that. (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Shawn)

This conversation highlights how our negotiations to plan and teach the first lesson on covalent bonds lacked a clear understanding of how Shawn typically taught the lesson. I initiated the conversation, and in doing so, positioned Shawn as the content teacher who could tell me his previous experiences teaching about covalent bonds. Shawn’s words, “Well, yeah, that’s the thing,” was his way of informing me that he did not have a previous lesson plan or activity in which to share with me. When he says, “I’ve just got some practice problems,” he meant that he had one problem that bonded potassium with another element. Since potassium is not a nonmetal, it cannot be used to explain covalent bonding because covalent bonds share electrons between nonmetals. Realizing this immediately, Shawn told me how he imagined the lesson. His description, “I teach it on the board” positioned him a teacher who preferred lecture as his teaching style. This positioning was also supported by his insistence that students “[take] notes” and complete “practice problems. I did not challenge Shawn’s positioning of a lecturer even though it contradicted my own teaching notions because I ultimately positioned Shawn as the one with ultimate authority to make decisions in the mainstream science classroom. I also did not think it would help me sustain collaborative efforts with Shawn. Had I challenged Shawn’s traditional notions, rather than going along with them, this might have produced a different lesson design process during the first cycle. He also invited me to assist in creating parts of the lesson, because in his ideal lesson conceptualization, he positioned me as a teacher who could
create the notes page when he said, “That’s where you would come in” By inviting me to create the notes, Shawn interactively positions me as a teacher who was capable of creating a notes page “that would be effective for all the students.” I accepted his positioning when I said, “For sure, I can do that,” which indicated that I would assume the responsibility of creating the notes. With my agreement, I hoped to give students a visual explanation, which might challenge Shawn’s strict traditional notions that lessons needed to involve mostly lectures.

Even though I agreed to divide content responsibilities with Shawn, I still did not know what Shawn wanted me to include on the notes page other than information about covalent bonds. In actuality, I had no previous knowledge about covalent bonding. Thus, we had to continue to negotiate the contents of the notes page in order for me to fulfill my agreement. To this aim, I asked Shawn to explain how he would typically teach covalent bonding to students in this next conversation:

Amanda: We could do one on the examples that you have, the sheet that you have?
Shawn: Yeah, let's pull it up and do that, absolutely. [pulls it up]
Amanda: So, potassium which is K so that's–
Shawn: So that's gonna be a metal, so that's not gonna work with covalent.
Amanda: Oh okay.
Shawn: Let me pick the easiest one. Let's go with Carbon and Hydrogen. So, the first thing we do is list them both and you draw their Lewis Dot Structure, so Carbon is gonna have four dots and Hydrogen is gonna have one. With this one, I have the octet rule, as soon as we mention it, it's kind of blown out the window, because Hydrogen is happy with two, and so you know, the way I introduce it is that Hydrogen has got this single electron and they know that anywhere there's a single a bond can be there, they already know that. So, they're gonna be looking at these four singles. They know that Carbon can
form these four bonds. Hydrogen can form one. The singles will see another single, and
be like, “Hey what are you doing?” Get to flirting and then they're bonding, so they'll
circle those. And then they'll say, “Oh my gosh, Hydrogen is happy now because it has
two and the electrons in the circle are counted for both the Hydrogen and the Carbon.
But, these three are still lonely what are they gonna do?” The kids are gonna come up
with it on their own, they always do, “Well can't another Hydrogen come in and do that?”
I'm like, “Yeah”, you know, so then we draw a second Hydrogen and then of course, then
the whole class is going, “You need two more Hydrogens”, and they figure it out pretty
well. These are sharp kids, eighth graders. And then they'll add the fourth one. So, step
one in its completion looking like this. We started with the Lewis dots. We showed the
sharing, and they're like, “Oh my gosh, now Carbon has eight. Everybody is happy, and
once everybody is happy, step one is done.” So, step two is to redraw it but show a line
through the dots instead of the circle pairs. So, you redraw it like this. Then, take step
three is simply to name it, so they know to name it CH₄, I mean they'll be good with that,
because they've seen ionic bonding already.
Amanda: So, this is naming?
Shawn: So, one, two, and three.
Amanda: Right so naming and then this step would be?
Shawn: Yeah, let's give each of the steps a name. So, first thing you do is circle the
shared pair.
Amanda: You have to have the Lewis dot diagram and then circle shared pairs. Got it.
Shawn: And then, there's that. Then, they show bonds with lines. Okay.
Amanda: I assume that you've gone over why Carbon has four and Hydrogen has one
electron.
Shawn: Yeah, absolutely.
Amanda: Okay, got it.
Shawn: And then step three is write the molecular formula is how I'll refer to it in class, so they're really not naming it. The name of it is methane, and I'll tell them that it's methane.
Amanda: Do you expect them to know that it's methane?
Shawn: No, because Lord have mercy there's so many, and naming the ionic ones are a little easier than the covalent ones so, but there's the three steps and the notes on it. Would that be a good start?
Amanda: Yeah, I can definitely put something together and then we can come back together and talk about it. Do you wanna do that?
Shawn: Yeah, that sounds great to me if that's all right with you.
Amanda: I'm thinking about putting together the notes page, and you can deal with the practice problems. How about that?
Shawn: Correct. (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Shawn)

In asking Shawn to explain a practice problem, I initially positioned him as a teacher, while simultaneously positioning myself as a learner. This teacher-learner positioning was productive in bringing about the negotiated outcome for both collaborating teachers. First, Shawn’s positioning as a teacher ensured that he shared his lesson goals with me as the collaborating teacher. Second, my positioning as a learner assured Shawn that I was willing to carry out his lesson goals and afforded me the opportunity to learn the content. Throughout his explanation, I took notes that assisted me in creating the handout, asked questions (e.g., “So this is naming?” and “Do you expect them to know that it’s methane?”), and made clarifying statements (e.g., “You have to have the Lewis dot diagram and then circle shared pairs? Got it”).
By the end of this conversation, I felt confident that I could create the notes handout, which was evidenced by my statement, “Yeah, I can definitely put something together.” In addition to assuming responsibility for the notes page, I attempted to divide planning responsibilities for the lesson design by asking Shawn to “deal with the practice problems.” By doing so, I wanted to divide responsibilities and give each of us a part in planning for ESL students in the mainstream science classroom. His word, “Correct,” signifies that he agreed to create the students’ practice problems. We also agreed to discuss each part of the lesson during the next collaborative session. In the second collaborative planning session, we discussed the notes page only because Shawn did not complete the students’ practice problems. When Shawn looked at my notes, he said, “That’s exactly what I’m thinking,” which suggests his overall satisfaction with the notes page that I created (Collaborative Planning Session, #2, Shawn). He offered no explanation for why he did not create the practice problems before the planning session, and I did not push him for an explanation because (1) I worried that doing so would not strengthen our professional relationship needed to sustain collaboration; (2) I understood Shawn’s busy schedule; (3) we were learning how to collaborate to plan lessons in which Shawn had no previous experience, and (4) Shawn promised to create them before the collaborative teaching date. For these reasons, I did not ask for an explanation because I believed he would ultimately create them by the collaborative teaching date. Hence, collaboration became a space for teacher learning through lesson negotiation, which involved grappling with sharing responsibilities for the lesson design.

During the second collaborative cycle, Shawn and I designed a lesson about transverse and compressional (or longitudinal) waves. He offered one diagram of transverse waves during the third planning session. Before beginning negotiations to create a second lesson, I resolved to take a stronger lead in creating the lesson so that Shawn might see a different lesson design than
what he typically envisioned. In my ideal conceptualization, I planned to use scaffolded instruction to teach transverse and compressional waves and allow each student the opportunity to be an expert in one type of wave so that they could teach the other group. Since Shawn did not articulate a certain preference for the lesson design, he afforded me the opportunity to voice my ideal conceptualization in the next conversation:

Amanda: So, you're not going to require at any point, you're going to have them label the parts. So, I wouldn't, If I were you, I mean since you're not going to assess them on knowing the definitions, I'd just have them label the parts of the wave. But then here's an idea. And I'm just thinking out loud and I haven't really thought this through fully, so tell me what you think. If we put them in partners somehow and we let one partner, like one partner be the specialist or the expert in transverse and the other one is the expert in compressional and then they share with each other, so then they're talking to each other.

Shawn: That's beautiful.

Amanda: Okay, (Amanda laughs) but–

Shawn: I mean it really is. I love it.

Amanda: But let me think how we could do that.

Shawn: I told you that that was one of things that I garnered from the last one. That turn and talk stuff you were doing.

Amanda: Okay. Um...and you know, it would be a little more, because you would have to make sure, if you and I are partners that you're transverse and I'm compressional. You know, so it's not–

Shawn: We'll assign that, right.

Amanda: Um–but then my question is how are we going to teach the expert what it is so that they know?
Shawn: Oh.

Amanda: Do we want to put them in two sides and have them in groups? You teach one, and I teach the other? Or, how do we wanna (He looks at me like he's doubtful). I mean I'm just asking. It doesn't have to be that. I'm just saying how do we wanna deliver the information to them? Do we wanna make it—

Shawn: Could we deliver it all to all of them then have them explain it to each other just so that they have to not just hear it but then they have to say it and formulate an explanation in their one words.

Amanda: Yeah, that's fine. Okay. We can do whatever you want to do.

Shawn: So, I'm thinking we would explain it to everyone both types of waves.

(Collaborative Planning Session #3, Shawn)

This conversation shows my failed attempt to negotiate an alternative lesson design to challenge Shawn’s traditional notion that “we [had to] deliver it all to all of them” in a traditional lecture approach. I began to negotiate my idea for the lesson design by suggesting that students become experts on the two different types of waves. Initially, Shawn accepted my suggestion with his words, “That’s beautiful…I mean it, I really love it.” Even though Shawn accepted initially, he eventually shut down my suggestion and returned to his alternative teaching style because this aligned with his traditional notion that teachers should deliver content to all students. In this way, he could not conceptualize a different lesson approach. I did not challenge his decision because I interactively positioned him as the teacher with the ultimate authority in the science classroom. This was evinced by my words, “We can do whatever you want to do.” Had I challenged Shawn’s traditional notions, this would have yielded a different lesson design, yet I feared doing so would not sustain our collaborative efforts.
Nonetheless, the outcome of this negotiation was productive because Shawn afforded me the opportunity to create the lesson similar to the first collaborative cycle. In the next example, I offered to create the lesson activity for the students:

Amanda: Okay, so I will do the blank one of like the example and the model, and I'll put together sentence frames like at the bottom of it. I guess.

Shawn: Sure, that would be huge. It's a lot of work.

Amanda: Yeah, I don't mind. (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Shawn)

This meant that I created a fill-in-the-blank notes page but extended the notes to also include application of this learning through a turn-and-talk as well as an exit slip to show students’ understanding of the content and objectives. In doing this, I wanted the lesson to be scaffolded (e.g., co-teachers teach, students practice together with co-teacher’s facilitation, and students show their knowledge on their own). According to my goal, I designed the lesson that contained three parts, and based on our earlier planning sessions, I anticipated that Shawn would accept my contribution because it still aligned with his notion that we designed the lesson in such a way that “would explain it to everyone, both types of waves” (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Shawn). By saying, “that would be huge. It’s a lot of work,” Shawn understood that I carried the brunt of responsibility in designing the content lesson; however, I did not reject this positioning because it ultimately provided a pathway for Shawn’s learning to plan lessons for ESL students in the mainstream classroom.

This was not to say that Shawn’s learning to plan lessons resulted in strict compliance to my lesson design; rather, he wanted to change the vocabulary and improve the diagram, which ultimately resulted in a much-improved lesson design during the third collaborative planning session. The next conversation exemplifies Shawn’s desire to change some of the terminology in the lesson:
Shawn: Let's look and be sure. Oh, I do, I forgot about that—shoot. Flows up here I don't like this word, flow.

Amanda: Okay.

Shawn: Let's—do you mind if we change [flow] to travel?

Amanda: Not at all.

Shawn: Okay.

Amanda: I'm okay with whatever you want to do.

Shawn: And it's congruent with you've already used the word travel in the first sentence and so I wanted to keep it the same, let me see if it's anywhere else. I don't think it is. No, it's just on that one part. Yeah, I'm gonna switch to travel from flows. It doesn't mean it was inherently wrong.

Amanda: Okay. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Shawn)

On the notes section, I used flow rather than travel for the intended statement, “the medium is the material is which waves flow”, which I recorded straight from my notes from the previous collaborative planning session. Shawn, however, wanted to change the word, “flows”, to travel to improve the clarity of the lesson. I accepted all of Shawn’s changes, evidenced by my words, “I’m okay with whatever you want to do.” My acceptance further explicates my interactive positioning of Shawn as the teacher who has ultimate authority to make decisions in the science classroom. Shawn commented, “[My word choice] was [not] inherently wrong,” which supports the fact that I included this terminology from my notes from a previous planning session. Shawn accepted my positioning because he continued to make additional technological changes to improve the clarity of the wave diagrams. By challenging my lesson design activity and offering helpful suggestions, Shawn negotiated a fruitful collaborative cycle which resulted in a clearer lesson design for ESL students in the science classroom.
Shawn credited my flexibility during our collaborative planning sessions as what ultimately sustained the collaborative cycle. He explained:

Shawn: When we were planning, changes like to the document that we handed them the notes page you know you had a lot of great ideas and already had them on paper and then I made a couple of changes and then–

Amanda: During the planning sessions?

Shawn: Correct. And then you kind of made changes to that, and we did it together but being able to do that we had no problems, but I can see that being an issue if I'm saying, “No, it needs to be this way” and you be like, “No, it needs to be this way.” There could be some conflict to come up, but we didn't experience that.

Amanda: Why do you think we did not experience conflict?

Shawn: Two things. 1) We trust each other. 2) We both have the attitude of being here for kids, and ego is not a part of it with us. I can see it can be really challenging. Like I could think of people in my head, I'm certainly not going to say names, but if I were to do this same collaboration with them it would probably be painful. Two strong of personalities or too selfish or too prideful, you know things can get in the way. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn)

Shawn believed that “we had no problems” when one made changes or suggestions to the lesson, which he perceived sustained collaboration. He also believed we had a strong professional relationship built on trust (e.g., “We trust each other”) and shared similar goals (e.g., “being here for the kids”). This professional relationship and our shared beliefs enabled us to offer changes for the overall betterment of the lesson.

Moreover, our collaborative negotiations, strengthened by our professional relationship and shared student-centered beliefs ultimately afforded the space for Shawn to learn to plan
lessons with ESL students in mind. Shawn concluded, “[Collaboratively planning lessons for ESL students] has inspired me to provide them with extra scaffolding more than what I was” (Interview #3, Shawn). Shawn’s inspiration suggests that he was beginning to see the benefits of scaffolded instruction as a crucial part of designing lessons for ESL students. While this does not suggest that Shawn completely abandoned his traditional lesson design approach, it does suggest an important first step. Thus, the ESL and science teachers’ collaboration was a space where teachers negotiate lesson designs, and ultimately, learns to plan for ESL students in the science classroom.

**Distinguishing Characteristics in Lesson Design**

The most distinguishing characteristic was the fact that Emily and Kassie provided me the opportunities to create or change the lesson activity based on the content and language objectives, which afforded equal decision-making responsibilities. Emily, Kassie, and I were similar in age and had a strong professional relationship prior to collaboration. Their only experiences working with me was when I was the ESL teacher even though they both knew I taught eighth grade ELA. As mentioned previously, Emily replaced me as the eighth-grade ELA teacher. When she began teaching at Starcreek, I helped her transition into her new role as an ELA teacher. I listened as she navigated the social dynamics of her new ELA team, helped her accommodate lessons for ESL students, and offered my content suggestions when she asked for my help. While I interactively positioned her as the content teacher who made decisions in the ELA classroom, I did not position her as someone unwilling to change or adapt lessons based on my suggestions. She also positioned me as an ELA and ESL teacher and never closed down opportunities for me to make changes to the overall lesson design; thus, she welcomed my suggestions and tried to accommodate them.
Similarly, Kassie was a novice teacher with three years of teaching experience, and she was new to Starcreek when I first met Kassie. The ease at which she afforded me the opportunity to create the lesson activities is most likely attributed to her new teacher status, our previous experiences working in collaboration, and our professional relationship. This led her to position me as a teacher who would always help her. There were times when I reflexively positioned myself as having too much control, yet when I voiced my concerns to Kassie, she would insist that I knew what I was doing, and I helped her make the lessons better. Thus, she positioned me as the lesson designer/creator, and I accepted her interactive positioning.

With Carol, her reliance on previously created materials (e.g., TeachersPayTeachers, Kuta software) hindered my ability to create lessons during the first collaborative cycle. However, after the first cycle, I resolved that I would create parts of the lesson activity during the next collaborative cycle. With Shawn, he did ask me to create a notes page on covalent bonds during the first collaborative cycle. His position as a teacher who favored traditional lesson designs hindered my input. Both Carol and Shawn worked with me previously as an ELA teacher, but they did not allow me to completely change the lesson template. Thus, while they trusted me, they needed to work with me in this capacity before affording me more opportunities to create lessons with them. I positioned them as the teachers with decision making power, even though they both positioned me as a teacher with content knowledge in their respective subjects. Because of this positioning, I was hesitant to challenge their suggestions or offer another idea. The fact that they positioned me as a content teacher with additional content knowledge in mathematics and science ultimately sustained collaboration.

**ESL and Content Teachers’ Negotiation of Teaching Roles**

**Negotiated Teaching Roles in Language Arts**
Emily and my negotiation of teaching roles paralleled our contribution to the planning sessions. For example, during the first collaborative cycle, Emily’s primary duty was to create questions for students to answer after they read the group’s selected lines from Act I, Scene 1. My primary duty was to create a model as they read the lines closely and answered the questions. I also created a graphic organizer and sentence frames where students had to write an explanatory paragraph to describe how Shakespeare used eyes and sight to represent love. We based our negotiation of the teaching roles with this understanding. To evidence, Emily stated that she wanted me to explain the model to begin the lesson activity:

Emily: So, then we'll start with—
Amanda: the model.
Emily: So, you start that.
Amanda: So, you want me to lead?
Emily: I want you to start with “Today, we're going to go back and review what we read fully yesterday, we're going to do a close read of Act I, Scene 1, today, here's what I want you to focus on.
Amanda: Right. I'm going to say, this is going to be two teachers same content, but there are multiple roles, and I'm leading that. Do you see what I mean? (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Emily)

This excerpt highlights how Emily and I negotiated our teaching roles based on our contribution during the collaboration planning session. Emily began the conversation and chose me to start the lesson, which began with an explanation of the model. Her insistence that I lead the lesson shows that she positioned me as someone capable of teaching content and language in the mainstream classroom to all students (ESL students and non-ESL students). Accordingly, I accepted her positioning and confirmed that the teaching role for this collaborative teaching
session resembled “two teachers” instructing the “same content.” There was evidence in this example to suggest that Emily thought she needed to share with me how she would lead the lesson because she says, “I want you to start with...a close read of Act I, Scene 1.” She proceeded to tell me how she would explain the activity to the students. This excerpt, and more specifically, Emily’s explanation evidence her negotiation as she learned to share the teaching space with a co-teacher, especially considering she had no prior experience engaging in collaborative teaching with another teacher. She wanted to ensure that I understood the teaching goals, which was crucial in her learning to share instructional responsibilities in the mainstream classroom. Because of our willingness to articulate our intentions and instructional goals for the lesson, Emily and I assumed equal teaching roles, bouncing back and forth from one teacher to another. When students worked in collaborative groups, we circulated the room, answered questions, and facilitated small group discussion.

After students worked in collaborative groups, students shared their answers in a whole-class discussion format. Emily led this whole-group discussion. I explained the paragraph to the students reviewing the task and narrating how to use the sentence frames to write the paragraph. Emily and I circulated the room as students wrote their paragraphs individually. Another important aspect in Emily’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in collaboration involved transitions between the two of us. This next example explains Emily’s opinions about our interactions during the first co-teaching session:

Amanda: How did we transition between each other?

Emily: Oh, it was seamless. Like you introduced the whole thing like talked about tying their evidence and making sure they cite it and I was concerned about them messing up like we had seen them mess up earlier [in Li’s class] and so I was like, “Oh wait, add this
in there.” So, I just said it, and I didn't feel like you were like you know, it wasn't like either one of us were messed up or anything it just kind of went naturally.

Amanda: Right. And why do you feel like when we mess up, the other one says, “Oh” and interjects whatever they do?

Emily: I just assume that if you're going to say something it's because I missed it, and the same if I do it to you.

Amanda: And vice versa.

Emily: Yeah, if you do it to me, and I’m not offended, I know all of this has to get done today, my brain can't process all of it, if there is another person in here to help me do it all the better.

Amanda: Would there ever be an instance where you might be offended if someone interrupted you to interject?

Emily: Only if they like totally disregarded everything I said and said, “Okay students, don't do that”, you know, like but we were on the same page because we planned it together.

Amanda: And we tag-teamed.

Emily: Yeah. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily)

This example shows that Emily’s comfort in negotiating and sharing the teaching space with me. Part of Emily’s learning required that she navigate interruptions. Because “we were on the same page,” Emily felt confident to interject comments while I was teaching in order to accomplish the lesson’s instructional goals. She admitted that “[her] brain can’t process all of it” and having a co-teacher helped her fulfill the lesson objectives more effectively than if she had to teach the lesson alone. Hence, she attributed the ease of our transitions to planning the lesson together, and
thus, sharing the same instructional goals for the lesson. Consequently, we were able to “tag-team” and help students complete the instructional task.

Likewise, during the second co-teaching session, Emily and I shared instructional roles that paralleled our contribution during the collaborative planning sessions. We decided that we would share instructional roles like we did in the first collaborative session. For the second co-teaching session, we introduced the activity (Emily), reviewed the conflict (me), facilitated group work as students wrote the skit (both), graded the performance (both), and explained the exit slip (Emily). Because there were many lesson objectives in one class period, there potentially could have been awkward transitions; however, we did not experience them. This next example evidences that the interactions between Emily and me were quite natural and shows the reasoning for our good-natured interactions and smooth transitions:

Amanda: Okay, describe our interactions throughout the co-teaching session.

Emily: I feel like we just really balance each other. I start, you finish. You start, I finish. It just flows very naturally.

Amanda: Why do you think it flows so naturally with us?

Emily: Well we planned it. So, like we said you do the first part, I'll do the second part. And so, we knew, and when you said, “All right, get started,” I didn't have to come behind you and be like, “Okay, time to get started,” you know, you did that, so it's done, you know, we just understand you handle that, and I'll handle this. We'll do it together. It's better together than it is apart.

Amanda: And I think part of that too is kind of the stuff of what we don't see we are very similar like in how we approach planning.

Emily: And classroom management and procedures and everything, yeah.

Amanda: Exactly. And even what we're willing to do in the classroom is similar.
Emily: Yeah, if you ever needed a sub one day, I feel like I could walk in here and do exactly what you needed done, and it would be very similar to the way you would have done it. It would be the same.

Amanda: And I feel the same way. I think there's something to be said for why we're able to do that because our philosophy of teaching—

Emily: We're like-minded. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Emily)

Successfully negotiating teaching roles involved collaborative planning and developing shared teaching goals. Our collaborative planning sessions and shared teaching goals were complemented by our similar teaching styles and philosophies. This contributed to teaching roles were both teachers “really [balanced] each other” where one started and other finished seamlessly. Negotiating teaching roles was only possible because we planned the lesson together and therefore shared instructional objectives. It also involved trusting the other person to accomplish her responsibility. When Emily stated, “I didn’t have to come behind you and be like, “Okay, time to get started,” you know, you did that, so it’s done,” she implied that she trusted me enough to act as a content teacher and do what I felt was best for all students in the mainstream classroom. Without trust and a solid professional relationship, Emily and I would not have negotiated these roles successfully during the co-teaching session. In her view, she indicated that we teach in such a similar fashion that we could act as a substitute teacher for each other and conduct the class similarly. In the ELA classroom, Emily learned that prior collaborative planning, shared teaching goals, and trust are needed to negotiate instructional responsibilities; Emily’s example shows that this negotiation is enhanced when both teachers share similar teaching styles and philosophies.

**Negotiated Teaching Roles in Mathematics**
Carol and I had to grapple with teaching responsibilities in order to plan and teach ESL students in the mathematics mainstream classroom. Carol did not have previous experience co-teaching with an ESL teacher. Her only experience was with a special education teacher whom she reported did not share planning and teaching responsibilities; thus, this inexperience meant that we had to negotiate these shared teaching roles, particularly as it related to what an ESL teacher did (or did not do) in the mainstream classroom. As Carol began to share teaching responsibilities with the ESL teacher, she learned additional ways to teach content to all students in the mathematics classroom, which contributed to her overall satisfaction with the co-teaching sessions.

During the first collaborative cycle, Carol and I discussed our teaching roles during the co-teaching sessions. She wanted my primary role to be working with the ESL students during instruction. The following conversation depicts how Carol positioned me as the teacher who worked with ESL students in the mainstream Pre-Algebra classroom:

Amanda: As for the co-teaching model, would you say that this is reteach and teach, so you're teaching, and I'm reteaching in a smaller group, or would you say, one teaches, or one assists, where I'm assisting students. Probably the latter, what do you think?

Carol: It's kind of both. In the beginning it's kind of one teaches, one assist, but the [reteach and teach] is making sure, while they're working on this, it's making sure that [the ESL students] know how to do it. You might be reteaching it. It kind of depends what we see them doing.

Amanda: So okay, I'll put both. I'm gonna say that. All right, in the middle of the lesson, you're going to introduce that and then--

Carol: And then they'll take notes. This is where I need you to make sure that they're actually writing it down.
Amanda: Okay, will do. (Collaborative Session #2, Carol)

I positioned myself as a classroom assistant/content teacher for ESL students most likely because I did not help create the lesson. Carol accepted my reflexive position yet suggested that I could also be reteaching ESL students who did not understand the mathematics concept while she instructed. Her statement, “I need you to make sure they’re actually writing down,” solidifies that she interactively positioned me as a classroom assistant/content teacher for ESL students. Interactively positioning me as a classroom assistant/content teacher for ESL students might have been a typical association given my job title; however, by positioning me this way, Carol did not share responsibilities for ESL students in the mathematics classroom. She continuously used the second person pronoun, which implied that she did not conceptualize her role at least during the first collaborative cycle to teach ESL students; instead, it was my duty in the mathematics classroom.

Similarly, during the first co-teaching session in Algebra, Carol likewise explained that I was a classroom assistant in helping the ESL students. For example, Carol described my teaching role during the first co-teaching session in the following excerpt:

Carol: You're just another resource for her that she knows that know she can ask math questions to, but she's really willing to ask anybody.

Amanda: Yeah, she is.

Carol: She does not need assistance in the classroom. That's what is gonna make her good at the high school. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

Carol positioned me as a “resource” for Li in the mathematics classroom because I knew the content, so Li could “ask math questions”; yet, she did not position Li as a student who needed assistance. She also positioned students who did not need assistance to be “good” future high school students, which might indicate her belief that students who need assistance may not
be “good at the high school.” For this reason, by suggesting that this particular student did not need help, she further positioned me at best as a classroom assistant. She implied that my intended role was to assist or help an ESL student who did not really need help based on her perspective, which in effect questioned the significance of the ESL teacher’s role in the mathematics classroom. She did not entirely relegate the ESL teacher’s position in this conversation. When Carol emphasized my mathematics content knowledge, she believed my knowledge to be an asset or resource in the classroom. Thus, negotiation of teaching roles highlights how my mathematics knowledge overcame the ESL teacher’s relegation during the first collaborative cycle, even while still acting as a classroom assistant.

Carol and I shared teaching roles during the second collaborative cycle. This change was most likely attributed to my large contribution during the collaborative planning sessions, which led Carol to want to try sharing the instructional space with me. Hence, during this next conversation, Carol began negotiating our teaching roles by asking the following question:

Carol: Yeah. Now, would you like to try you explaining, defining the other, some of the other angles?
Amanda: Sure. I can do–
Carol: I think that would be interesting to try.
Amanda: So, let's say–
Carol: because we're doing transversal. Okay, and then–
Amanda: Do you wanna switch back and forth? Like you do one and I do one? Or do you wanna do like me, then you?
Carol: Yeah, yeah, let's do that.
Amanda: I think that would be fun.
Carol: I think it'd be neat.
Amanda: So, I'll just take the first one. So, I'll do transversal, corresponding–

Carol: No, okay, if I'm gonna do parallel lines I'll do–

Amanda: (nods her head) you do transversal.

Carol: I'll do transversal. You do vertical. I'll do corresponding.

Amanda: That's a good idea. So, I'll start with vertical angles and go every other one.

Carol: Yeah.

Amanda: That works for me.

Carol: I think that'll be fun. Let's try it. I've never done it. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Carol)

Carol’s satisfaction with my contribution to the lesson plan designed led her to want to experiment with an alternative teaching model that she had “never done.” My contribution included my mathematics content knowledge and was supported by our professional relationship. This negotiation involved deciding who would begin the explanation of the vocabulary words. Here, I suggest that I could go first by explaining the vocabulary word, transversal. My willingness to volunteer, especially given the first collaborative cycle, spoke to my determination and persistence to co-teach ESL students in the mathematics classroom. Acknowledging my ability to teach mathematics and share instructional responsibilities, I accepted all of Carol’s suggestions, even when it challenged my suggestion. Carol challenged my suggestion only because she wanted to begin class with a discussion of parallel lines; thus, logistically, it made sense that she would begin the first word. We ultimately agreed to switch between content teaching roles and allowed each other the opportunity to teach the vocabulary words in the mathematics Pre-Algebra classroom; therefore, this co-teaching model most closely resembled two teachers teaching the same content.
Carol and I used a similar teaching model (e.g., two teach the same content) during the co-teaching session in the Algebra class. Our teaching responsibilities corresponded with our contribution to the lesson design during the planning sessions. This meant that Carol started the lesson with a notes page that she previously used, and I taught students how to write justification statements using sentence frames. Negotiation of teaching responsibilities began with Carol stating what she wanted us to teach in the following excerpt:

Carol: Okay, I'll start off and do the handout, which is basically note taking you know fill in the blanks to make sure you get the notes and explaining.
Amanda: Right. Introducing that. Now I'll explain, do you want me to do some of the teaching?
Carol: Yeah, do you want to do this one [referring to the one Amanda created]?
Amanda: Yeah, you want me to do model?
Carol: Yeah (emphasis), yeah.
Amanda: I mean I can do whatever you want me to do.
Carol: Let's do that. I like that. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Carol)

Instead of switching between two people in the Algebra classroom, we decided to transition teaching roles so that each teacher could explain her planning contribution to the class. My response to Carol’s suggestion, “I can do whatever you want me to do,” suggests my willingness to be part of the Algebra classroom on Carol’s terms. This willingness implies that I positioned Carol as the ultimate teacher with the authority to make decisions. By recognizing Carol’s authority, I deferred to her suggestion. Carol’s acceptance was related to the fact that she had never used sentence frames in the mathematics classroom prior to collaboration. As such, she positioned me as the one who was capable to teach the “model” to students. This positioning
was important, because in doing so, she afforded both of us the opportunity to become co-teachers of content and language in the mathematics classroom.

By negotiating teaching roles, Carol learned an alternative way to teach students. In the second collaborative viewing session, Carol expressed how much she enjoyed co-teaching in the next conversation:

Carol: I really liked it. Again, you showed them something that I hadn't seen before, and I used that with the rest of my classes.

Amanda: With the alternate interior angles?

Carol: With the Z. And the alternate interior angles. I used it with my other Pre-Algebra class.

Amanda: I think that's good to have multiple ways to understand--

Carol: I think it's great for the kids to hear other ways. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol)

Carol’s words, “I used it with my other Pre-Algebra class” signifies that Carol’s learning extended beyond the actual co-teaching session to influence her teaching in other Pre-Algebra classes. In addition, Carol believed this alternative information was beneficial for students, implying her belief that is “great” for multiple people to show different approaches to the same content. Hence, by negotiating teaching roles to share the instructional space, Carol learned to share the mathematics mainstream classroom with an ESL teacher whom she positioned as a mathematics content teacher. In doing so, she learned a new teaching strategy to help students access and master the lesson objectives.

**Negotiated Teaching Roles in Social Studies**

The ESL and social studies teachers’ collaboration influenced Kassie’s learning to teach ESL students. By negotiating teach roles, Kassie and I had to decide which teacher would
instruct each part of the lesson, and in doing so, Kassie learned to share the teaching space with another teacher. In this way, Kassie and my teaching roles corresponded with the job title associated with each teacher’s position and sometimes with our contributions to the planning session. This meant that Kassie was mostly in charge of content explanations, and I was in charge of explaining models, paragraph scaffolds, and the sentence frames.

For example, during the first collaborative cycle, instructional duties involved introducing the activity, explaining students’ tasks, facilitating students’ whole-group discussion, and giving the exit slip. The next conversation shows how Kassie and I decide teaching responsibilities:

Amanda: Yeah. So, at the beginning of the lesson, what are we going to do at the beginning? Are you starting with this activity? So, we're going to watch the video?

Kassie: We should get completely through. I'll probably know by tomorrow, obviously I'll know by the end of the day, but we should get completely through what we're doing today and I'm not going to even really, I might have a bellringer that talks about what we did today, because we always have a bellringer, but besides that I'll be like, because I'll put our document that we made on my website and I'll put 06 Five Pillars of Faith in your unit folder and then I can kind of explain what we're doing.

Amanda: Introduce what we're doing and the video.

Kassie: Yeah.

Amanda: And then we're going to model that here. Are you okay with I'll read the first paragraph, you’ll read the second paragraph and then you will do questions one, two, three and I'll do questions four, five.

Kassie: Yes, and I'll do the chart.
Amanda: Yes, please do. Okay, so model but we'll do the chart, first, and then model. And then I'll come in with the model. Then the middle of the lesson, two teachers, same content still wouldn't you say, because we're both facilitating what they're doing in their groups?

Kassie: Oh, yeah.

Amanda: And then I can explain maybe I can explain what they're doing in groups and then we can tag team this. You know what I mean? And then facilitate group work, and then groups report out what they did. Groups report out what they did. Okay, two teachers teach same content, so the exit will be the slip, and then exit slip. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Kassie)

Kassie positioned herself as the content teacher who knew better the scope and sequence of the lesson. Students were accustomed to Kassie delivering instruction without another co-teacher because she instructed them daily, and consequently, she had a better understanding about how this lesson fit with other lessons. Thus, she needed to “explain what we’re doing” and show the introductory video. I accepted Kassie’s reflexive position and simultaneously positioned myself as a content co-teacher willing to share in instructional responsibilities when I volunteered to teach the model. By accepting my reflexive positioning, Kassie agreed that our instructional model most closely resembled “two teachers teach the same content” because we shared equal teaching duties even as we facilitated group discussion.

The ease of this negotiation was mostly likely attributed to in large part to my contribution to the planning sessions. Kassie interactively positioned me as a content co-teacher who shared equal planning responsibilities; thus, she did not hesitate to give me instructional responsibilities as well. My suggestion that we would “tag-team” during group discussion meant that we both agreed that we would say and act in whatever way to meet the lesson objectives.
Our ability to tag-team was possible because of our professional history and relationship that was built on trust and shared instructional goals (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Kassie)

In commenting on these shared instructional roles, Kassie stated that our duties corresponded with our job title and stated that students benefited from the model and our emphasis on writing in complete sentences in the following conversation:

Kassie: I think as the content teacher I was going over the content part and like ensuring that they understood what the Qur’an and the Sunnah was. But then you as the ESL teacher, I felt like it was more your role to explain, this is how we want you to write the sentences. This is how we want you to look for the answers to the questions, kind of bringing in the language aspect of the assignment.

Amanda: Okay, and I decide to during my explanation, to give them a question and response, so they repeat after me a lot, like how many are you doing in your group, okay you're doing one, and I think I did that to a) elicit participation and b) to just make sure that they understood what they were supposed to do, and but at some point, I felt like I asked too many questions, I feel like I asked too many times, and they were like, okay we got it, move on. But, I mean–

Kassie: Maybe half of them did, but the other half greatly benefitted from that and probably could have been used more. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

Kassie’s words (e.g., “greatly benefitted”) suggest her overall satisfaction with my explanation of the content and lesson activity. In order to ensure that students wrote in complete sentences, I asked them directly in a whole-group discussion format to repeat the instructions in an effort to solidify students’ understanding of the instructions and encourage participation. Here, I was concerned that I asked too many questions when students already knew what to do. To address my concerns, Kassie positioned me as an asset in the social studies classroom, one who was able
to explain instructions. This conversation makes obvious the fluidity of our interactions and the comfort we felt in being able to voice concerns and receive feedback from each other, which our strong professional relationship made possible. Thus, negotiating teaching roles were smooth and agreeable in large part because of our planning sessions and professional relationship.

These negotiations continued during the second collaborative cycle. The lesson design called for numerous explanations to ensure that students completed the content and language objectives. This meant that our instructional duties needed to be specified as we delivered specific instructions to students. During the fourth collaborative cycle, Kassie and I decided on our teaching roles:

Kassie: You want me to kind of how we set up the last one like I'll introduce how she fits within the, we'll like touch on her because she's significant in the outcome of the Hundred Years Wars, so I'll just recall, remember yesterday we talked about Joan of Arc and today we're going to talk about--

Amanda: analyze character traits about her.

Kassie: So, I can kind of explain and do the background part.

Amanda: Okay, so you're going to introduce activity, transition from yesterday, introduce activity, and show video. Transition from yesterday, introduce Joan of Arc and show video. Then, you can also, because I feel like this goes with the video, so you can do the background. I'm going to make that included with the video. Do you want me to do this [referring to the chart with Joan of Arc's attributes] like what is a feminist and I may ask them, like what do you think a feminist is, but I might call on some of them to help me if they don't answer me? So, I'm going to do the “you decide” part. Um, and then, do you want me to do the model and example?

Kassie: Yeah.
Amanda: Model and example. And then here we're going to break them into specific pairs, and so I'll go ahead and break them into pairs. Oh wait, do you want to give them who is positive and negative?

Kassie: Yeah.

Amanda: So, give positive and negative, like the columns, right? Columns to be positive and negative, and then you can break them up into and start activity and then facilitate student work. Right?

Kassie: Yeah.

Amanda: Because I'm going to do that too when they're all working and then okay round two? Do you want me to explain what they're going to do in round two?

Kassie: Yeah.

Amanda: So, I'll bring them back together and [types] brings back together and explain round two, and I may have you role play with me, like “Okay, pretend Ms. Kassie and I are partners”, like I kind of did before, because then they'll get it. Then they'll choose the two that are the strongest. So, then you can help me facilitate how they're going to move. So maybe after I explain, maybe you'll explain how they'll going to move, and then we'll both facilitate the move.

Kassie: Okay. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Kassie)

Kassie’s responses (e.g., “yeah” and “okay”) shows that she agreed with all of my decisions to divide teaching responsibilities. Specifying teaching roles provided clear expectations for the co-teaching session, thus, instruction flowed smoothly between the two teachers. My decisions during this negotiation were meant to switch between the two co-teachers without awkwardness or confusion. This supports the notion that the instructional model resembled two teachers teach the same content and reinforces our shared positioning that both teachers were content co-
teachers. In specifically commenting on our interactions during the second collaborative teaching session, Kassie described:

The interaction was great. Each teacher fulfilled their role as the lead when it was their time and then when it came to walk around and help the students, both did that as well.

Clear expectations led to clear results. (Reflective Journal #2, Kassie)

Kassie’s words also suggest that clearly defined teaching roles (e.g., “expectations”) contributed to a successful collaborative teaching session, which was mutually defined as meeting the lesson’s content and language objectives. Kassie’s statement also indicates that we had equal instructional duties, and each co-teacher took “the lead when it was their time.” Thus, her words indicated her satisfaction with the second co-teaching session. These negotiations were crucial in Kassie’s learning to teach ESL students because she learned to share the teaching space with another teacher in a satisfactory way that met the lesson objectives.

**Negotiated Teaching Roles in Science**

The ESL and science teachers negotiated teaching roles in order to learn to teach ESL students in the mainstream science classroom; that is, the science teacher had to learn to share the teaching space with the ESL teacher. This negotiation involved dividing on teaching responsibilities and adapting to interruptions as they arose in order to better teach ESL students in the science classroom.

During the first collaborative cycle, we negotiated teaching roles based on our contribution to the planning sessions. This meant that Shawn was responsible for reviewing ionic bonding and using this knowledge to transition to an explanation about covalent bonding. Shawn lectured students about the three different steps involved with this bond. Since I created the notes page, I explained the notes page, which resulted in a repeated explanation from what Shawn
already mentioned during the collaborative teaching session. The next conversation depicts how Shawn and I negotiated these roles during the second collaborative planning session:

Shawn: And go into, okay, what would happen if we had two nonmetals bonded together? That's when I'll introduce covalent.

Amanda: Right, okay, after you do that?

Shawn: Then, we'll go into the example.

Amanda: So, then you're gonna demonstrate an example. Before you do that, do you want me to go over the notes page? To show them what I've done.

Shawn: No, I think that we need to work a problem first and then show them that.

Amanda: Okay, demonstrate problem and then go over the notes page. During that, you're going to be leading that and I'll be helping the students, making sure that they're following you.

Shawn: Either way, whatever you want. You can lead it if you want. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Shawn)

Shawn positioned himself as a lecture teacher as he informed me how he was going deliver the information to the students. My questions, “Before you [give students an example], do you want me to go over the notes page,” was intended to supplement Shawn’s lesson delivery with a visual representation of the notes, which might have increased students’ understanding of the content and objectives. However, Shawn shut down the opportunity for students to have the notes in front of them during the lecture, when he said, “No, I think that we should work a problem first and then show them that.” Hence, in actuality, my role in the science classroom was to repeat the explanation that Shawn provided (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Shawn). Shawn’s example was to demonstrate how Carbon and Hydrogen shared electrons through covalent bonding, which was the same example provided on the teaching page. To Shawn’s credit, he afforded me
the opportunity to “[lead] the lesson if [I wanted],” which in hindsight I should have accepted his positioning of a lead teacher. Rather than accepting his position, I challenged it by suggesting that he demonstrate the example because I thought he would provide a different example than what was provided on the notes in class. Shawn’s example, however, was never discussed during the collaborative planning sessions.

We also negotiated how we would facilitate students’ discussion in collaborative groups:

Amanda: So, it's two teach the same content. I'm going over the notes, and you are going over the problems. And then demonstrate another example of covalent bonds. And then are you going to have them do the practice problems? Along with this, right?

Shawn: I think I'm going to let them get started on [the practice problems] before the end of the period, yes.

Amanda: So, then they'll work on additional examples in groups, or by themselves, or how?

Shawn: In pairs, I always have them like you know how we have tables. I always just have whoever you're at a table is who you work with. They'll do their own work but then they'll kind of help each other, you know? (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Shawn).

This negotiation resulted in our decision to allow students to work in pairs to work through the practice problems rather than work alone. This decision is most likely attributed to Shawn’s preferred teaching style to let students work in pairs so that “they’ll do their own work but then...help each other.” This conversation shows that Shawn did not completely position himself as teacher who preferred more traditional teaching approaches. Rather, in this conversation, he wanted to give students the opportunity to learn from each other while still working to master the lesson objectives. This conversation also highlights the above-mentioned misunderstanding about the example that inadvertently resulted in sharing the same example with students. This is
evidenced by my phrase, “And then demonstrate another example of covalent bonds,” suggesting that Shawn would give “another example” before I explained the notes page.

Moreover, this conversation also shows that Shawn believed that our negotiation resulted in equal teaching roles. The earlier conversation where he offered to let me lead (e.g., “You can lead it if you want”) and the subsequent conversation where he agreed that I would share the teaching page with students indicate his belief that both teachers taught the same content. Shawn credited the ease of our interactions to my willingness to share teaching roles with him in the following conversation:

Shawn: I’m glad you reminded them that they needed to be taking notes. You know, because sometimes I’m thinking about what I’m going to teach and not always what the students were doing, so I was glad you noticed that and actually said something. Some people may not have said anything, and you did. And as you can tell from what I said, I was very glad you said that. I said, “Thank you!” It’s nice having someone to be willing to make sure students are doing what they are supposed to do.

Amanda: Yeah, I thought it was important for all students to be taking notes as you were showing an example. I wanted to make sure everyone was writing it down. Along those same lines, describe our interactions during the co-teaching session. Specifically, here, I guess I interject to remind students that they need to be taking notes.

Shawn: I’m teaching, and you’re not afraid to interrupt. I think we interact well together. It’s very seamless and we have no problems.

Amanda: Why do you think that it is seamless, and we didn’t have any problems?

Shawn: I think it was seamless because we have a good relationship and we planned together, and we knew what the other expected. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn)
In commenting on the fluidity of our teaching roles, Shawn learned the benefit of having two teachers in the science classroom. His statement, “I’m thinking about what I’m going to teach and not always what the students were doing, so I was glad you noticed that and actually said something,” shows his recognition that enacting teaching responsibilities is an arduous task. He distinguished my role from his previous experiences with co-teachers where they would have noticed but would not have interjected. Rather, I challenged his interactive positioning of a co-teacher because I insisted that all students needed to be taking notes. Shawn’s response, “It’s nice having someone to be willing to make sure students are doing what they are supposed to do,” shows his satisfaction that I am willing to interrupt and contributed to his learning to share the teaching space with another co-teacher. Shawn credited the ease of our interactions and fluidity of our transitions to our “good relationship” and our planning efforts so that “we knew what the other expected.” Therefore, by negotiating interruptions, Shawn learned to share the teaching space, which contributed to his learning to teach ESL students in the science classroom.

The negotiation of teaching roles was similar during the second teaching cycle. We decided that Shawn would begin the lesson about transverse and compressional waves to introduce the new material. The next conversation discusses my role as Shawn introduced the new material:

Amanda: While you're going over this, can we project the notes handout on the screen and I'll type as we go over it, so they have a visual of what we're writing down and what we're saying goes on the notes on the blank, right, because you're gonna fill in the notes as you talk about it, right?

Shawn: So, they're gonna have a copy of this and plus we're gonna have it on the screen?

Amanda: Yes.

Shawn: And we're coping on the screen; you're gonna be typing on it as I talk.
Amanda: Yeah, is that okay with you?

Shawn: Yeah.

Amanda: Okay, so I'm gonna say go over transverse waves, and [my role] is gonna be work on the computer filling in notes page. Okay, that's the beginning. How about you also go over compressional waves?

Shawn: Yeah, that's what I was thinking I was gonna do.

Amanda: Because you know what you wanna say about the sound waves. And I'll help you with either with identifying the parts, but I mean it's either that or I can just type the answers on the screen. It doesn't matter to me.

Shawn: Yeah, that's fine by me, because that's what I would usually be doing anyway, but having your support just makes it that much better with the typing and everything.

(Collaborative Planning Session #4, Shawn)

I reflexively positioned myself as a support teacher initially because I believed that students needed a visual representation of what Shawn would be teaching. Shawn questioned my supporting role two times during this conversation, which made me wonder if Shawn agreed with my supporting role. To clarify, I asked, “Is that okay with you?” Shawn’s response indicated his agreement (e.g., “Yeah.”) and his additional statements (e.g., “Yeah, that's what I was thinking I was gonna do” and “your support just makes it that much better with the typing and everything”) solidified and assured me of his agreement. Giving the notes prior to instruction distinguished this lesson from the previous one.

While Shawn and I made this agreement, we did not enact these teaching roles in actuality. Shawn made an impromptu decision before the lesson to instruct content (e.g., compressional and transverse waves), and afterwards, we distributed the notes handout, and I reviewed the content by filling in the blanks for the students (Collaborative Teaching Session #2,
Shawn). Hence, in enacting these roles, Shawn additionally positioned himself as a traditional content teacher who preferred lecturing the content information to the students. During the lecture, I assumed the position of a learner who sat to the side of the room listening as he lectured. During the collaborative teaching session, he told the students four times to “not worry about taking notes,” because he knew we had a notes page and activity for students to complete after the lecture.

When asked to explain his reasoning for this change, Shawn responded in the following way:

It was neat how we kind of worked through it and made those modifications [right before the teaching session] and I think the final product we came up with that lesson that day was fantastic. The reason for it was to try to keep kids from trying to work ahead some because if they try to work ahead then they miss something you just said and then it just interrupts the flow and I wanted to keep them focused on the things you and I were drawing on the board and saying and listing before they got to see the actual drawing and notes page that you had made. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn)

He offered to “keep [the students] more focused” as his explanation and did not want students “to work ahead” to fill in the blanks. This teaching act aligned with his position as a content teacher with knowledge to transmit to the students. However, the students eventually did fill in the blanks on the notes page and complete the activity.

Similar to the first collaborative cycle, there is evidence to suggest that Shawn did enact teaching roles that challenged the notion that Shawn was a traditional teacher. Shawn and I modeled how students were to work in pairs to discuss the content information. The next conversation depicts how we negotiated these roles:
Amanda: In the middle, can we model how to work in partners? So, you'll be transverse, and I'll be compressional, and we can even like, you know, model sentence frames of how we want them to talk about it, you know what I mean? Like letter A is on there is crest, right? Something like that, so we'll go back and forth, so then they know what they're supposed to be doing in their partners?

Shawn: And I think the way maybe to do it, tell me if I'm wrong whichever one of us is speaking first goes through all five letters and then we switch roles, and the second person goes through all five.

Amanda: I agree. Right, and then–

Shawn: No, and we're doing the same, same.

Amanda: And then we rotate and then whatever I didn't do first, you see what I'm saying? So that we're both reviewing.

Shawn: Yeah, right. I'm just saying whoever speaks first does the whole thing. Then the other person does the whole thing. There's no back and forth.

Amanda: Right, okay. Well I–

Shawn: Except for the one time.

Amanda: Okay, good. And then we'll facilitate, we'll walk around, and we'll facilitate, we're both gonna do that, facilitate group work. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Shawn)

Based on this conversation, it is obvious that I wanted students to engage in back and forth communication where students took turns asking and questions. My wish that students switch roles stemmed from my earlier suggestion that the student partners become expert in different types of waves. This would have allowed for both partners to ask and answer questions. It is clear from this conversation, that Shawn thought that only one student asked the questions and
the other gave all the answers when he stated, “One of us is speaking first goes through all five letters and then we switch roles, and the second person goes through all five.” In response, I confirmed his thinking because we provided a model but did not need to fully script students’ discussions with their partners. Thus, I did not elaborate on what I envisioned; rather, I agreed with Shawn’s suggestion for the model. My agreement is also attributed to the fact that I consistently positioned Shawn as the teacher who had the ultimate authority in the science classroom. This positioning led me to act in ways to defer to his ideas in an effort to sustain the collaborative cycle. In actuality, we engaged in teaching acts that paralleled our decisions during the planning sessions. In modeling the instructional task and affording opportunities for students to work in groups, Shawn began to experiment with different teaching methods which included student discussion. During the second interview, Shawn mentioned how collaboration influenced his teaching style:

I would say I don't use turn and talk quite the same way that you do. I do it in a way to where I'll give them, like what I did today, these problems were on the screen, you can see on the other monitor, and I had them pair up and work with somebody so that they could do that but the way you said let's stop and right now and do this and go back, I thought that was neat. I usually do that in a whole class setting of okay, what's the answer, who's this, what do you think of his answer, I lead a similar thing but not in the same way you did, and I like how you did it, so I would probably incorporate that now into my own style. (Interview #2, Shawn)

Through negotiating teaching roles, Shawn learned to consider an alternative way to teach content. His admitted that he typically questioned students “in a whole class setting” where students were randomly selected to provide the answer. With this alternative approach, he realized that he could have students “pair up and work with somebody” and return to a whole-
group discussion. In considering a new approach, Shawn learned to share the teaching space with me as the ESL teacher in collaboration, which gradually created opportunities for Shawn to experiment with alternative teaching styles where students learned from each other as they conversed in smaller groups.

**Distinguishing Characteristics of Teaching Roles**

The most noteworthy characteristic is that ESL and content teachers’ collaborative planning acts corresponded directly to their teaching acts. All content teachers reported engaging in collaborative teaching acts with special education teachers prior to collaborating with the ESL teacher. However, the special education teachers did not plan lessons with the content teacher, so they were not able to teach the lesson with the co-teacher. Thus, the collaborative planning sessions paved the way for collaborative teaching sessions where both teachers took a lead role. This is most likely attributed to the fact that both teachers knew the content and language objectives and discussed teaching roles during the collaborative planning sessions.

It is also worthy to note that the content teachers did not have experience engaging in collaborative teaching acts prior to collaborating with me as the ESL teacher, creating new experiences for all content teachers. While it may be impossible to pinpoint why they never collaborated with the ESL teacher prior to working with me, there is evidence to support that they had never been asked to co-teach with the ESL teacher. This means that the ESL teacher may have to initiate these collaborative teaching relationships with content teachers and be committed to sustaining them. The ESL teacher might also try to contribute to the planning sessions by creating parts of the lesson activity since the planning sessions overwhelmingly paralleled with the collaborative teaching acts.

This finding is not to say that the collaborative teaching acts will always run smoothly. With the science teacher, the planning and subsequent teaching acts were not enough to
completely challenge the science teacher’s traditional position as a lecture teacher. Nonetheless, through collaboration, the science teacher became more aware of scaffolded instruction and ways to incorporate student talk/discussions into the lessons. Working with the ESL teacher worked to pave the way for more equitable learning opportunities for ESL students. Dismantling the science teacher’s position was not the goal necessarily; rather, creating this equitable learning space was the ultimate goal. Hence, with continued interactions with the ESL teacher, the science teacher will continue to make progress toward this aim.

ESL and Content Teachers’ Negotiation of Language Strategies

Negotiated Language Strategies in Language Arts

In the language arts classroom, negotiation of language strategies required that I make suggestions for language strategies based on the content objectives because Emily did not have previous experience or training incorporating language strategies into a lesson. Consequently, she did not know what or how to add language strategies into a lesson especially during earlier collaborative planning sessions during the first cycle. During negotiations, this meant that I had suggest a specific language strategy and help Emily understand that this particular strategy would help the ESL students access and eventually master the content and language standards; However, the ESL students’ mastery of the content and language standard did not happen instantaneously. This could have posed a challenge in collaboration if Emily did not see the necessity of the strategy or see ESL students’ learning outcomes immediately to understand its importance. However, incorporating language strategies was not an obstacle in collaboration because Emily positioned me as a language teacher who knew how to teach the content in ELA. Therefore, Emily acts in ways that respected my expertise. In this next example, in the second collaborative session, I drew Emily’s attention to the fact that the lesson needed to have a specific language objective for ESL students:
Amanda: I'm going to find a language objective for this. We want them to write a paragraph and–

Emily: Integrate quotations and there's one about–

Amanda: Integrating quotations.

Emily: And there's one about citing evidence to support your interpretation of the text.

Amanda: Yeah, but this is like what we want them to do, like so we want them to write a sentence with a subject and a verb, and we want them to combine those sentences into a paragraph. Your content standards are something like what you just mentioned. You see what I mean? Language would be something like we want but this to be the focus for ESL students and their language objectives. Like what do you want your ESL students to be able to do? After we look at this, what do we want them to do?

Emily: Oh, okay. I see. Write a paragraph where they indent and put a period at the end.

Amanda: Yeah, right. But, you're focusing more on punctuation. I'm thinking the contents of the sentence. Like so the learner will write a sentence with a subject and a verb–

Emily: in every sentence.

Amanda: And then we want them to put this together in a paragraph. I mean that's the ultimate goal, right? We want them to write sentences with a subject and a verb and ultimately a paragraph.

Emily: And putting someone else's words with yours together in a sentence that makes sense.

Amanda: Okay, so incorporate quotations with your own words. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Emily).

This excerpt illustrates that Emily initially confused specific language objectives with content objectives. Emily began rephrasing parts of the content objective in offering a potential language
objective. The content standard stated that students were to cite textual evidence, so the content objective was to integrate text based on students’ own commentary. However, the ESL students in this co-taught class struggled to formulate complete sentences and further compile sentences into a paragraph. Thus, in order to focus Emily’s attention on a specific language objective, I suggested that the language objective needed to begin with this skill, and secondary to this skill would include textual citations. Emily words, “Oh, okay, I see,” show that she began to understand; however, she still focused on sentence mechanics (e.g., indentation and punctuation) rather than the contents of the sentence (e.g., subject and verb). As this example shows, while Emily understood that students needed to write a sentence with a subject and a verb, she did not completely forget that she wanted students to integrate textual evidence into their paragraphs. To this objective, I validated its importance after we established that ESL students needed to be able to write complete sentences in paragraph form. Both objectives are necessary and needed to be included into the lesson. Emily needed to understand that ESL students needed instruction on how to craft sentences, and I needed to understand that ESL students needed to craft sentences while incorporating textual evidence. Negotiation of language strategies required that I explicitly state the need for a language objective and then suggest an appropriate language strategy.

Simultaneously, Emily had to understand the purpose and be receptive to this language strategy. In negotiating the language objective, Emily learned how to incorporate a language objective into the lesson. In the subsequent planning session, I suggested a paragraph scaffold and sentence frames to help ESL students accomplish the language objectives. In this next example, Emily commented how she learned to use these scaffolds and sentence frames:

Amanda: What did you learn about pedagogy for ESL students?

Emily: Oh, wow, I didn't realize how scaffolded I needed to make that paragraph with sentence frames and how much that helped ESL students in future assignments. So, we've
done an assignment since that time and I scaffolded the paragraph for the ESL students, and they like did way better than they had in the past. And I wish that I had been scaffolding their paragraphs all along.

Amanda: Why do you think that helps them?

Emily: It helps them generate their thoughts and develop a frame for the structure of the sentence. (Collaborative Viewing Session, #1, Emily)

Negotiation of language strategies led to Emily seeing the importance of the paragraph scaffolds and sentences on the current and “future assignments.” She referenced a writing assignment that took place beyond the collaborative planning and teaching sessions in which she had students write a paragraph using sentence frames and a similar scaffold. She had students write a paragraph after they read an informational article. She used paragraph scaffolds and sentence frames to help students craft their paragraph. Emily’s actions show that she was able to move away from initially understanding the purpose of a language objective and selecting an appropriate language strategy. Here, she exemplifies that she could adapt the same language strategy on a similar activity without my help, solidifying how ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced Emily’s learning to use a language strategy to plan for and teach ESL students in the language arts classroom.

In the same way, during the second collaborative cycle, Emily identified language strategies (e.g., scaffolding the assignment and sentence frames) in the lesson without hesitation. When asked about instructional tools for ESL students, Emily responded:

Emily: Sentence frames.

Amanda: Or, you're having them do a script?

Emily: Yeah, I started doing the sentence frames on other stuff to get my other kids who are low level. That translates well from ESL to other things too. So that and breaking the
assignment down so it's more manageable in a chunk, looking at something big, all together.

Amanda: When you say breaking down, what do you mean?

Emily: I mean scaffolding instruction. So, like we did here, first select your couple. Then, outline your conflict. Then, pick an element you're going to choose. That way, by the time, they get to writing the script, they have progressed through, they could basically use what they've written up there to draft a script and it would be fine. (Interview #2, Emily)

Emily’s words show that she identified the language strategies, but her words (e.g., “other kids who are on a low level”, “translates well from ESL to other things too” also indicate that she negotiated the use of language strategies for students who were not ESL students. Emily’s statement also indicates potential risks. First, she might assume that ESL students are struggling students or “low” students, which indicate a deficit perspective. Second, she might reduce a language strategy for a tool that works for all students, or “just good teaching” because Emily internalized the use of the strategy and believed it was useful for other struggling students (de Jong & Harper, 2005, p. 102). Nonetheless, Emily’s learning is a process that will be refined with continued use of the language strategy and multiple interactions with the ESL teacher. Thus, making this connection was ultimately productive because it increased the likelihood that she would use this strategy again in the future as a useful tool that might benefit all students.

Similarly, realizing the strategy’s potential to help ESL students and other students evidences Emily’s learning to plan and teach ESL students in the mainstream classroom. Furthermore, she recognized that delivering information to ESL students through scaffolded instruction is an effective language strategy because “it’s more manageable in a chunk.” This is, she understood that designing the lesson with this language strategy helped ESL students break a larger
assignment (e.g., interview skit assignment) into smaller manageable pieces. In doing so, the ESL students were able to access and master the content and language standard.

Emily’s negotiation of language strategies in the language arts classroom influenced her approach to planning for and teaching ESL students. When asked specifically about her renewed understandings about approaching lesson planning for ESL students, Emily stated:

It's changed the way I wanna start the year. I want to start the year differently next year. I need to meet with the ESL teacher before school starts to see what passages and readings I can adapt and looking at those lessons beforehand because some of them can be grouped by level in class. Their levels are all different and their progress has been different so not just grouping them as all English language learners, which I don't mean I thought they were all the same beforehand, but it's just made me more aware of how to approach them from the get go. With each lesson I need to start thinking, how does this standard break down into something manageable that still shows growth, and so I think it's just a different viewpoint, but maybe not necessarily I've changed all the things I've done, but it's just a different way of looking at how are you gonna start this lesson.

(Interview #3, Emily)

Emily’s internal negotiation of language strategies shows that she learned that an effective approach to lesson planning for ESL students begins at the beginning of the lesson, which is markedly different than her own conceptualization that ESL instruction initially was as “an afterthought” (Interview #1, Emily). Emily’s growth highlights her learning experiences in collaboration with an ESL teacher. Based on this passage, she changed her “viewpoint” in designing lessons for ESL students in the future. She also became aware that ESL students had unique language and content abilities, making it impossible to classify them in one large group of students. Thus, by negotiating the use of language strategies in the mainstream classroom, Emily
learned to change her approach to designing lessons, and in doing so, developed a renewed understanding about ESL students’ language and content needs in the language arts classroom.

**Negotiated Language Strategies in Mathematics**

By negotiating language strategies in collaboration, Carol learned to plan for and teach ESL students in the mathematics mainstream classroom. Specifically, she learned a new way to teach vocabulary (e.g., an adapted four square) and how to use sentence frames to scaffold justification statements for ESL students. During the first collaborative cycle, Carol stated, “I don't know that there is anything new. We didn't have any new strategy” when asked to describe her learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream classroom (Interview #2, Carol). Even though Carol’s statement did not appear to be a negotiation, it actually was the motivating force in my understanding that I had to help create a lesson in order to include language strategies so that Carol might have increased opportunities to learn these strategies in order to plan for and teach ESL students. In this way, I negotiated Carol’s admittance of (non)learning to imply that I needed to bring to Carol’s attention to specific language strategies.

During the third planning session, I introduced a vocabulary four square as a language strategy as a potential option to help ESL students learn the vocabulary in Pre-Algebra. This next conversation begins with my suggestion:

*Amanda:* We could do like a four square. Like we do, they put the definition and they have a picture so we'll, we can put the, so here they would have the definition, here they would have a picture, here they might use it in a sentence and here we give them a practical math example using it.

*Carol:* That's gonna be an awful lot of those. But you could have more than one on a page.
Amanda: Oh yeah, I'd put them all on one page. I mean you would make it fit all on one page. I'd make it fit all on one page where you could run it off.

Carol: 'cause–

Amanda: And I may not even do...like I may just do it instead of a traditional four square I may just have like rows instead of boxes

Carol: Oh, and then have four. That would make sense. ‘Cause my brain just does that.

Amanda: And then have the four things, me too. I mean that's the traditional four square.

Carol: But I think you're right if you just did–

Amanda: Then you could have, then you could change up the way you wanted to do them. You know what I mean? You could have the picture–

Carol: And then you could have the word here and they could do the–now I like that idea.

(Collaborative Planning Session #3, Carol)

In the above conversation, I reflexively positioned myself as a language teacher who was capable of introducing and adapting language strategies in the mathematics content classroom. Carol, in response, did not conceptualize how to create the four square to fit her content objectives, mostly because the amount of space each one might take up on a page. Her statement (e.g., “That’s gonna be an awful lot of those”) shows that she doubted that this vocabulary strategy was an adequate use of space. Throughout this exchange, I validated and addressed Carol’s concern. Here, I assured her that “I’d make it fit all on one page” and accepted Carol’s concern that the traditional four square might take up too much space. As an alternative solution, I suggested a table with “rows instead of boxes” so that more vocabulary words could fit on one page. By negotiating in such a way, Carol eventually agreed that she “[liked] that idea,” which ultimately accepted my reflexive position of a language teacher who was capable of adapting language strategies to fit content lessons in the mainstream mathematics classroom.
Carol and I continued to negotiate the vocabulary four square activity in order to decide the task in each of the four squares. Carol wanted to include the word’s definition, stating:

Carol: Okay, that would be the definition. That'd be them marking it.

Amanda: Yep. And then we could do a practical math example, or we could use it in a sentence.

Carol: I'm not even sure how practical of a math. Now okay, so now this they'll be tested. Like they might give 'em, so we're doing corresponding okay, so we know that this one and this one, no this one and this one are corresponding so if I told you that this one was 60 degrees the question would be what's that?

Amanda: Yeah.

Carol: Is that practical enough?

Amanda: I mean, yes, that's what they'll be tested on, right?

Carol: Yeah.

Amanda: So then, what is this angle? Give them like this is angle a this is angle b and then we'll say what is the measure of angle b? And then they'll put 60 and then we could even have like a justification because–and that's what we have here, so then we'll have them write a sentence and this is good for vocabulary and language because then they could say, like angle a and angle b are congruent because they are, whatever the angle is, in this case corresponding. Do you see what I'm saying?

Carol: Oh–

Amanda: And then we're teaching them how to use words like congruent, but then we give them a sentence stem or frame to help them do that.

Carol: I like that. (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Carol)
This conversation illustrates the components (e.g., definition, picture, practical example, and justification statement) that Carol and I decided to include on the four square for each vocabulary word. In this exchange, I reflexively positioned myself and was interactively positioned as a language coach, teaching Carol how to create the four square. First, I drew Carol’s attention to the fact that the practical example should resemble a question that students might see on an assessment. Carol questioned whether the example was “practical enough.” My response articulated that Carol should give students examples that similarly reflect how she would assess their knowledge. Second, I introduced justification statements and sentence frames to help students articulate their claim. In writing these statements, students also would use an additional vocabulary word (e.g., congruent) that was applicable for the content objective. My positioning as a language coach provided a fruitful learning opportunity to plan for and teach ESL students because I accepted the opportunity to introduce and adapt a vocabulary four square as an appropriate language strategy to fit the mathematics content objective.

Carol’s learning continued in the fourth collaborative planning session. In working with me, Carol became aware of what sentence frames were and how to use them. Continuing my position as a language coach, I specified the language objective. In doing so, I showed how language objectives could be implemented in the mathematics classroom in the following excerpt:

Amanda: Okay, so I like this because they can use this up here, so really with language, we're focusing on having them put together a statement of why they are saying these things.

Carol: Okay, so this is what you're calling a sentence frame?

Amanda: Yes.

Carol: I like that.
Amanda: So, this is a sentence, so then, I scaffolded it here so like here for vertical angles they would say something like angles A and D are congruent because they are vertical angles. And then here like I scaffolded it each time.

Carol: Okay, so you add less and less?

Amanda: Yeah, less and less so by the time they get here hopefully they can do it the same way.

Carol: Okay, I'm glad you explained it to me, so if I need to help somebody. That is really cool. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Carol)

This conversation shows that Carol had no previous knowledge about how to use sentence frames to teach mathematics prior to collaborating with me. Her question, “So this is what you’re calling a sentence frame?,’’ supports this claim. Further, acting as a language coach, I taught her how to scaffold the sentences frames in such a way that by the end of the activity students could write the justification statement without the sentence frame. This exchange also suggests that Carol’s learning might extend beyond this collaborative process because she stated that she could use the information learned “if [she] need[ed] to help somebody.” While Carol’s reference to “somebody” is not clear, it implies that she could now help ESL students when they struggle to write a sentence. It could also refer to other teachers asking for help. In this way, Carol learned how to scaffold the language strategy to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream mathematics classroom.

In the last interview, Carol insisted that the collaboration influenced her learning to plan and teach ESL students because she realized that ESL students needed language strategies to access and master the content standards. She explains:

I think you've given me lots of ideas, like the sentence frames and the vocabulary sheet with the pictures. It's more detailed than I would normally do, but it's makes me realize
that the ESL students need it, but the regular ed kids need it too. It helps everybody except for the two to three people that should be in advanced math and are not, but everybody else it just really does them good, so I liked being exposed to that because it's ideas that I can use for anybody. And I like things that you use for everybody, I don't like it when I have to do something, I don't mind doing something different, but I don't like a person to stand out, here your handout is different because you don't speak English. You know, I don't like that. (Interview #3, Carol)

Carol perceived that her learning to plan and teach ESL students occurred in collaboration with the ESL teacher. She referenced a specific strategy (e.g., sentence frames) and understood that she needed to explicitly teach vocabulary to ESL students. While Carol learned in collaboration to plan for and teach ESL students, she also believed the strategy “helps everybody,” which might include students receiving special education services or other struggling students. Carol’s belief that language strategies can be “[used] for everybody” could be a potential challenge in collaboration because statements like this can reduce ESL students’ need for explicit language instruction and/or perpetuate the notion that language strategies are “just good teaching,” (de Jong & Harper, 2005, p. 102). Instead of constraining collaboration, Carol’s statement actually was a starting point that paved the way for increased opportunities in collaboration. Carol needed to see this language strategy as an appropriate and effective strategy to teach the content to all students if she was going to be willing to allow the ESL teacher the opportunity to make suggestions for students. Further, Carol’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students was a process that will not occur only in this collaborative effort; with continued experience working with ESL students and me, Carol will continue to refine her understandings.

**Negotiated Language Strategies in Social Studies**
In collaboration, Kassie learned to include language strategies in the two lessons to help ESL students access and master the content standard. In order to create opportunities for this learning, we had to negotiate the use of language strategies in the lesson. This meant that I had to make Kassie aware of a particular language strategy and state how this strategy might help ESL students learn the content in the social studies classroom. Kassie’s learning extended beyond awareness of the language strategy to a more nuanced understanding of how to distinguish a language accommodation from an accommodation for students in special education.

During the first collaboration session, in order to help ESL students access the content standard, I divided the text into smaller reading segments (e.g., chunking), included pictures to represent each pillar, provided a model to guide students’ writing, and created a graphic organizer where students had to restate the question and write their answers in complete sentences. I introduced the language objective in the following conversation:

Amanda: And for the language objective, have them write in complete sentences, I might add that [in the directions] and then I added a picture because I just felt like that would be helpful and then where they can write, did you look over these questions?
Kassie: Yeah.
Amanda: And you thought they were all okay?
Kassie: Yeah, they're all really good. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Kassie)

This conversation shows how I specified the language objective (e.g. “have [students] write in complete sentences) and how I incorporated a picture to help ESL students visualize the content material. In this way, I positioned myself as a language teacher/coach who wanted to help Kassie understand the importance of the language objective. Like earlier conversations, Kassie’s response (e.g., yeah) indicates that she did look over the questions, but it did not necessarily imply that she understood the importance of the language objective. My follow-up question
attempted to elicit a more detailed response, which achieved the intended effect because Kassie states, “Yeah, they’re all really good.” While she expressed satisfaction with the questions, she did not necessarily pinpoint a language strategy or objective. In hindsight, had I phrased my question differently it may have generated a more detailed response from Kassie in this segment. Nonetheless, in the collaborative viewing session, Kassie re-stated the language objective and mentioned the model as beneficial to ESL students:

> I think first thing is that we wanted them to write in complete sentences, and I think by modeling that we proved that you'll find the answers in the readings, but you need to reword it or answer it in a way, that even without the reading, someone who is reading the answer to your question, could get all the information that they needed, but I think in modeling, it really I think shows that they can refer to that, like wait, what did they say, then having to remember long drawn out instructions, they can just scroll up and be like, “Oh okay, that's what they want me to do.” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

This conversation exemplifies that Kassie was aware of the language objective and its importance. She also suggests that modeling is an appropriate strategy because “[the ESL students] can refer to that” and know the task they need to complete. This conversation also highlights that Kassie’s learning was a process, which took place gradually over multiple interactions. While I had collaborated with Kassie previously, I specifically stated a language objective for the first time; hence, Kassie’s agreement signified the beginning stages of her learning, which continued to progress throughout the collaborative cycle. Further, in another excerpt from the collaborative viewing session, Kassie expressed her satisfaction with beginning with the content objective and then focusing on the language objective:

> I think starting with the content, like this is what they need to know, like I think it is easier, maybe because I'm the content teacher, but I think it's easier to say I need them to
know the Five Pillars of Faith, how do you want them to know or be better at speaking English at the end of this? Rather, then being like I would like to do an assignment where they have to write in complete sentences and me trying to fit content into that. I think it's easier to lay the groundwork and then work from there to make an assignment that would fit an ESL student. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

Here, Kassie’s words, “how do you want them to know or be better at speaking English at the end of this” suggest her growing identity as a language teacher because she was not thinking only in terms of the content objective. She also mentioned the language objective (e.g., “they have to write in complete sentences”) that we employed in the lesson. Given her position as a content teacher, it is obvious that she might begin with the content objective; but rather than focusing only on the content objective, she thought how a content teacher might also become a language teacher, which was a crucial first step in negotiating her identity as a language teacher. She also explained that “it’s easier to lay the [content] groundwork” and then include language strategies, which signifies the importance of starting with the content objective. This is important because it shows that Kassie did not feel she had to create a new lesson for ESL students; instead, she could add language strategies to enhance the way she approached planning for and teaching ESL students. In the second interview, Kassie commented directly on her learning to employ language strategies into content lessons:

I think chunking [the reading] up is helpful and making it smaller and more manageable. I think a huge thing is so much of our readings are in depth and not taking out important parts but taking out the fluff that isn't needed I think that's important because if we, I'm just measuring the content standards like there is so much extra fluff that I could get rid of for them and not like you only have to read the first page but just genuinely being like what I have highlighted in a blue box is what I for sure need you to know. Like this other
stuff will help it make more sense but if you can know these three blue boxes very, very
difficult and concentrate on knowing that, that's what I would like (Interview #2, Kassie).

Kassie’s statement evidences that she knew why “chunking [the reading]” helped ESL
students specifically. She also mentioned “taking out the fluff that isn’t needed,” which signifies
how she knew to simplify the language to help ESL students “concentrate on knowing” relevant
content information. In addition to “chunking” and language simplification, she also explained
how she could highlight key words or change the font color to draw ESL students’ attention to
content information. The fact that she understood that these strategies make reading a difficult
text “more manageable” contribute to her growing identity as a language teacher who knew the
significance of why these strategies are important for ESL students.

During the second collaborative cycle, we incorporated paragraph scaffolds and sentence
frames to help ESL students write argumentative statements about Joan of Arc. For this lesson,
we chose to focus on writing rather than reading the primary sources. The next conversation
highlights our grappling with deciding whether to simplify the language in the primary sources:

Amanda: The primary sources I thought about simplifying the language, but I want–it's a
primary source, so to me, do you think [the ESL students] can get the idea even though
it's a primary source? Do you see what I mean?

Kassie: Yeah.

Amanda: I mean they have the sentence frames and we can facilitate their understanding
during the class. We can help them, right? I mean to me this up here [referring to the
different reasons at the top of the document] will help them know what we mean?

Kassie: It's–

Amanda: Or, do you think we should simplify the language? Or, do you think it's okay?
Kassie: The words are not necessarily hard. It's the way that they're said. Like, “In all she did, except in affairs of war, she was a very simple young girl” like it's just like they word things backwards.

Amanda: Yeah, it might be better to say: She was a very simple girl except for when she was a warrior or fought in wars. You know, something like that, but I mean it's a primary source, so I totally understand if you want to retain the language in that and then we help them–

Kassie: Let's do where we just really key in and make sure we ask them, what is this, we'll just have to because I want them to know that you're going to have to be able–like you're going to have to be able to figure this out, so I think that'll just be our biggest thing in class with [the ESL students]. Unless you want to, but I think it would be better making them struggle?

Amanda: I mean I'd have to read them, but I think we could always simplify the language, but they will have to deal with difficult texts.

Kassie: Making them struggle?

Amanda: Okay, I think we have scaffolded [the lesson activity] so I mean they can pick three reasons from the top. But like you say, we'll need to make sure they know that. You know what I mean? The scaffolds are designed to help them formulate their thoughts. You know what I mean? Because they're learning information about her anyway, so you know what I mean?

Kassie: Yeah. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Kassie)

This conversation highlights my own conflicted feelings to not simplify the language in the primary sources. My positioning as a language teacher compelled me to “always simplify the language,” yet I also understood that ESL students would have to “deal with difficult texts” (e.g.,
primary sources). Hence, I provided an example of how we might simplify the language. Yet, Kassie’s positioning as a social studies teacher compelled her to contend that ESL students will need to “struggle” through primary sources and find the necessary information. This negotiated outcome results in deciding to “retain the language” of the primary sources. This decision is partly attributed to Kassie’s awareness that using the primary sources without simplifying the language will be the “biggest thing in class with [the ESL students],” which signifies Kassie’s understanding that she and I would have to help the ESL students as they were reading the primary sources in class. It is clear that I was not completely convinced by the end of the conversation that we should not have simplified the language in the primary sources; yet, I acquiesced because we scaffolded the activity and would help them during class with the difficult language in the primary sources. My willingness to accept Kassie’s intention to “retain the language” in the primary sources is most likely related to my interactive positioning of Kassie as the teacher with the ultimate authority to make decisions in the content classroom even though Kassie shared this authority throughout the collaborative process. I interactively positioned her in this way because she taught the class daily, and she was the social studies teacher. In order to sustain collaboration, I had to consider Kassie’s intentions as possibly being more important based on my own perceptions. It is also obvious that I did not completely disagree with Kassie. Given my background as a content teacher, I understood that ESL students would have to confront difficult texts. This wrestling emphasizes my own internal struggle, which was never completely resolved. Yet, I conceded to Kassie’s recommendation as long as we helped the ESL students through the primary sources in class.

As such, Kassie and I specifically helped ESL students understand the primary sources in class. There was evidence in the data to suggest that Kassie and I both intentionally helped ESL
students in class. This next excerpt shows how Kassie added impromptu language strategies to help the ESL students read the text during class:

When [the ESL student and I] would be looking at a quote, and I'd be like what small segment of this summarizes it the best or that is going to back up the character trait that you said that she had, and they'd point to a small little part or half of a sentence or a whole sentence and I'd underline that part just so we could again kind of getting out all the different kind of fluff and zeroing in on what was most important so I think just breaking it down like that in steps helped them understand the goal more. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Kassie)

Kassie’s statement signifies that she realized the importance of simplifying the language in difficult texts and how she ended up actually adding impromptu language strategies as the ESL students read the primary sources. Kassie “[underlined]” key words and helped the ESL students focus on what was important. This was evidenced by her statement that she omitted the “fluff and [zeroed] in on what was most important”. In doing so, she realized these were “steps [that] helped [the ESL students] understand the goal more,” which was understand Joan of Arc’s character attributes.

This next conversation highlights how Kassie negotiated language simplification as a particular language strategy that would help ESL students:

Kassie: I think over and over I've seen and continuing to learn ways to break it down where it is more manageable and accommodating to their needs. Again, I think for a special ed student the issue would not have been let's look at this one specific quote and one specific sentence within that I think it would have been a different ball game depending on the kid. But for this, I was like the language and the meaning of these quotes is what is going to mess them up so if we can simplify that.
Amanda: Simplify what?

Kassie: the language and just what the quote is saying essentially because if you don't understand the base of that then you don't understand the rest of the assignment but once I feel like we could clarify each time what the quote was saying they were able to produce the answer. Whereas the skill for the other students was I want you to struggle with the reading of the quotes and I want you to have to figure out what they mean but with the ESL students I think it helped to have it more—I didn't want to simplify it for anyone else. Or, I didn't need to but with the ESL students for them to be able to understand what the quote is saying, it needed to be more focused I guess.

Amanda: I agree. What would you say that ESL students need?

Kassie: Yeah, I just think that I wanted everyone to understand the content like that is always the standard of like are you understanding what this is saying but I think for ESL students a part of this assignment was you have to read old primary sources to understand it but that's not necessarily a skill ESL students need at this point in time necessarily like they still had to read it and understand it but I think I was able to—I think it helps to focus it more, but my goal for this assignment was to have some of them struggle with the reading but my goal for ESL students was can you understand the reading that I give you? (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Kassie)

Kassie’s realized that her learning is a negotiated process that occurs over multiple conversations and collaborative interactions. In this conversation, she distinguished language simplification as a strategy that worked specifically with ESL students, which she juxtaposed with strategies for students in special education. Based on Kassie’s perceptions, a student in special education might need a content accommodation where the teacher focuses on “one specific quote” rather than the entire page with quotations. ESL students, however, can understand the content if they
can access the language, which is why “ESL students need” language simplification. To this aim, she suggested why she did not want to simplify the language in the primary sources when she stated, “---I didn't want to simplify it for anyone else,” indicating that she did not want to change the assignment for all students. After witnessing how simplifying the language in class and distinguishing language as what ESL students need, Kassie refined her understanding about how to plan for and teach ESL students in the social studies classroom. This refined understanding coupled with her awareness and understanding of the significance of language strategies contribute to her emerging identity of a language teacher, which occurred as she worked in collaboration with an ESL teacher.

**Negotiated Language Strategies in Science**

The ESL and science teachers’ collaboration provided the space to negotiate language strategies to help the ESL students access the content standard. Early negotiations helped Shawn become aware of the importance of including a language objective in the content lesson. With Shawn’s awareness of the importance of a language objective, I worked to include additional strategies (e.g., sentence frames) to guide ESL students in discussing the content information.

During the first collaborative cycle, I specified the language objective to be that students would explain how to form covalent bonds using content-specific vocabulary. The next example depicts how I began this conversation:

Amanda: So, the language standard, so you're just the science standard, that they'll communicate in science. So, the language objective is that the learner will explain covalent bonds using content specific vocabulary. Okay, so key vocabulary, that you want them to focus on would be covalent bonds, valence electrons, maybe?

Shawn: Yes, that's exactly what I was thinking.

Amanda: Octet rule? Is that important?
Shawn: Sure.
Amanda: Simply, share, because they share electrons.
Shawn: Yeah. And molecular formula possibly. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Shawn)

By introducing a language objective, I positioned myself as a language coach in which I make Shawn aware of the fact that we needed to include a language objective along with the content objective. Shawn accepted my positioning when he said, “Yes, that’s exactly what I was thinking,” suggesting that he acknowledged that there were content-specific vocabulary words that needed to be taught specifically in the lesson. Simultaneously, I invited Shawn to assume a position as a language teacher through my questions (e.g., “maybe?”, “Is that important?”). Shawn accepted this positioning when he offered to contribute an additional vocabulary word. His contribution shows that his willingness to include language objectives extended beyond merely acknowledging their inclusion to actively including science words into the content lesson.

In the second interview, Shawn recognized that having a notes page with content-specific vocabulary words helped the ESL students access and master the content and language objectives. When asked specifically how collaboration affected his approach to planning for and teaching ESL students, Shawn responded:

Notes developed by the teacher where I have more of an expectation of they write down their own notes. I put down everything I want written down on the board, and I have expectations of them copying it. (Interview #2, Shawn)

By stating that he needed to provide notes to ESL students, Shawn realized that this practice would at least ensure that everyone had a completed copy of the notes. In addition, he realized that providing the notes would increase ESL students’ access to the content information, because if ESL students are listening to more traditional teaching approaches (e.g., lecture), then they
may not have full access to the content material. Hence, in providing notes “developed by the teacher,” he was increasing his expectations for ESL students by affording them opportunities to access the content vocabulary.

In the second collaborative cycle, I introduced sentence frames to facilitate students’ discussion with their partners. Shawn welcomed this addition to the lesson and suggested changes to the language strategy in an attempt to clarify our expectations for ESL students. The following conversation shows how we negotiated this change:

Shawn: Do you see why? I don't want them to think that compressional waves don't have these things because they do. I'm not trying to develop a misconception, so–

Amanda: And then make that box a little smaller.

Shawn: Well, I'm thinking it would need Letter A is a ______________ of a transverse/compressional wave? And Letter A is pointing to like I'm thinking we could break this into two pieces.

Amanda: Yeah.

Shawn: Because letter A on the transverse is pointing to the crest where it's pointing to the compressions on this one.

Amanda: Right, that's why I put a blank and a slash.

Shawn: I know what you mean by transverse/compressional but I'm worried about the kids knowing what to do with that.

Amanda: Oh. Okay.

Shawn: So, to clear it up with them, so I'm thinking to put this as two sentences.

Amanda: Oh, I see what you're saying. I think that's a great idea. (Collaborative Planning Session #4, Shawn)
This conversation highlights Shawn’s positioning as a language teacher because he acted in ways to change the lesson to make the language more comprehensible for ESL students. When Shawn said, “I'm not trying to develop a misconception,” he inadvertently positioned me as someone who might unintentionally confuse ESL students. This positioning required that I defend my reasoning to include sentence frames into the science lesson based on my own perceptions. To provide this defense, I responded, “Right, that's why I put a blank and a slash.” However, as Shawn began to explain his reasoning (e.g., “I'm worried about the kids knowing what to do with [a slash]), he weakened my defenses because I began to see that he wanted to “clear [the sentence frame] up” rather than omit it completely. For this reason, I assured him that “this was a great idea,” which indicated my agreement that the sentence frame needed to be clarified.

Through negotiation, Shawn and I clarified the sentence frame so that students would be able to use the frame to articulate questions and answers related to the content objective. While this negotiation could have potentially resulted in disagreement, it exemplifies Shawn and my shared student-centered goals, which helped us confront disagreements and ultimately sustained our collaborative efforts.

Shawn continued to emphasize how the sentence frames helped ESL students during second collaborative viewing cycle. When asked specifically how this language strategy helped students, Shawn commented:

Two reasons. 1) So, they can see the sentence frame on the paper and they're not trying to remember what I am supposed to say, what am I supposed to do, so it made it clear again of the process. And then 2) forcing them to use that vocabulary is just one other way for them to effectively learn it. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn)

His explanation and his earlier suggestion to make the sentence frames clearer emphasize his emerging identity as a language teacher who can acknowledge, explain, and adapt strategies to
make the language more accessible in the science classroom. This emerging identity is crucial in learning to plan for and teach ESL students, which is expected to continue as he designs lessons for ESL students. In commenting specifically on how this lesson changed his approach to lesson design, Shawn reiterated:

The exit slip, the scaffolding, and with the turn and talks we bumped it up a level with like the sentence frames which is something that I don't usually do, so there's some little tweaks and twists that you know I thought were improvements. (Interview #3, Shawn)

In answering this question, Shawn provided general teaching strategies (e.g., “exit slip, the scaffolding...and the turn and talks”) as well as a specific language strategy (e.g., sentence frames) to justify how we increased the lesson quality for ESL students. His statement, “we bumped it up a level” evidences this claim, which he believed improved the lesson. By using the first-person plural pronoun, we, he recognized that the “improvements” were a collective effort. This collective effort was reinforced further when he admitted “I don’t usually do [strategies].” Hence, collaboration was a site for the negotiation of language strategies in the science classroom; these negotiations made obvious Shawn’s learning opportunities and emerging identity as a language teacher who included language strategies in the science classroom. Evidence of this language teacher identify suggests that Shawn will consider including language strategies into future lessons.

**Distinguishing Characteristics of Language Strategies**

The distinguishing characteristic with language strategies is that the content teachers needed to be made explicitly aware of the language objective first and then complement the objective with an appropriate language strategy. With no previous experience collaborating with the ESL teacher, the content teachers were not accustomed to using language strategies to help ESL students access the content objectives. Thus, the first and second collaborative cycles
worked to bring awareness to a language objective and a particular language strategy. In doing so, each content teacher developed an emerging identity as a language teacher, which will grow with continued interactions with the ESL teacher.

Another point to mention is that learning to plan for and teach ESL students, specifically in regard to including language strategies in a content lesson, makes obvious that content teachers’ learning is a process, which did not occur instantaneously with two collaborative cycles. Rather, each content teacher now had an awareness of the need to specify language objectives and an idea of how to include a language strategy in content lessons. This learning will continue to be refined through engaging in practices that bring out opportunities for content teachers to think and act like language teachers. ESL and content teachers’ collaboration is a site for this learning and identity development.

**ESL and Content Teachers’ Negotiation of Assessment Techniques**

**Negotiated Assessment Techniques in Language Arts**

The ESL and language arts’ teachers’ negotiation of assessment techniques led to Emily’s learning to progress monitor ESL students’ mastery of the content and language objectives and grade these students more fairly. This entailed asking Emily during each collaborative cycle to specify how we were going to assess the ESL students’ work. In this way, I asked, “With assessment, how will we know that the ESL students met the content and language objectives?” (Collaborative Session #2, Emily). During the first collaborative cycle, Emily identified both formal and informal assessment techniques to understand the ESL students’ grades in the first reflective journal, stating:

We monitored students throughout the evidence collection process to facilitate their analysis of the assigned portion of text. We read what students wrote in their notes. Then
we assessed students as they presented their information to the class. Finally, we reviewed the students’ written paragraphs. (Reflective Journal #1, Emily)

By answering questions and facilitating group discussion, we were able to ensure that ESL students understood the selected lines and could answer the questions as an informal assessment tool. Having two teachers assess student work increased our ability to check on all ESL students. Shortly after the first co-teaching session, Emily told me that she wanted to assign a letter grade that would be weighted as a thirty percent grade to be recorded in the gradebook. To help Emily accomplish this task, I volunteered to grade the paragraphs using her previously created rubric as well, and afterwards, we decided on each of the ESL student’s grades. Emily created the rubric to assess students based on the lesson objectives. There were two parts to the assignment. First, students worked in collaborative groups to analyze selected lines; this part of the rubric was three points. Second, students had to write a paragraph that included an assertion, evidence, citation, commentary and concluding sentence; Emily assigned seven points to this portion of the assignment. Emily and I, for example, negotiated a grade for Marisa on this assignment (See Table 7 for Marisa’s rubric). For Marisa’s assignment, Emily and I assigned the same point value to each category except for commentary; as such, this next excerpt begins with Emily and I explaining our reasoning for the commentary portion of Marisa’s grade.

Emily: Out of her commentary, it's out of 2 points, I gave her 1 point.

Amanda: I gave her 1.5, let’s see I said, I'm not sure that the second commentary really conveys the idea of emotions. She starts well but doesn't really include it. She could have put more. I just counted out a half of point. But here you probably gave her–

Emily: 0.5 again.

Amanda: I gave her a 1 because I counted off here (assertion) because it was not intelligible, so I didn't want to doubly penalize her, do you see what I mean?
Emily: Okay, yeah. Didn't connect back yeah, I went ahead and gave her an 8. I just could not decipher.
Amanda: Oh, I mean I agree with you. I mean I’m totally with you.
Emily: I just couldn't decipher what was going on.
Amanda: I wrote that down.
Emily: I didn't really get where she was going, but you saw it.
Amanda: I mean I knew that she was going somewhere with emotions, but it wasn't intelligible that's why I counted off. But I only counted off .5 because I guess I just didn't want to be too harsh because I'd already counted off once for unintelligibility.
Considering her language needs, I didn't want to doubly count off. I knew where she was going, but I do agree with you. I don't think it was intelligible.
Emily: I will go back on Marisa’s and give her an 8.5 just because I agree with you if she didn't get it in the assertion, she's not going to get it in other places either, so I'm going to go back and give her a full point on that, so she'll have an 8.5. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily)

While Emily and I graded Marisa’s paragraph similarly, we needed to discuss our rationale in order to assign Marisa an equitable score given her language needs; hence, our negotiation highlights Emily’s grappling to assign a grade to Marisa’s paragraph, particularly since Emily thought the paragraph was unintelligible. I did not disagree with Emily about the unintelligibility of Marisa’s paragraph, but what I wanted Emily to understand was that we should not penalize Marisa for the same error in multiple places when Marisa’s error was most likely related to learning the English language rather than failing to understand the content. Content and language are not mutually exclusive as evidenced here by the fact that Emily did not understand what Marisa was trying to say (e.g., content) because of her language errors. Nonetheless, we had
Table 7. Marisa’s Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Emily</th>
<th>Amanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Work</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertion</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tie/Cite</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concluding Sentence</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiated Grade:</strong></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“already counted off once for unintelligibility” in the assertion and should not “doubly count off.” I did not want to ignore completely Marisa’s language errors since she had a paragraph scaffold and sentence frames to help her write the paragraph nor did I want to discredit Emily’s opinion that some sentences were unintelligible in the paragraph.

My intentions were particularly important in this exchange because I needed to advocate for fair grading procedures for Marisa, which could have posed collaborative challenges if Emily disagreed with me. At the same time, I needed to validate Emily’s concerns to sustain the collaborative cycle. Emily began to refine her understanding that an ESL student should not be penalized twice for the same error because she stated that if Marisa had made the mistake earlier that “she's not going to get it in other places”; therefore, she agreed with my score (e.g., 8.5) and accordingly assigned Marisa’s grade. Emily’s understanding emphasizes her (gradual) learning to practice and assign more equitable grades for ESL students in this conversation; thus, this negotiation was significant to Emily’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream ELA classroom.

A consequence of the above-mentioned negotiation led to the co-creation of a rubric during the second collaborative cycle. In this rubric, Emily and I wanted to measure content and
language objectives. Emily’s intentional inclusion of a language criteria shows her increased learning to plan for and teach ESL students:

Emily: Yeah, now I just want to add a group rubric/checklist. This is so we can try to add in the things that we have to have for yours and mine. My big thing on this one is–
Amanda: Conflict?
Emily: Yeah, because we're in the falling action in Act IV so I want them to predict the resolution for the conflict and act it out. So, for ours, we want them to talk about resolution, conflict, and sentence-
Amanda: Mine would be sentence structure, so like did they write a question with–We would I guess look at the script, right?
Emily: So, we're going to grade their script, I think this is going to work. If we do a quick–we can clearly see can they write a question so they're going to have to flip the format with a subject and a verb and the answer with the subject and verb not inverted, this is like two language standards.
Amanda: And another thing, if we wanted to do an exit slip, you know when they're finished and to see if they really got it, then we could say you know describe the main conflict between your characters in one sentence, and we could do it like that and then it would be a formative assessment. Because this activity is very collaborative, so we could assess it collaboratively and individually, you know what I mean?
Emily: Yep. We'll just put a table here. (Collaborative Planning Session #3, Emily)

The outgrowth of this negotiation produced a co-created rubric that included both content (e.g., conflict, falling action, and predicted resolution) and language (e.g., appropriate declarative and interrogative sentence structures). This inclusion contributes to Emily gradually becoming a co-teacher of ESL students because she initiates the conversation to ensure that both objectives were
assessed. The collaborative nature of the assignment (e.g., students’ collaborative group skit) prompted me to suggest that we additionally provide an “exit slip” so that the students could be individually assessed on the language and content standards in addition to their work in collaborative groups. This suggestion, while not specifically geared toward ESL students, addressed our concern to ensure that there was an equal division of responsibility among group members. An individual assessment (e.g., the exit slip) enabled us to ascertain what each student could do based on the content and language objectives. Emily’s planning for assessment techniques that included language standards for ESL students highlights her growing identity of a co-teacher of ESL students. This growth attests to her learning in collaboration with an ESL teacher.

During the second co-teaching session, Emily and I co-assessed student presentations. Emily discussed how she relied on me as her co-teacher to help her assess the content and language objectives. In this next conversation, Emily commented on our collaborative grading practices during the second collaborative viewing session:

Amanda: I noticed too you and I had grading responsibilities, so as students were presenting, you and I were collaborating together.

Emily: I was asking you, “Did you see this? Did I miss that part?”

Amanda: As we were going through. We came to an agreement of what—

Emily: their grades should be.

Amanda: And why do you think that's important that you and decide together and we come to an agreement and we're bouncing off each other?

Emily: Well, because I'm looking at it from one perspective of this is what it has to be for this content standard and you're saying yeah, here's what I saw that you may not have seen just based on my experience with them this is what—this is their version of what
we're asking. And I was like, yeah, they did do that. Whereas I might have been a little harsher, and one time, I graded a group high, and you were like no, and I was like well I want to give it to them. I can't remember which group, maybe it was Juan’s group, and you were like oh no, bump that down. So, there were times where I would be too hard or too lenient because they're an ESL student. And I'm confident that you know that balance between they can do that, or yeah, the language needs to be accommodated for that. I needed to hear that from you. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Emily)

This example shows how Emily believed that she and I drew on each other expertise to help us negotiate an equitable grade for ESL students. She discussed how I “[balanced]” the assessment expectations for ESL students, and her “confidence” shows that she validated my suggestions. This emerging confidence contributed to Emily’s learning and ultimate identity as a language co-teacher. Developing an identity of a co-teacher of language did not occur outside of collaboration; put another way, Emily did not begin to start planning for and assessing ESL students’ language abilities without the ESL teacher’s help. For this reason, she is becoming a co-teacher of language and content for ESL students. Throughout this entire exchange, Emily solicited my expertise on the language (and content) standards. In asking my opinion, she negotiated how to fairly assess ESL students. Her statement, “I needed to hear that from you,” when referring to the nuances of content and language assessments reveals that she required and wanted my help. This negotiation might not have occurred without the ESL teacher’s help, but Emily’s negotiation leads to her learning to have a more refined knowledge about content and language assessments for ESL students in the mainstream ELA classroom.

**Negotiated Assessment Techniques in Mathematics**

In collaboration, Carol learned to plan for and teach ESL students by negotiating language techniques. In this negotiation, Carol and I decided how to best serve ESL students in
the mathematics mainstream classroom. This meant we had to agree on an assessment tool and use this tool to ascertain the ESL students’ progress. Overall, collaboration resulted in the creation of formative assessments. In this way, negotiation of formal assessments created opportunities for Carol to learn tools that would help her better assess ESL students’ progress and work, thereby learning more effective strategies to plan for and teach ESL students.

During the first cycle for Pre-Algebra students, Carol and I agreed that the practice problems on scientific notation was the formative assessment tool. When asked how we would know that the ESL students accessed and mastered the language and content standards, Carol answered, “Basically, the practice problems. They're gonna have practice problems, and use that” (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Carol). With this understanding, we were able to examine the ESL students’ “practice problems” in order to measure students’ content knowledge. In addition to the “practice problems,” collaboration provided the space to include the ESL teacher who knew the mathematics content in order to help students in class. In the second reflective journal, Carol commented that I was “more eyes” in the room (Reflective Journal #1, Carol).

When asked to explain what she meant by “more eyes” in the room, Carol responded:

They were doing practice problems in class. It was looking at did they understand them? did they get them? In the co-teaching part, you're another set of eyes so you can see it, we see more people between the two of us, but you could know, and you know enough about math to help them which those so it was formative assessment in that you saw right there whether they were doing it right or wrong and could explain it right then. (Interview #2, Carol)

In interactively positioning me as “another set of eyes,” Carol suggested that collaboration improved formative assessment for ESL students because co-teaching included two teachers who both understood the mathematics content. Her statement, “We see more people between the two
of us,” support this claim. She also particularly focused on my contribution, stating, “You saw right there right or wrong and could explain it right then.” Based on Carol’s words, this immediate formative assessment was only possible because “[I knew] enough math to help them.” Carol’s statement pinpointed me as the teacher who witnessed ESL students’ progress and checked mistakes accordingly. She switched between two pronouns, “we” to “you,” which suggests that formatively assessing ESL students’ work during instruction may not have been Carol’s main priority prior to collaboration. Nonetheless, in collaboration with me, she began to understand that having two co-teachers in mathematics classroom benefited her ability to assess the ESL students’ work. In discussing further Carol’s perceived learning, she stated that “it was the whole, just a different look at [an ESL] student, which is fabulous” (Interview #2, Carol).

This new perspective involved checking to make that ESL students completed the task and using these problems to assess the ESL students’ content mastery. In future collaborative lessons, Carol wanted to continue using “an exit slip” to refine her understanding about ESL students’ content knowledge, explaining:

Carol: The one thing that probably would have been nice if we would have added an exit slip so that I had a little more formal, but that's probably true of me every day. Something we'll look at.

Amanda: Yeah, and we can look at that moving forward.

Carol: That's just a good one to see what they're doing, but you saw what they were doing, and we can figure out where they needed help. (Interview #2, Carol)

Carol’s reasoning to include “an exit slip” reinforces my earlier claim that formatively assessing ESL students’ work may not have been a priority before engaging in collaboration. The fact that she said, “that’s probably true of me every day” suggest that she did not typically formatively assess ESL students’ work each day, yet she knew it was a tool to help her more
effectively teach ESL students. Similarly, she commented, “But you saw what they were doing,” which further positioned me as the teacher in charge of formatively assessing ESL students. However, Carol’s recognition that she needed to refine her formative assessment tools for ESL students and her awareness that the ESL teacher was a co-teacher who could come alongside her in this effort were crucial first steps in negotiating and ultimately learning assessment techniques to better plan for and teach ESL students in the mathematics classroom.

In the same way, Carol and I used the study guide as a formative assessment tool to measure Li’s mastery of quadratic equations. In the first collaborative viewing session, Carol expressed the importance of the study guide because it helped predict students’ performance on the summative assessment. She explained:

Carol: That's why on that study guide because if you can do that on the study guide, you're ready for the test. I give it to them because I want them to work on it with each other to get, that's just gonna give them better information. But, they a lot of those questions, they need to have seen the exact problem to make sure they know how to work it, and then once you change the numbers, sometimes it's like a whole new problem to them, but I want them to have the confidence, you know, if you've worked the problem right once, you can usually work it right again.

Amanda: Yeah. And she was so pleased. I mean she came back and showed me, I only missed one on the whole study guide, and I think it was this one where she was completing the square.

Carol: I could look to see how she did on her test too. I don't know if I have her test handy.

Amanda: It was #10, that was the only one she missed [on the study guide].
Carol: Yeah, she made a 96 on the test, so see, really working through the study guide helped her.

Amanda: That's great. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

This conversation illustrates how using the students’ mastery of the study guide helped Carol and me predict the ESL student’s performance on the summative assessment. More specifically, Li only missed one question about completing the square on the study guide. Her mastery of the study guide corresponded with her high score on the summative assessment. For this reason, the study guide was a crucial formative assessment tool for us to predict students’ performance because if “[they’ve] worked the problem right once, [they] can usually work it right again.” Carol’s reasoning also implicates the importance of preparing formative assessment tools (e.g., study guide) to resemble closely the summative assessment. This approach suggests a good instructional approach of creating summative assessments before instruction so that all instructional activities similarly reflect assessments. The study guide was Carol’s way of aligning her instructional activities to her summative assessments, which afforded us the opportunity to know confidently that Li would perform well on the summative assessment. Through this negotiation, Carol gained a greater awareness that formative assessments can predict students’ performance on later summative assessments; this realization might not have been as poignant without collaboration because collaboration created opportunities for reflection about assessments in the mathematics mainstream classroom.

Carol and I also used students’ practice problems to ascertain ESL students’ mastery during the second collaborative cycle. By focusing on a language objective, Carol learned how to assess informally students’ language mastery. For example, as mentioned previously, we had students write justification statements to explain realistic examples for scatter plot associations.
In this next conversation, Carol and I negotiated how to use Li’s justification statements as a formative assessment for language mastery:

Amanda: I did like Li’s justification statements. You know, I mean she does follow the model and use it to write her sentences.

Carol: Yeah, it really helps her.

Amanda: I really like teaching it like that because it gives them a model to show because so much they have to justify why they're choosing it. And so many times, they just want to put one word.

Carol: They need a whole sentence. I think they need more. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol)

In this exchange, I reflexively positioned myself as a language coach, instructing Carol about how the model helped Li write sentences. By looking at Li’s justification statements, Carol concluded, “Yeah, it really [helped] her,” suggesting that the model helped Li write sentences about scatter plot associations. This conversation foregrounds Carol’s growing awareness that language is important in the mathematics classroom, even for students whom she positioned as good mathematics students (Interview #1, Carol). In this way, she learned that students who are good at mathematics still need language supports. After having already learned how to include justification statements, Carol now knew that you could assess these statements for clarity. This awareness about how to assess language assessments contributes to Carol’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the in the mathematics content classroom.

Negotiated Assessment Techniques in Social Studies

Kassie and I negotiated assessment techniques, specifically the use of exit slips, to help us drive our instruction. This negotiation influenced Kassie’s learning to monitor ESL students’ progress before the summative assessment and specify ways to improve ESL students’ learning
outcomes in the social studies classroom. Kassie admitted that she did not frequently use exit slips as a formative assessment tool; consequently, our negotiation resulted in Kassie’s understanding of how to use them to assess students’ work in the social studies classroom.

During the second collaborative planning session, I introduced an exit slip as a way to informally assess students’ learning:

Amanda: And another thing I thought for like the end is a formative assessment tool, like did they get it or did they not? So, make a little chart that looks like this but then black out the names and then or maybe make it matching, probably matching might be easier at this stage and then see if they can match them. And then we can use this to drive the next instruction and that would be fairly easy to make because all it would be. I like this, but you know a visual representation of the pillars. That would be easy to make.

Kassie: Yeah.

[There’s a break where we discuss another topic and Amanda returns to the topic of assessment]

Amanda: Make them more aware and then like so at the beginning, you know, I think we should review these, and then at the end, we can review what the five pillars are just before we give them the exit slip, you know? And then I'm thinking just on paper, you know match, just to know do they have it or do they not. Do you know what I mean?

Does that make sense?

Kassie: Yeah, that's perfect. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Kassie)

In response to my suggested assessment technique, Kassie expressed agreement (e.g., “Yeah”) and satisfaction (e.g., “yeah, that’s perfect”) with using an exit slip as a formative assessment tool. I positioned myself as an instructional coach to help Kassie understand the significance of formative assessment as a means “to drive the next instruction.” Based on my perceptions, an
exit slip is a “fairly easy” tool to create to help teachers discern whether students understood the content objective (e.g., “Did they get it or did they not?”). Kassie’s response indicates her willingness and her emerging awareness of how to use the exit slip to formally assess students, which is a crucial first step in learning how to assess students’ learning outcomes.

In administering the exit slips to all students, we were able to justify that students needed further instruction and critique how our instructional procedures might have contributed to students’ misunderstanding. In the first collaborative viewing session, I admitted that we could have improved the design of the exit slip:

Like maybe if during when other groups were presenting, we gave them a blank whatever that looked sort of like the extra slip and had them write this is just off the top of my head, and so we had the five pillars, we had that picture, and they write one fact that they learned, like what it is, and then one fact that they learned. What it is? And then what did they learn? So then, maybe they're writing it down, because I don't feel like, I don't wanna say, because some of them did very well, but then some of them did not, but looking at this exit slip, and then too, I'm going to critique my own exit slip, I wondered if because we didn't give time, like they only specialized in their own, like that was pretty much what they did, and I wasn't completely confident that all of them were listening and fully engaged throughout the whole time [when other groups were presenting their pillar]. Yes, is there evidence that they were participating and listening? Sure, but the entire time, from one to five. So, I wonder if we would have had a notes page or something that got them off the computer, not necessarily off the computer but they could write down or type as they hear groups talking to then remember it. Because they didn't do so hot on the exit slip, which is okay, I mean it's a formative assessment. And I just wonder why, and partly I think the exit slip, the assessment, did not accurately reflect how we taught it
because they only specialized in their own pillar and didn't have time…this is just me thinking out loud here. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

My critique of the exit slip served to highlight my view that “the exit slip, the assessment, did not accurately reflect how we taught [the content],” which I assumed responsibility for this mismatch because it was my suggestion to incorporate and create the exit slip. In class, each group “specialized in their own pillar” and listened to other students explain the other pillars. I did not anticipate the lengthy discussion, which lasted about twenty-five minutes in actuality. The lengthy discussion was not the only factor that contributed to this instructional mismatch. Students did not have a purpose for listening to another students’ explanation. Using a Google document allowed all students to type on the document, so by the time students explained their assigned pillar, they had all the information typed on the document. During this discussion, it inadvertently created a space where students did not actually have to listen to students’ discussion. This realization led me to state that I wish students “had a notes page” similar to the exit ticket, which would prompt them to actively listen to the discussion. Creating a discussion guide might have contributed to more favorable students’ learning outcomes. Nonetheless, Kassie and I used this exit slip to drive the next day’s instruction because we reviewed the five pillars as the bellringer another time. This additional explanation led to increased students’ learning outcomes, at least for ESL students, because all students showed measurable growth from the first exit slip to the second one.

While the exit slip during the first collaborative cycle did not go the way we planned, it influenced our next day’s instructional approach, which is in effect the purpose of a formative assessment tool. It also was productive because it enabled our reflection on how we could improve the collaborative teaching session for future lessons. In the first reflective journal,
Kassie mentioned how she wanted to change our instruction to influence students’ learning outcomes:

The changes that I would make for the second collaborative cycle is that I would make each student responsible for taking notes while other people were presenting the answers. Because the entire class worked on one shared document, it was easy for the students to zone out when it was not their turn because they knew the answers were already on the document. I would like to have them have more responsibility and ownership in knowing the information. (Reflective Journal #1, Kassie)

Kassie likewise expressed a desire to change our instructional procedures, which would “have [the students] have more responsibility and ownership in knowing the information.” The fact that we both specified this change implied that we shared similar teaching goals, which was particularly important in moving into the second collaborative cycle. Kassie’s reflection also shows how the exit slip helped her negotiate instructional procedures in the social studies classroom. Therefore, the exit slip mediated Kassie’s learning to change her instructional procedures, which led her to give a suggestion for improvement (e.g., a notes page). It is also important that this suggestion was co-constructed in collaboration. Kassie gave a similar suggestion as I did when critiquing the lesson. Thus, collaboration influenced Kassie’s learning by making Kassie aware of assessment techniques and how to use them in social studies, which ultimately led her to refine her teaching practices.

During the second collaborative cycle, Kassie continued to refine her understanding of assessment techniques. We created an additional exit slip to see whether students formed an argument about Joan of Arc’s character based on the instructional activity. In the second reflective journal, Kassie identified the exit slip as an assessment technique that helped us assess the content and language objectives:
We assessed the content and language objectives by walking around the class and periodically checking in to see how the students were doing. We also gave them an exit slip where they had to come up with their own perspective and what they truly thought about Joan of Arc. This was helpful because they had to understand both sides and back up their opinion with facts. (Reflective Journal #2, Kassie)

Based on Kassie’s reflection, it is obvious that Kassie understood how to use assessment techniques (e.g., exit slip) to measure students’ learning outcomes. More specifically, she states, “[The exit slip] was helpful because they had to understand both sides and back up their opinions with facts.” This signifies how she used the exit slip to measure whether students mastered the content objective. By negotiating assessment techniques, Kassie learned to use formative assessment tools in planning for and teaching ESL students in the mainstream social studies classroom.

**Negotiated Assessment Techniques in Science**

The ESL and science teachers negotiated the use of assessment techniques in the mainstream science classroom. During these negotiations, we had to decide which assessment tool we would use to assess whether the ESL students showed growth toward mastering the content standard. Neither collaborative lesson occurred at the end of the unit or required recording a letter grade in the school’s grading system; thus, all negotiations centered around formative assessment tools, which provided Shawn and me with information to verify the ESL students’ progress towards mastering the content standard. In negotiating formative assessment techniques in the science classroom, Shawn developed a more nuanced understanding about the importance of distinguishing a standard from a measurable objective as well an awareness of assessment tools during instruction.
During the first collaborative cycle, Shawn and I had to articulate the assessment tool and decide what information the assessment tool would provide based on the content and language objectives. In the second collaborative cycle, I acknowledged the need to include an assessment tool in the lesson in the following way:

Amanda: Okay, so this assessment is not formal. This is how will we know after we watch the co-teaching video together, how will we know that they know how to form and explain covalent bonds? We're going to look at the practice problems.

Shawn: Yes, exactly. Their performance on the practice problems. (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Shawn)

In this conversation, I positioned myself as an instructional coach who helped Shawn understand that we needed to use an assessment tool for the content and language objectives. My question, “How will we know that [the ESL students] know how to form and explain covalent bonds?” was directly related to our content and language objectives. Shawn accepted my reflexive positioning and agreed that the “practice problems” would be our formative assessment tool. Thus, by looking at the ESL students’ practice problems, we would have a more nuanced understanding of the ESL students’ progress toward meeting the content and language objectives. While it may not be obvious at first consideration how “the practice problems” helped us measure the ESL students’ toward the language objective, the ESL students had to comprehend science-specific vocabulary (e.g., covalent bonds, valence electrons) in order to form covalent bonds. In addition to the practice problems, we realized that the turn and talk helped us better ascertain whether ESL students met the language objective. Shawn acknowledged the inclusion of the turn and talk as a formative assessment tool in his first reflective journal. When asked how we assessed the content and language objectives, Shawn commented, “We assessed the content and language objectives through the turn and talk and the practice problems” (Reflective Journal,
Shawn). By being able to explain the assessment tools used in the lesson, Shawn shows his emerging awareness of the importance of assessment techniques in the science classroom.

In actuality, the practice problems took the form of one question where students had to write the three steps (e.g., draw the Lewis Dot structure, replace the electrons with lines to show bonding, and write the molecular formula) to form a covalent bond with the elements Nitrogen and Chlorine (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Shawn). Students completed this task after they explained the steps in forming covalent bonds through turning and talking with their partner. Hence, Shawn’s above-mentioned response in his reflective journal indicates that our negotiation of assessment techniques during the first collaborative cycle resulted in Shawn’s explanation of the assessment tool used in the lesson.

The second collaborative cycle’s exit slip at the end of the lesson highlights Shawn’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the science classroom. As mentioned previously, I took a lead role in planning the second collaborative lesson, and in creating this lesson, I included an exit slip for students to complete near the end of the lesson. When Shawn looked at the created lesson, he acknowledged the exit slip and made no changes. In the second collaborative viewing cycle, Shawn explained the value of the exit slip in contributing to his understanding of the ESL students’ progress in the science classroom, stating:

Well this particular exit slip, we had them put all their notes away and I erased the board. I took the notes off the screen and made them depend on the knowledge that they had just acquired in the previous 45 minutes or 40 minutes and so they could really think deeply because it takes a different level of thinking to all of a sudden to do it without any support. Without the paper in front of them, you know, the paper where they were quizzing each other. Without the notes on the board in front of them as they were filling
out the notes sheet you know as we were filling it in on the screen for them.

(Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn)

Shawn’s description of the exit slip shows his understanding that this exit slip mimicked summative assessment conditions (e.g., “put all their notes away,” “I erased the board”) without the actual grading pressures. By mimicking these conditions, we were able to understand if each ESL students could distinguish between compressional and transverse waves as well as label the parts of each wave. Shawn also conceptualized the exit slip to “[add] a deeper level of retention” in which students solidified their learning from the lesson. By having a better understanding of ESL students’ progress towards meeting the language and content objectives, Shawn learned how to more effectively plan for and teach ESL students in the science classroom in collaboration with an ESL teacher.

**Distinguishing Characteristics of Assessment Techniques**

A distinguishing characteristic was Emily’s case where she and I negotiated a grade for ESL students. This is most likely related to Emily’s desire to assign a letter grade to be recorded in the school’s grading system. The other three teachers did not assign a grade; rather, we designed assessments that we would use as formative assessments. Emily’s case highlights the potential for ESL and content teachers to make equal decisions when assigning grades for ESL students. An outgrowth of this collaborative grading was a co-created rubric, which brings about more equitable grading procedures for ESL students.

**ESL and Content Teachers’ Negotiation of the ESL Teacher’s Role**

**The ESL Teacher’s Negotiated Role in Language Arts**

The ESL and language arts teachers’ collaboration influenced Emily’s learning about the ESL teacher’s role, which she negotiated in collaboration. Negotiating the ESL teacher’s role is important because the outcome of this negotiation ultimately shows whether Emily would see the
ESL teacher as a resource in the mainstream classroom. Analyzing this positioning makes visible her conceptualization about what an ESL teacher can and does in the ELA classroom. Prior to collaborating with me, Emily had no experience within collaborative planning and teaching with an ESL teacher. At Emily’s previous school in another state, there was one ESL teacher for the entire district. When asked to describe her interaction and collaboration with the ESL teacher, Emily stated, “I would see her in the hall, and I knew her name. And that was it. We did not work together. She was in on meetings where she would sign off on stuff, but there was nothing” (Interview #1, Emily). Emily cited infrequent interactions with the ESL teacher who was only present when she needed to “sign off on stuff.” Positioning the former ESL teacher in this way reduced the ESL teacher’s role to a secretary who only kept track of important meetings and paperwork. What is absent from Emily’s description is an explanation of the ESL teacher’s role in helping the student learn language and content. For this reason, she concluded that language instruction was “separate” from the language classroom (Interview #1, Emily). In collaborating with me as the ESL teacher, Emily learned to refine her perspective about the ESL teacher’s role, particularly in the ELA classroom. When asked how her view of the ESL teacher’s role changed, Emily commented:

Gosh, you do so many things. I mean I don't think I realized how much you work with each kid and each teacher to help them be successful. Like I knew you did a lot of work, but like you do a lot of work. And so, I guess the role of the ESL teacher as far as being in my classroom, I just wish we could co-teach more because I think it would help the students more.

Amanda: What is your perception of me doing a lot of work?

Emily: You learn all the content, so like you don't just know language arts content. You know transverse waves and covalent bonds. You know parallelograms. You know you
have to learn all the content to be able to teach it to ESL students, so you're doing the work of four teachers in one, plus language standards. And then translating everything you do. (Interview #3, Emily)

Emily’s words suggest that she now reconceptualized the ESL teacher’s role to be a co-teacher of language and content in the language arts classroom. Her words, “I wish we could co-teach more” signify that she wished that our collaborative teaching sessions occurred more frequently because “it would help the students more.” Revisioning the ESL teacher’s role was part of her learning to plan for and teach ESL students because she needed to see the ESL teacher as a language expert in the ELA classroom. Without understanding how language can be interwoven with content standards and then positioning the ESL teacher as a capable co-teacher of language and content, she would not have been able to plan for and teach ESL students effectively. Here in this example, she mentioned examples that were not related to ELA but rather science and mathematics. Widening the scope to include additional contents shows that Emily acknowledges that the ESL teacher’s role needed to be vast and comprehensive in order to plan for and teach language in the mainstream classrooms. Moreover, Emily’s negotiation of the ESL teacher’s role in collaboration contributed to her renewed understanding of the ESL teacher’s role, which now is categorized in large part as a valuable asset in the mainstream ELA classroom; this understanding was crucial in working to provide equitable learning outcomes for ESL students.

**The ESL Teacher’s Negotiated Role in Mathematics**

Carol negotiated the ESL teacher’s role while working in collaboration. The outgrowth of this negotiation produced the ESL teacher’s recontextualized role in the mainstream mathematics classroom. While Carol had experience with other co-teachers before collaborating with me, she had never co-taught with the ESL teacher. Her experience then was mostly with the special education teacher. This next excerpt begins in the middle of Carol’s positioning of the special
education as a support teacher who was not involved in instructional planning or teaching. Carol used this interactive position to distinguish me as the ESL teacher from the special education teacher in the following conversation:

Amanda: So, when [the special education teacher] comes in, specifically with these students, he's more of a helper?
Carol: He's just helping them.
Amanda: Instead of actually helping you teach.
Carol: He's a lot more of an aide.
Amanda: And you would see me as—
Carol: I like you more as a co-teacher. I wish he was. He is obviously not comfortable with math.
Amanda: So, you would see me more as a teacher or an aide, and why?
Carol: A teacher.
Amanda: And why is that?
Carol: Because you know enough about the curriculum and you're teaching them. You're not giving them the answers and you're not—I don't know. It's just something about you're being there motivates them to work harder and the special ed teacher being in there doesn't seem to make— they just seem to just wait for him to tell them and that's not, that's not helpful. That's not teaching them to be independent because you're not there all the time. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol)

Carol’s interactive positioning of the ESL teacher is interesting in light of earlier conversations that positioned me as a support teacher, particularly during the first collaborative cycle. In this exchange, Carol clarifies this comparison when she said, “[The special education teacher] is obviously not comfortable with the math.” Interactively positioning him as an “aide” who lacked
content knowledge served to simultaneously position me as someone who was “comfortable with math.” Thus, while she also viewed my role as a support teacher in the first collaborative cycle, this perspective is not fixed because of my mathematics content knowledge. Moreover, my mathematics content knowledge partly contributes to her interactive positioning that I am “a teacher” or “co-teacher” rather than an “aide.” In addition to mathematics content knowledge, she also positioned me as “a teacher” because I encouraged ESL students’ independence by “teaching them” rather than simply “giving them the answers.” In Carol’s view, teaching ESL students the mathematics concept afforded them the opportunity to be able to work the mathematics problem and/or show content mastery even when I was not present. She also implied that the ESL teacher’s role in the mathematics classroom “motivates [the ESL students] to work harder,” which contributes to her positioning of the ESL teacher as “a teacher.” Carol’s negotiation of the ESL teacher’s role now includes a co-teacher who knows the mathematics content, motivates ESL students’ work ethic, and instructs them on mathematics problems so that they can eventually show mastery and work independently. Carol’s perception of the ESL teacher’s role suggests that she now positioned an ESL teacher as a mathematics content teacher.

During the final interview, Carol expanded view of the ESL teacher to include knowledge about how to use language strategies to help ESL students master the content objectives. In doing so, she distinguished me from working previously with other ESL teachers. When asked how collaboration changed her view of the ESL teacher’s role, Carol responded:

Carol: Oh, wow, I have seen now how much more they can do than what I've seen before. Yeah, I mean you just opened up a whole new world. This is just so much more than anybody else has ever done before.

Amanda: Can you elaborate on what the so much more is?
Carol: You know, like I give you an idea and you say, oh I can type up that form and you expand it in ways that just really look good and the sentence frames, you could have told me to make sentence frames and I would not have really known exactly what you were talking about but when you do one for me and show me, now I can copy it and do it again. You're willing to do a lot of those extra things.

Amanda: How do those extra things relate to what's going on in your classroom?

Carol: I think it relates to lesson design and what's going on in the classroom. And it's all stuff, I don't know, maybe some ESL teachers can come up with things that are very specific to just that student and that's not as good that can be used for the whole classroom, but again, you've taught all kinds, so you know what you're doing.

Amanda: Is there anything else you want me to know as someone who is interested in collaboration and working with teachers to serve ESL students in the building?

Carol: This has really been a good experience. This has opened my eyes to a lot of things that can be done with co-teaching. Yeah, I think we need to do more of it. (Interview #3, Carol).

Carol’s words solidify that she positioned me as a language coach. Her words, “You do one for me and show me” illustrate how Carol could use this knowledge and transfer it to other assignments and “do it again” in future lessons. She attributed this learning to my “willingness to do a lot of those extra things,” which specifically involved creating lessons in the mathematics content classroom. In her view, my contribution was beneficial because my ideas could be used “for the whole classroom,” implying that I contributed information that could apply to all students in the mathematics classroom even though my focus was primarily on ESL students. She credited this ability to my previous experience “[teaching] all kinds,” so [I] know what [I’m] doing.” This meant that I have taught various subject areas in the past, so I knew how to adapt
language strategies in such a way that they were meaningful for all students. The ESL teacher’s contribution to the mathematics classroom was a new learning experience for Carol, which was evinced by Carol’s words that working with me “opened a whole new world.” This signifies that in working with me she negotiated the ESL teacher’s role to include many positions (e.g., a content teacher, a language teacher, a co-teacher in the mathematics classroom, a lesson designer) in ways that she did not know were possible before collaboration. An outgrowth of the ESL teacher’s recontextualized role was a new understanding about co-teaching general. More specifically, co-teaching involved both teachers planning instruction, creating lessons, and teaching the content in the mathematics content classroom. Lastly, she concluded, “I think we need to do more of it,” which means that she wanted and realized the necessity of working with me as the ESL teacher to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream classroom. This statement is significant because it implied that collaboration should continue even after the collaborative process ended.

The ESL Teacher’s Negotiated Role in Social Studies

The ESL and social teachers’ collaboration influenced Kassie’s learning to plan and teach ESL students through her negotiation of the ESL teacher’s role in co-planning and co-teaching. Kassie’s first teaching job was at Starcreek, and prior to securing this job, she was in college. As such, she had only worked with me as the ESL teacher when she began teaching at Starcreek. While she had not collaborated with an ESL, she did co-teach with the technology coach and special education teacher; however, based on her perceptions, these experiences fell short of meeting her ideal co-teaching definition. This next conversation distinguished this collaborative experience as different from previous experiences:

Amanda: Do you see your work with these co-teachers similar or different than what we did together?
Kassie: Oh goodness, it's very different.

Amanda: Why is that?

Kassie: Because with ours, I feel like we're on an equal playing field, not that I'm like above or below someone but I feel like we're both equally engaged in wanting the same goal so to speak. I just feel like with special ed, like they're much more behind the scenes like I'm just kind of going to walk around, like they've never taken like a lead role, I guess I'm saying. Like they would never get up and explain anything and we don't collaborate beforehand about what I’m teaching on or anything really like they just focus on their one or two kids and make sure they're on task. They just are a facilitator, so I've never depended on them.

Amanda: Do you think that approach is effective?

Kassie: Um, no, can I say no? I mean I think if they knew about–I think they just help them stay on task.

Amanda: If they knew about what?

Kassie: The content like I just feel like if there's ever a question they're not able to help because they aren't able to help because they're not paying attention. I think they're not paying attention because they don't have to be engaged. Like you would always be paying attention when we're co-teaching because you're helping me actually teach.

Amanda: I hope I would be paying attention anyway and taking an active part in whatever you're doing whether I had an actual teaching part or not.

Kassie: Yeah, I totally agree. That's just not the case here, you know that. You have an equal stake in it. You're like I'm here to co-teach like I'm going to be an asset to you.

(Interview #2, Kassie)
Kassie positioned me as a co-teacher “on an equal playing field,” which signified that she believed that we both equally shared teaching responsibilities. This positioning was made possible because of my content knowledge and shared planning and teaching responsibilities. This was made evident through her positioning of the special education teacher as “a facilitator” of behavior (e.g., “I think they just help them stay on task”) rather than a “facilitator” of content (e.g., “They’re not able to help [with the content]…because they’re not paying attention”). She also reiterated, “I’ve never depended on them,” which suggests that she did depend on me given the comparative nature of the conversation. She also indirectly interactively positioned me as “[taking a lead role],” which contributed to her emerging belief that an ESL teacher would take an active teaching role in the social studies classroom. Because of this “active part,” she ultimately positioned me as “an asset” with “equal stake” in planning for and teaching ESL students.

This negotiation was crucial to Kassie’s understanding of the ESL teacher’s role, and more specifically, what an ESL teacher does (or does not do) in the content classroom. Since I contributed to the planning and teaching sessions, she began to position the ESL teacher’s role as a co-teacher, an asset, and ultimately, someone she depended on to plan for and teach ESL students. She continued to refine these positionings during the second collaborative cycle. In commenting on the collaborative experience, Kassie stated, “It was wonderful” (Interview #3, May 16, 2018). When asked to elaborate, Kassie stated:

Yeah, I mean it was so easy just because I think you and I have a good relationship and so planning it is not hard. And I think we both since we have the same goal in mind in wanting to see each student succeed we both do our part and I think that's what makes it so easy is just like I know that you're gonna do what you say you're gonna do and I know
I'm gonna do what I say I'm gonna do. And we both bring the expertise of our field to the table, so I think it is the best of both worlds. (Interview #3, Kassie)

Kassie’s elaboration indicates that our professional relationship and shared teaching goals contributed to a successful collaborative planning and teaching experience. In this way, the ESL and content teachers’ collaboration “[was] the best of both worlds” because “we both bring the expertise of our field,” which ultimately paved the way for Kassie’s learning to plan and teach ESL students in the content classroom.

Lastly, collaboration influenced Kassie’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students by solidifying her interactive positioning of the ESL teacher as an important part of the social studies classroom. When asked how collaboration changed her view of the ESL teacher’s role, Kassie explained:

I think just way more of a resource than I thought would be available I guess as far as again in schools they're like call the ESL teacher if you need help setting up a lesson. I just feel like that's not really taught in universities like I just have never like it's an untapped resource like the technology coach or something like there's so much you can get from that person if you use it and utilize but I just don't think it's utilized a lot. And so, I think just seeing you as the expert of how to do things like that and help those students out and making you a more integral part of the classroom is what I think.

(Interview #3, Kassie)

By positioning the ESL teacher as “a resource” and “a more integral part of the [mainstream] classroom,” Kassie validated the ESL teacher’s contribution to the social studies classroom. With continued collaborative efforts, one suspects that this positioning will continue to thrive. Kassie’s learning to recontextualize the ESL teacher’s role may not have occurred to the fullest extent had she not collaborated with me. Thus, Kassie’s description of the ESL teacher’s role speaks to the
ESL teacher’s resourcefulness and contribution, which is necessary if Kassie is going to learn to plan for and teach ESL students in the social studies classroom.

**The ESL Teacher’s Negotiated Role in Science**

The science teacher continuously negotiated the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream science classroom, which led to a renewed understanding about the ESL teacher and collaborative teaching in general. Before engaging in collaboration with me, Shawn had experience working with other co-teachers in special education. He had never co-taught with the ESL teacher prior to collaboration; thus, collaborating with the ESL teacher was a new experience for Shawn.

In this next example, Shawn described the ESL teacher’s role within the school community:

Shawn: Your role in the building in its entirety to my understanding is (1) to assist children with language acquisition, (2) to assess their progress on that, (3) to direct them towards not only completing assignments but also going to the proper place to get assistance, you know morning help with you or what have you and in addition to giving them a solid person that they can get to know well over the course of multiple years, someone that they see is their advocate that helps them with the adjustment of fitting in even with the language barriers. That's what I see your role as an ESL teacher. I also think that that is what your role should be. I think that's what the needs are for the kids are in another words.

Amanda So, how do you think collaborative co-teaching–?

Shawn Was I close to describing everything that you do in the building? To what you really do?

Amanda: Yeah.
Shawn: That was my perception, but I could be wrong. And translating. Yes, that is also your role. I don't know that translating should be your role, but it becomes your role. The fact that you’re a liaison between them and their parents, I guess, is part of that package of being the advocate.

Amanda: Right, I totally agree. How does collaborative teaching enhance or constrain your ideal role of the ESL teacher?

Shawn: Well, first and foremost, there is only so many hours in your day, and so I think to do all of that and teach collaboratively is a stress considering that there is only one Amanda in this building. That's why in a perfect world there would be at least two. And more of those roles could happen, but yeah.

Amanda: Two Amandas?

Shawn: Yeah, definitely. Two Amandas is what we need.

Amanda: I don't know about that. That's kind of weird. Did this change your perception of what an ESL teacher should do in any way?

Shawn: What an ESL teacher should do? No, not at all because I already think that what you do do is what you should do. It's gonna be what's gonna be best for those children.

(Interview #2, Shawn)

In this conversation, Shawn positioned me as the person ultimately responsible for ESL students’ content and language learning. His initial description includes teaching English (e.g., “to assist children with language acquisition”), monitoring the ESL students’ English learning (e.g., “to assess their progress on that”) and helping students with content assignments (e.g., “to direct them towards not only completing assignments but also going to the proper place to get assistance”). He also suggests that my role included more relational factors, such as helping the student adjust to a new place and school. In addition to these duties, he interactively positioned
me as a translator, because by speaking an additional language, I helped serve as advocate for the ESL students. While Shawn realized these multiple duties might be too numerous for one person, he concluded that “we need two Amandas.” He did not say we needed two ESL teachers, suggesting that he believed I fulfilled his notion of the ideal teacher’s role. This claim is further evidenced by his last statement, “I already think that what you do do is what you should do.”

In the third interview, when asked how collaboration changed his view of the ESL teacher’s role, Shawn responded:

Shawn: Now, this is the first time I've ever done co-teaching with an ESL teacher. Are you saying that co-teaching is going to be part of your role or is it going to go back to the way it was before you were the ESL teacher?

Amanda: No, not as long as I'm the ESL teacher. I hope that co-teaching will always be part of my role.

Shawn: Okay, so if you're an ESL teacher that's gonna want to jump in and do what you do, obviously occasionally you can't teach a lesson with four different lessons there's only one of you, but to jump in sometimes, and say, “Hey can we try something together?” Just to give me more ideas and tools like that came from you this time, yeah, that's something new, and I think a great thing. You know, the support that we get out of ESL teachers or special ed teachers, I've always thought has been pretty minimal. Now, not to say ESL teachers or even some of the special ed teachers haven't been very supportive of the children that they work with, but for them to actually work with the teachers as far as creating and changing lessons, this is a new thing and I like it. (Interview #3, Shawn)

Shawn’s explanation interactively positioned me as a co-teacher of ESL students in the mainstream content classroom. I accepted Shawn’s positioning when I asserted, “I hope that co-teaching will always be part of my role.” In positioning me in such a way, Shawn distinguished
me from previous ESL and special education teachers who provided “minimal support.” The distinguishing factor was my willingness to “jump in” and “give [him] more ideas and tools,” which contributed to his renewed understanding of the ESL teacher’s responsibilities in the school. Shawn went on to describe this collaborative teaching experience as the best because of my willingness to engage in planning for and teaching ESL students. He commented, “It wasn't like you were just a warm body in my room, and it was still me doing what I usually do. You, by contributing from your side of things, improved the quality of the teaching” (Interview #3, Shawn). Shawn’s words suggest that he still believed my responsibility consisted of language strategies to help ESL students master the content objectives, but I assisted him in engaging in the act of teaching, which “improved the quality of teaching.” Thus, Shawn’s renewed understanding about the ESL teacher’s role speaks to the potential for collaboration to be a space where teachers continuously negotiate their duties and responsibilities in collaboration. In this negotiation, Shawn learned strategies to plan for and teach ESL students, which led to this renewed understanding of the ESL teacher's role and contributed to improved teaching in the mainstream science classroom.

**Distinguishing Characteristics of the ESL Teacher’s Role**

The distinguishing characteristic related to the ESL teacher’s role included the ESL teacher’s content knowledge, which created increased opportunities to contribute to content lessons. Each content teacher distinguished my content knowledge as what separated me from other co-teachers. This content knowledge paved the way for me to take a larger role in planning sessions, which created space for equal teaching roles. In doing so, each content teacher recontextualized the ESL teacher’s role to include teaching collaboratively in the mainstream classroom.
The ESL teacher’s recontextualized role also speaks to the ESL teacher’s agency in initiating and sustaining the collaborative efforts with content teachers. In these collaborative efforts, I made the choice to initiate collaborative efforts and defer to the content teacher’s authority. In the same way, I made the choice to not challenge the content teacher’s position even when it contradicted my own opinions. Agency is always based on the sociocultural community (Kayi-Aydar, 2015); thus, my experiences with content teachers are supported by my cultural capital within the school community, that is, specifically my background as a content teacher at Starcreek and my professional relationships with teachers.

**ESL Students’ Participation**

This study defines student participation as observable classroom actions/behaviors and work samples in the mainstream content classroom. Research supports that increased ESL students’ participation contributes to higher learning outcomes; that is, the more ESL students participate in the mainstream classroom, the more likely they are to learn the content and language standards. This is not to insinuate that participation always means that ESL students are talking. This claim incorrectly assumes that talkative students participate more and thus learn more than quiet or shy students. This misassumption does not consider how ESL students’ personalities or life histories might affect their classroom participation. Given the tendency to draw this superficial conclusion, this study includes ESL students’ work samples along with their observable classroom actions and behaviors.

Two major strands in the literature suggest that ESL students are reluctant to participate in the mainstream classrooms and focus on how teachers’ student positionings and pedagogical choices affect ESL students’ classroom participation. Positioning theory provides the appropriate lens to examine the multiple factors that contribute to ESL students’ participation, and more specifically, how ESL and content teachers’ perceptions of students’ personalities and
positionings relate to ESL students’ participation. As such, this study found that the ESL and content teachers’ collaborative practices influenced ESL students’ participation by opening up space for the ESL teacher to encourage ESL students and prioritize task completion and quality work. Collaboration also illuminated how content teachers’ student positionings often corresponded with ESL students’ participation. With some students, collaboration led to content teachers’ renewed understandings. Lastly, analyzing teachers’ practices illuminated how ESL and content teachers’ teachers collaborative planning and teaching acts generated or constrained opportunities for ESL students’ participation. Given these findings, this section will discuss how ESL and content teachers’ student positionings influenced ESL students’ participation, beginning with an explanation of how the ESL teacher prioritized ESL students’ task completion in the mainstream classroom. After this discussion, this section will explain that collaboration shed light on how content teachers’ ESL student positionings corresponded with the ESL students’ participation and with some students led to renewed understandings. Lastly, this section will conclude with how teachers’ collaborative planning and teaching acts influenced ESL students’ participation.

The ESL Teacher’s Role in Mainstream Classroom

The ESL Teacher’s Role in Language Arts

The ESL and language arts teachers’ collaboration opened up space for the ESL teacher to prioritize ESL students’ task completion, which in effect, led to ESL students’ increased quality of work based on what students typically submitted in the mainstream content classrooms based on the content teacher’s perceptions. By co-teaching with Emily, I was able to answer questions for students and help them complete the assigned task. For example, during the first co-teaching session, a student in Marisa’s group, who is not an ESL student, asked me to explain how to cite lines from the play. I went to the whiteboard and provided an example of how to
incorporate citations correctly with parenthetical documentation. While Marisa did not ask the initial question, she listened attentively to the discussion as I instructed the group. When Emily and I watched the first collaborative viewing session, we commented on Marisa’s attentiveness during this discussion:

Emily: Marisa is looking at the board when you start making notes on the board about stuff. She's checking her own document to see if she's done it.

Amanda: I'm modeling how to integrate quotations when you have to break a line for a play. You need a slash between the lines.

Emily: Like we're talking earlier, that doesn't make any sense until you have to actually do it, and you're like how do I have to do this? Yeah, I remember just looking up and seeing that on the board and thinking I wish I would have written that. Yeah, that. Do that. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily)

This excerpt shows how I was able to clarify information for a group that included Marisa. Emily’s statement, “I wish I would have written that” shows that she positioned me as a content teacher because she wanted all students to include citations and parenthetical documentation in their paragraphs. She did not have to stop and explain to the students or correct my explanation; rather, I was capable of discussing content information with students without prior discussion with Emily in an impromptu small group instructional setting. Emily’s additional statement, “Marisa is looking at the board. She’s checking her document to see if she’s done it” illustrates Marisa’s participatory behavior. Even though Marisa was not talking during this teaching segment, she exhibited participation when she looked at the board and verified she cited her source correctly.

Moreover, Marisa’s paragraph illustrates her participation during my explanation because she did mostly incorporate the citation with parenthetical documentation correctly into her
paragraph (See Figure 1). Marisa did not include the first set of quotation marks when she wrote the quotation, nor did she write a completely intelligible paragraph without grammatical and stylistic errors. However, what is evident is that she listened to my instructions and understood how to cite information from a source (i.e. a play), and she used this citation to begin to help her formulate her thoughts about Shakespeare’s representation of emotions through eyes and sight. Co-teaching with an ESL teacher paved the way for another teacher to explain information to students, which helped Marisa cite sources in her paragraph.

In addition to helping ESL students clarify content information on the assigned task, the ESL teacher was also able to ensure that Juan completed both assignments, which was not the norm for Juan. Emily described Juan as a “distracted” and disinterested student who struggled to complete all tasks and who typically did not contribute to small group or whole class discussions in the ELA classroom (Interview #1, Emily). Emily also cited instances where Juan ignored her

![Figure 1. Marisa’s paragraph](image)

and his classmates when questioned directly. However, in the second reflective journal, Emily commented on the change she witnessed in Juan, which she attributed to my presence in Juan’s class. She stated, “He offered an idea for his group and helped them get started showing initiative I do not see when the ESL teacher is not present” (Reflective Journal #2, Emily). Emily made a reference to Juan’s idea, which served as the catalyst for his group to begin working on the
assigned task. During the second co-teaching session, Juan responded appropriately to another group member and even chose the couple from the play:

Student A: What couple are we doing?
Student B: I don't know. Juan?
Juan: Huh?
Student B: What couple do you want to do?
Juan: Hm — Helena and Demetrius, or we can do Hermia, Lysander.
Student B: Let's do Helena and Demetrius, or something like that.
Emily: (comes over to record the group’s choice): All right, which couple did you pick?
Student B: Helena and Demetrius. (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Emily)

By Juan choosing the couple, he showed that he could identify characters from the play, explain their relationship, and describe the conflict well enough to offer the group two options without my or Emily’s prompting. Juan’s answer was markedly different than Student B who responded, “I don’t know.” It is difficult to discern what Student B meant with his response. It is possible that Student B did not know the characters or conflict in the play well enough to respond. It is also possible that Student B knew both the characters and conflict but did not want to make the decision for the group. Student B’s response is not what is most important; the most significant aspect of this conservation is Juan knew the conflict well enough to choose an appropriate couple when Student B afforded him the opportunity to provide his opinion. It is also important that the group decided on Juan’s choice, which is evident by the end of the conversation when Emily asked the group about their choice.

Juan’s participation in small groups shows that he contributed ideas to his group, particularly in a group setting where other members did not contribute. Emily credited me as the
teacher who encouraged Juan’s participation because she stated, “I do not see [Juan’s participation] when the ESL teacher is not present.” Her words relate to his participation with his group members but also extends beyond the small group discussion to the completed script. He prepared and wrote a script before his group’s performance with the ESL teacher’s assistance (See Figure 2). Juan’s script highlights his participation because he was willing to work on and complete the assigned task by collaborating with his group members and accepting assistance from the ESL teacher. Juan’s willingness to work contradicts Emily’s earlier claim that Juan is a “distracted” student because his contribution to group discussion and script suggest that he remained on task to complete the assigned work. My role in the classroom served to encourage Juan to complete the assigned task, and based on Emily’s perceptions, made the difference in Juan’s participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willy Shakes</th>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>How did the problem start?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character #1</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Well Demetrius was in love with Hermia while I was in love with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character #2</td>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td>Whatever, I never loved you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy Shakes</td>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>How do you feel about that Helena?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character #1</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>I am not happy with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character #2</td>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td>Just get over it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy Shakes</td>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>How did the conflict resolve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character #1</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Robin put the love potion on Helena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character #2</td>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td>I love her too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Juan’s script*
My ability to help students participate by completing tasks in the ELA classroom is strengthened by my relationships with students. In the first collaborative viewing session, Emily noted my ability to connect with Li. When asked to describe how Li’s participation is similar or different from her typical classroom participation, Emily responded:

She's a little quieter typically, but this was definitely more participation. She was more excited. She was happy you were in there. She connected with you. I think she–It was her, but a little more in all the ways she normally is. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily)

Li’s increased participation is evinced by emotional behaviors (e.g., happy, excited) that occur partly because Li knew that she had another teacher whom she shared a connection in the ELA classroom. Emily’s words corresponded with Li’s task completion. In collaborative groups, students worked with partners to complete a section of a collaborative assignment (See Figure 3 for Li’s collaborative group handout). Li and her partner were responsible for the first section of the assignment. Li answered each question completely and collaborated with her partner, which highlights her participation during the co-teaching session. Li’s positive emotional response influenced her ability to participate by completing the assignment.
Leo also participated ELA classroom more than his typical participation. When asked to describe Leo in the first interview, Emily responded that Leo never asked her a question in class (Interview #1, Emily). Nevertheless, in the first co-teaching session, Leo asked me a question about his paragraph in the following exchange:

Leo (turns to looks at Amanda): Is this good, Miss Giles? Is this okay?

Amanda (reads Leo’s paragraph): Yes, buddy, I like how you use evidence to support your claim that people should marry who they want. But, how do we punctuate the names of people?

Leo: Capitalize them?

Amanda (point to an example on Leo’s screen): Yes, so let’s make sure that we capitalize the names of people. Shakespeare, Hermia, Demetrius—

Leo (smiles and starts capitalizing names): Oh, okay, then I’m gonna turn it in?

Amanda (smiles and pats Leo’s shoulder): Yeah, capitalize people’s names and turn in.
(Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Emily)

Leo’s question contradicts Emily’s earlier claim that Leo did not participate by asking a teacher a question. Here, Leo directly asked me to read and comment on his paragraph. His question also shows that Leo depended on my affirmation in order to submit the paragraph. My constructive feedback on the assignment (e.g., “I like how you use evidence to support your claim that people should marry who they want”) prompted an observable positive response because Leo smiles. This conversation also shows that Leo also responded positively when I encouraged him to correct the errors because he corrected them on his paragraph (See Figure 4 for Leo’s paragraph).

When observing this exchange between Leo and me, Emily remarked, “You gave him confidence!” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily). Emily interpreted Leo’s facial expressions and observable behavior as confident. Leo’s confidence shows that he felt comfortable enough to ask the ESL teacher a question, one he might not have asked, had I not been part the ELA class. Thus, by building and strengthening relationships with students, I was able to answer a question and inspire confidence because of my role as the ESL teacher in the mainstream ELA classroom.

There was also evidence to suggest that the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream classroom not only influenced ESL students’ increased task completion, but the ESL teacher’s role also contributed to ESL students’ higher quality of work. This quality of work means that the ESL students met the language and content objectives in the ELA classroom. The above-mentioned conversation with Leo highlights my effort to ensure that students met the
Shakespeare uses references to eyes because he trying to show that a person gets to decide how they should marry. An example from the play is when Hermia says, “O hell, to choose love by another’s eyes!” (I.1.142) This example shows Theseus and Egeus are trying to get Hermia to marry Demetrius, she does not like him. She thing that she should decide who to marry. Another example from the play is Hermia says, “There my Lysander and myself shall meet / And thence from Athens turn away our eyes / To seek new friends and stranger companies”. (I.1.222-224). The example also explains she will run in order to marry Lysander because everyone should marry who they like. Because love depends on the person’s perspective, Shakespeare makes references to eyes and sight.

Figure 4. Leo’s paragraph

language objectives. Our interaction also served as a mini lesson to remember to capitalize proper nouns. I asked Leo, “How do we punctuate names of people?” By asking Leo this question, rather than telling him to capitalize people’s names, I was hoping to have Leo recall a skill in which I knew he knew how to do. Leo’s response (e.g., Capitalize them?) shows that he knew the answer to my question, even though he still wanted affirmation. While I wanted to encourage Leo, I did not want to ignore Leo’s mistakes. He needed to learn to capitalize proper nouns in a formal writing assignment. While he used citations to support his claim, he did not capitalize proper nouns. I drew his attention to these language errors and asked him to correct them even though I recognized that Leo needed language services. Drawing attention to these language errors contributed to a well-written paragraph, which earned him a perfect score on the assignment. When Emily and I collaboratively graded the assignment, she responded, “I mean [Leo’s paragraph] was like, wow, all the way better” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily). Emily’s words, “all the way better” signify that she thought Leo’s writing was of higher quality when compared to what she typically received from Leo. In the first reflective journal, I asked Emily to distinguish this quality of work from others. In response, she stated, “His reading analysis was more accurate, and his writing was more structured” (Reflective Journal #1, Emily).
“More accurate reading analysis” and a “structured” paragraph contributed to Leo’s higher quality of work, which was partly made possible by the ESL teacher’s presence in the ELA classroom. As such, the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream classroom influenced ESL students’ participation by contributing to increased task completion and higher work quality.

**The ESL Teacher’s Role in Mathematics**

The ESL and the mathematics teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by creating space for the ESL teacher to serve ESL students in the mathematics classroom. When asked to describe how co-teaching influenced ESL students’ participation, Carol responded:

I think [the ESL students] enjoy having you as much as possible because it's a safety net. And, that's what, to me, that's what an ESL teacher does. They provide a safety net for kids who need a little extra. If it's because your language, or because your culture, or because you're low in that subject, but you're their safety net. You're the person they can go to and say, “I didn't do my homework, or I need help with that. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

Carol’s description positioned me as “safety net” for ESL students, implying that co-teaching introduced another teacher who helped ESL students when they “[needed] a little extra” help. This positioning suggests that the ESL students were confident that I would assist them when they admitted their mistakes (e.g., “I didn’t do my homework”) or when they needed to ask a question. Further, this positioning insinuates that my presence in the mathematics classroom provided a secure place to work through the difficult mathematics concepts without the fear of ridicule or embarrassment. Practically, my “safety net” positioning allowed the ESL students to ask for clarifications or questions, which resulted in task completion and ESL students’ higher work quality.
Moreover, in the first co-teaching session, Carol focused particularly on Juan’s increased participation as a positive consequence of the ESL teacher’s role in the mathematics classroom. When discussing Juan’s participation, she noticed that I “kept [the ESL students] on task. You gave them someone to ask a question of and Juan did do that. He wouldn’t do that otherwise” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol). During the co-teaching session, I worked closely with Juan as he worked to complete the practice problems on scientific notation. Juan’s more focused classroom behavior included working on the assigned task and asking the ESL teacher questions when he did not understand. For example, Juan asked me to check a question on the practice sheet during the first co-teaching session. A transcript of this exchange is provided below:

Juan: What about this one, Miss Giles [referring to number 4]?

Amanda: Let’s look at number 4. First of all, is this a decimal or a whole number?

Juan: A decimal.

Amanda: How do you know?

Juan: Because there’s a dot.

Amanda: Very good, because there’s a dot. So, since it’s a decimal, you know it’s gonna be positive or negative? (Amanda waits for Juan to answer and then says) If you have a decimal, it’s going to be–

Juan: Negative.

Amanda: Good, okay, so how many spaces do you move over to get to 5?

Juan: Three.

Amanda: Huh?

Juan: Three.
Amanda: Three, good. Okay, so what did we say? Does [the answer] need to be negative or positive?
Juan: Negative.
Amanda: Okay, so how would you rewrite it?
Juan: (writes on his paper and says): $5.08 \times 10^{-3}$, [instead of saying -3 Juan says 3]
Amanda: Good, you wrote [the answer] correctly, but say it one more time.
Juan: $5.8 \times 10^{-3}$
Amanda: There you go. Good job. You can’t forget about that negative because it changes the answer. It’s important. Keep it up and keep going! (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Carol)

This brief conversation illustrates how the ESL teacher provided Juan with clarification about writing expressions in scientific notation. More specifically, Juan understood the significance of a negative exponent and how to count numbers past the decimal by the end of this conversation. This clarification enabled Juan to complete the rest of practice sheet (See Figure 5 for part of the practice sheet). By looking at Juan’s practice sheet, it is evident that Juan distinguished when to use positive and negative exponents when given whole numbers and decimals in random order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete the following problems.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Convert the number to standard notation.</td>
<td>$7.83 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Convert the number to standard notation.</td>
<td>$783,000,000$</td>
<td>$25,100,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Convert the number to standard notation.</td>
<td>$8.345 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Convert the number to standard notation.</td>
<td>$0.003$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. Juan’s practice sheet*
Similar to Juan, the ESL teacher’s role also afforded Li the opportunity to clarify her understanding of how to interpret the graph of a quadratic function. This next conversation begins with Li asking me to explain how to interpret graphs for quadratic equations on her study guide:

Li: So how do I know how to graph them [referring to questions 8 and 9 on the study guide?]
Amanda: If A is positive, then it’s going to open up like this [points to the graph above question 4 that opens up].
Li: Okay.
Amanda: If A is negative, then it’s going to go down, open down like this [can’t find a graph that opens down on the study guide] well, like this [draws this graph on a piece of paper]
Li: But what about B?
Amanda: The graph’s direction doesn’t matter for B. You also have to look at your constant, which is C, and if this is positive, then it’s going to go to the right, and if C is negative it’s going to go–
Li: to the left.
Amanda: Yeah, then it’s going to go to the left.
Li: I get that now. [Li writes down notes from this discussion] (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Carol).

This conversation with Li illustrates how Li was able to understand the parabola’s direction when graphing quadratic equations. Based on this conversation, Li understood to look at A in the quadratic equation in order to ascertain the parabola’s direction. Thus, the ESL teacher’s
presence in the Algebra classroom provided Li an additional person to clarify information, which contributed to her increased understanding of the mathematical concept.

The ESL teacher also increased Leo’s classroom participation by providing a space where he exhibited more attentive classroom behaviors. For Leo, more attentive classroom behaviors implied that he worked on the assigned task (e.g., the practice sheet on scientific notation) until completion. In commenting on Leo’s classroom behavior, Carol noticed “I think he was especially focused with you in the room” (Reflective Journal #1, Carol). Like Juan, Leo’s increased focused classroom behavior contributed to his ability to complete the assigned task and produce quality work (See Figure 6 for Leo’s practice sheet). Leo’s completed practice sheet evinced his focused classroom behavior. His practice sheet also served a formative assessment tool for me to understand Leo’s progress toward content mastery. During the collaborative viewing session, I explained that Leo could distinguish positive and negative exponents yet identified areas in which Leo struggled in the following excerpt:

Amanda: He's getting that it's negative when it starts with a decimal and positive when it's a whole number. But you're right though, they get tripped on when it has to be a number 1-10. You know what I mean?

Carol: Yeah, that's the hard part. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)
**Figure 6. Leo’s practice sheet**

This explanation accurately identifies Leo’s struggle to recall that expressions in scientific notation must begin with numerical values between one and nine. On question six, for example, Leo incorrectly wrote $76 \times 10^2$ instead of $7.6 \times 10^1$. This error resulted in a wrong whole number at the beginning of the expression (e.g., 76) and the incorrect exponent (e.g., 2). Carol’s statement, “Yeah, that’s the hard part” signifies that Leo’s error was a common error among Pre-Algebra students because they often forgot the rule about numerical values at the beginning of an expression when writing in scientific notation. Leo might not have realized his error without the ESL working in collaboration with Carol because Carol only checked the practice sheet for a homework completion grade and did not draw Leo’s attention to the error. However, since I
worked with Leo, I reminded him about the rule and helped him find the correct answer (e.g., 7.6 x 10^1). This conversation highlights how the ESL teacher’s presence contributed to Leo’s task completion and Leo’s understanding of a challenging question. Hence, in collaboration, my presence afforded the opportunity for students to ask questions, clarify information, and explain difficult questions.

The ESL teacher’s presence in the mathematics classroom also influenced Marisa’s task completion and quality of work during the second collaborative teaching session. In commenting on Marisa’s classroom participation and quality of work, Carol stated, “I think she appreciates your presence” (Reflective Journal #2, Carol). The evidence to support Marisa’s appreciation of my presence is her observable classroom behavior, task completion, and application of the geometric words on the coloring sheet. Marisa stayed focus during instruction as she completed the notes graphic organizer as Carol, and I instructed the class. Marisa participated in the Kahoot game by answering the questions on her Chromebook. Further, Marisa took out her colored pencils and prepared to complete the coloring sheet (See Figure 7 for Marisa’s completed coloring sheet). Marisa’s coloring sheet shows that she completed the task and could correctly identify the geometric vocabulary words by using different colored pencils. Thus, the ESL teacher’s presence in the mathematics classroom provided another person capable of answering Marisa’s mathematics questions, which ultimately contributed to Marisa’s task completion and
The ESL Teacher’s Role in Social Studies

The ESL and the content teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by including the ESL teacher as a co-teacher who focused on ESL students’ participatory actions and learning outcomes. In the social studies classroom, the ESL teacher’s increased involvement afforded the opportunity to help all students with the assigned task, which included monitoring students’ progress and answering students’ questions. Specifically, for ESL students, this meant that two teachers checked in with students and answered questions for them, which contributed to ESL students’ increased task completion and quality of work. The ESL teacher’s presence also encouraged ESL students to explain their answers fully, which led to students’ participation during a whole-group discussion and provided more accountability for students. Lastly, there was also evidence that the ESL teacher’s role enabled opportunities for students to connect information taught in the ESL classroom to application in the social studies classroom.

Kassie expressed her perception of the ESL students’ interactive positioning of me as the ESL teacher, stating, “I think because you have a lead role the students look to you as a resource, oh Miss Giles will know, let's ask her” (Interview #2, Kassie). Kassie’s words suggest that
students positioned me as a resource because of my role in planning and teaching in the social studies classroom. As a resource for ESL students’ specifically, I was able to answer questions about the content material and check on students to ensure content understanding. In discussing Marisa’s classroom participation during the first co-teaching session, Kassie and I observed that having two teachers contributed to Marisa’s increased confidence on completing the assigned task:

Kassie: I think the biggest thing with her is ensuring her that she does have the right answer so when she does speak, she says it confidently, and I think it makes her very nervous to speak out loud so I think being like that's a perfect answer, like just say that exactly and you're good.

Amanda: Yeah, and I also think that we did go over there, and show her I mean she was doing, once she figured out which one she was doing, that gave her the confidence that she needed. I think that was exactly right. We gave her confidence, like yes, that is the right answer. Okay, and then she wrote it out, and then when she shared it with the class, she did so correctly. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Marisa)

This dialogue suggests that Marisa has two teachers to give her feedback. Marisa’s group was responsible for the third pillar (Zakat), which required Muslims to give charity to the poor. Marisa’s contribution to her group involved answering the second question (See Figure 8 to see Marisa’s question and answer). By looking at Marisa’s response, it is obvious that she found the answer from the text and included textual evidence as the answer to her question. As Kassie and I circulated the room to help students, we were able to monitor Marisa’s progress and assure her that she had the correct answer. This collective effort “gave her the confidence that she needed” to present her answer during the whole-group discussion. This assurance was crucial for Marisa,
whom Kassie positioned as “the quietest soul I have ever encountered,” and a student who “would be so almost embarrassed if she got the wrong answer in front of people” (Interview #1, Kassie). Due to Marisa’s naturally “quiet” personality and potential embarrassment if she “got the wrong answer in front of people,” Marisa might have needed this reassurance before she presented her answer during the whole-group discussion.

In describing Marisa’s quality of work in the first reflective journal, Kassie insisted, “Her quality of work (correct answer and complete sentence) was perfect” (Reflective Journal #1, Kassie). As Kassie’s words suggest, Marisa’s answer evidences that she provided textual evidence from the reading as her answer; in doing so, she correctly located the answer in the text and wrote down the “correct answer.” Having two teachers who knew the content material, contributed to Marisa’s perceived increased confidence level and “perfect” quality of work in the social studies classroom, thereby showing how space for the ESL teacher’s role contributed to an ESL student’s exemplary participatory actions on the assigned task.

Leo also exhibited increased participatory actions due to the ESL teacher’s role in the social studies classroom. Leo asked me to help him decide on a third reason to show that Joan of Arc was a positive historical figure in the following conversation:

Leo: Will you help me with number three? I’m working on that one.
Amanda: Sure, so you have that she was a military leader and that she was devoted to people. So, here you can either talk about her goodness or her faith. Which one?
Leo: (points to Joan of Arc’s goodness) this one.
Amanda: Okay, her goodness. So, for your claim, you’re going to say, Joan of Arc was—
Leo: Joan of Arc was a good person.

Amanda: Good job, write that down and find a piece of evidence. (Collaborative Teaching Session, Kassie)

My interaction with Leo exemplifies how having another teacher in the room contributed to Leo’s ability to decide on a third reason and ultimately write his claim. In this exchange, I identified Leo’s reasons why Joan of Arc was a positive historical figure (e.g., military leader and her devotion to people) and gave him two options that he could discuss (e.g., faith or goodness). With these suggestions, Leo’s observable classroom actions show that he pointed to the one he wanted to use and stated the answer verbally, which indicated his understanding of the assigned task. After Leo wrote his claim, I also encouraged his continued participation when I said, “write that down and find a piece of evidence.” This interaction helped Leo answer his question and complete the assigned task (See Figure 9 for Leo’s third reason). Leo’s work sample evinces his ability to fulfill the requirements of the assigned task (e.g., develop a claim, include textual evidence, state its importance, and recognize a counterclaim). The paragraph scaffolds aided Leo in this effort to the point where he wrote a nearly perfect paragraph about Joan of Arc. Leo stated his claim (e.g., “Joan of Arc was a good person.”), cited textual evidence (e.g., “According to Durand Laxart, “She was a girl of good disposition, devout, patient, loving the Church, going often to confession, and giving to the poor all that she could.”), stated its significance (e.g., This evidence is important because it show that she was nice and giving to the poor.), and acknowledged a counterclaim (e.g., Although some might think she is bad, they need to realize that she was a loving person). His only observable error is on the significant portion of the assignment where he had an error with subject/verb agreement; that is, Leo wrote, “It show” rather than “It shows”. Leo’s writing sample shows that he fulfilled Kassie and my expectations for the assignment, which was partly made possible by my involvement in the social studies
Figure 9. Leo’s third reason classroom. Having extra assistance from the ESL teacher enabled Leo to begin working on his third reason and contributed to his satisfactory quality of work. Kassie commented on Leo’s classroom participatory, and more specifically his quality of work, explaining:

Leo participated super well and the quality of his work was excellent. He was on task the whole time and worked mostly independently with asking clarifying questions. Once he got started on a character trait, he was good to go. (Reflective Journal #2, Kassie)

Kassie’s description supports my claim that Leo needed Kassie and my assistance to “[clarify] questions”, but after this clarification, he was able to complete the assigned task. Thus, having another co-teacher who knew the content contributed to Leo’s participatory actions in the social studies classroom.

The ESL teacher’s role also influenced Juan’s participation, which helped him complete the assigned task and expand his answer during whole group discussion. During the first co-teaching session, Juan and his group worked to complete the fourth pillar (e.g., Siyam). With
Kassie’s assistance with typing his answer, Juan found the correct answer in the reading passage and satisfactorily contributed to the task completion of his group (See Figure 10 for Juan’s completed question).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Your Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is Ramadan? Why is it important?</td>
<td>Ramadan is the month during the Islamic calendar where Muslims do not eat. It is important because Ramadan was the month when God first revealed his message to Muhammad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10. Juan’s completed question*

completed question). After Juan’s group completed the task, each member shared his/her question the class during whole-group discussion. The next example provides a transcript of Juan’s response during whole-group discussion:

Kassie: What is Ramadan, and why it is important? [encouraging Juan] Come on, you got it.

Juan: (reads) Ramadan was the month was the month when God first revealed his message to Muhammad (stumbles over Muhammad’s name).

Kassie: Perfect, okay, so–

Amanda: Good, Juan, but what do Muslims do during Ramadan? Remember, you told me. What is this a picture of?

Juan: They don’t eat.

Amanda: Huh?

Kassie: He said it.

Amanda: Oh, okay. Good job. (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Kassie)

I intended to encourage Juan to expand his answer by explaining his answer fully. While Juan did participate appropriately, he did not state the purpose of Ramadan. Having monitored Juan’s
progress earlier in the class period, I knew that Juan knew that Muslims fast during the month of Ramadan, and in order to answer the question, Juan needed to state this purpose directly. My promptings (e.g., “Remember, you told me.” and “What is this a picture of?”) helped Juan recall the answer. Juan’s response (e.g., “They don’t eat”) shows that Juan understood my question and the content material.

As such, I influenced Juan’s participation by affording him the opportunity to explain his answer fully. Kassie and I discussed my interjection to Juan’s response during the first collaborative viewing session:

Amanda: Okay, so he said Ramadan was when God first revealed his message to Muhammad. And, my question, Okay, so you said, "Perfect, Okay!" And I was trying to get him to actually say why Ramadan is important–

Kassie: What does that mean? What do they do during Ramadan?

Amanda: Right, which I kind of feel bad, but at the same time, I feel like sometimes we say perfect, I do it too all the time, like I'll say, perfect, oh you said something, woohoo, but then he didn't explain his answer fully. He could say more. He didn't really–

Kassie: He knew more [than he said].

Amanda: Yeah, he had the right–like I wanted him to say I wanted him to have confidence in his answer, and I didn't want us to move on without him giving and saying the right answer because I knew he had the right answer.

Kassie: Yeah. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

This exchange shows my personal belief that sometimes teachers affirm students’ responses, when in actuality, the student did not state fully the correct answer. It also shows my own reflexive position that teachers should afford students the opportunity to showcase their language and content knowledge rather than restrict these opportunities. While I did not believe Kassie
intended to restrict Juan’s participation, I thought she was sufficiently pleased with a response that was partly the right answer. Since I interrupted Kassie’s discussion, I state that “I kind of feel bad”; nonetheless, my desire for ESL students to participate fully in the mainstream classroom alleviated the guilt I felt for intruding in on the conversation. Had I not been part of the social studies classroom, Juan would have still participated; yet, he would not be able to showcase his content and language knowledge to his fullest potential. Based on his answer to the question, I was confident in Juan’s ability, and therefore, wanted to encourage him to expand his answer. In this way, the ESL and social studies collaboration influence ESL students’ participating by including an ESL teacher who encouraged ESL students to contribute fully to whole-group discussions.

There was also evidence to suggest that including the ESL teacher influenced ESL students’ participation by extending English language skills learned in the ESL classroom to language skills expected in the social studies classroom. The lesson activity during the first collaborative teaching session required students to write in complete sentences. As I explained the instructions to the class, I reminded all students that all sentences must contain a subject and a verb with a capital letter and a period in the next example:

(After Kassie reads the model passage)

Amanda: (with the model projected on the screen) After you read the passage with your group, you will see that each group has five questions to answer. Each person in your group will choose one question to answer. How many questions are each person answering in their groups?

Class: one [Li also says one aloud]
Amanda: One, yeah, each person is answering one question, so they’ll all be answered.

Another important thing before we go through these answers is that you write in complete sentences. What must sentences contain?

Student A: A period?

Amanda: Well, yeah, a period and a capital letter at the beginning of the sentence, and what else?

Li: A subject and a verb.

Kassie: You go, girlfriend, say it loud and proud.

Li: (louder and with a smile) a subject and a verb.

Amanda: Woohoo! Good job, Li! (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Kassie)

This conversation highlights Li’s knowledge that every sentence must have a subject and a verb. She answered this question aloud without being forced or prompted, and she was the only student to offer the answer that sentences contain both a subject and a verb. Her knowledge suggests her familiarity with similar content taught in the ESL classroom. Had Kassie and I not collaborated to plan for and teach ESL students, Kassie would not emphasize a language objective (e.g., students write in complete sentences) on this particular assignment because on most assignments Kassie allowed students to answer questions in any written form (Collaborative Planning Session #2, Kassie). Thus, the ESL teacher’s role in planning and teaching the lesson contributed to Li’s ability to make a connection from the ESL classroom to the social studies classroom. Her understanding about sentences is obvious because Li’s sentences contain a subject and a verb (See Figure 11 for Li’s question). Li did not copy exactly from the reading passage; instead, she synthesized the information learned and showed her original thoughts in well-written sentences. In commenting on Li’s classroom participation,
Figure 11. Li’s question

Kassie responded:

Li was awesome. She answered the question on what a sentence contains, and she even edited a grammatical error in one of her group member responses. Her quality of work was great too (she got all of her answers correct on the exit slip). (Reflective Journal #1, Kassie)

Kassie mentioned Li’s contribution to whole-group discussion (e.g., “she answered a question about what a sentence contains”) without being called on directly. Kassie also commented on her exit slip in which Li made a perfect score (See Figure 12 for Li’s exit slip in social studies). Li’s participatory behavior shows that she connected information taught in the ESL classroom to what was learned in social studies, and the ESL teacher’s presence made these connections possible, thereby emphasizing how the ESL teacher impacts students’ participation in the social studies classroom.

The ESL Teacher’s Role in Science

The ESL collaborative teacher’s role in the science classroom created opportunities for ESL students’ participation. More specifically, I contributed to increased task and ESL students’ engagement based on the science teacher’s perceptions. For example, during the first collaborative viewing session, Shawn commented on how the ESL students listened as I explained instructions:
Figure 12. Li's exit slip in social studies

Shawn: You can tell that Marisa, Juan, and Leo respond to you well. They are listening to you talk and writing down what you say.

Amanda: Yeah, And I called on Juan and Leo because I wanted to give them an opportunity to speak and because I know them better than anyone in the room. First, I call on Juan, are we finished with step 1? Juan initially says no, but then I went over and showed him where we were. We were finished with step 1 and then asked to repeat step 1, Juan said, draw the dots and circle.

Shawn: Yeah, he responds to you well.
Amanda: I called on Leo to explain step 2, which with prompting, he is able to tell me that we replace the circles with lines. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn)

This exchange exemplifies how the ESL students responded to the ESL teacher’s instruction, whom they are not accustomed to teaching in the mainstream science classroom. Based on Shawn’s perceptions, “[The ESL students responded to me well” and “[were] listening and writing down what I [said].” The ESL students also feel included in the whole-group discussion because I specifically call on the ESL students to respond. This conversation references how Juan and Leo responded to my question, and while they needed additional prompting to answer the questions, they are learning a new concept that was unfamiliar. By the end of my discussion, they articulate the steps to form covalent bonds, which contributed to their increased understanding of covalent bonds. The fact that I called on ESL students directly did not imply their voluntary participation, but it did still influence their participation because it gave them the opportunity to be included in the whole-group discussion and affected their participatory actions to complete the task. By asking ESL students’ questions, I was able to clarify areas in the instruction where they were confused, which ultimately led to both Juan and Leo leaving the class with specific notes from the collaborative teaching session.

Juan’s exit slip and Leo’s notes evidence their understanding of how to form covalent bonds (See Figure 13 for Juan’s exit slip and Leo’s notes). Juan’s exit slip proves that he drew the three steps to form a covalent between Nitrogen and Chlorine because he drew the Lewis Dot Structure for each element individually, circled the shared pairs, replaced the circles with lines, and wrote the molecular formula (e.g., NCl₃). Leo’s notes also show the three steps to form covalent bonds for H₂O and CH₄, which were taught in the co-teaching session. He also drew the Lewis Dot Structure for both elements, circled the shared pairs, replaced the circles with lines, and wrote the molecular formula. Thus, my role in the science classroom partly enabled Juan and
Leo to take well-written notes and clarify understandings through answering questions, which contributed to their understanding about how to form covalent bonds.

Leo also volunteered to name the molecular formula after looking at me for assurance that he was about to answer the question correctly. After instruction, Shawn and I gave the students a practice problem which asked them to form a covalent bond between Nitrogen and Chlorine. Shawn asked for student volunteers to explain the steps in forming this covalent bond. The following excerpt is a transcription of the first collaborative teaching session where Leo voluntarily participated:

Shawn: Who can give us the name for the molecular formula? Let’s see who has the answer.

(Leo turns his head to look at Amanda for reassurance. Amanda nodded her head, and he raised his hand to volunteer)

Shawn: Leo?

Leo: NCl₃
Shawn: That’s exactly right, Leo! Great job! (Leo smiles) (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Shawn)

This conversation shows that the ESL teacher’s role in the science classroom increased Leo’s confidence to answer a question voluntarily in class. By looking at me, Leo interactively positioned me as a teacher whom he trusted to ensure that he correctly answered the question. By nodding my head, I accepted Leo’s positioning and verified his answer, which contributed to his voluntary participation. Had I not been in the room, it is likely that Leo would not have felt as confident to raise his hand since he looked at me for confirmation. Leo’s exit slip further illustrates that he knew how to form the three steps of covalent bonds (See Figure 14 for Leo’s exit slip). Leo’s work shows that he knew how to draw the Lewis Dot Structures for Nitrogen and Chlorine. In doing so, he shows that he knew that Chlorine has seven valence electrons and Nitrogen has five. In order to satisfy the octet rule, Nitrogen forms a covalent bond with three Chlorine molecules. Lastly, he wrote the molecular formula, which shows that he knew how to name the molecular formula before asking for reassurance. By looking at me, Leo answered his question with confidence. For this reason, The ESL teacher’s role influenced ESL students’
participation by ensuring that students took notes, which contributed to their increased content knowledge and confidence to participate voluntarily in the mainstream science classroom.

Shawn also believed that the ESL teacher’s role increased ESL students’ engagement during the second collaborative teaching session. Shawn explained his reasoning in the next excerpt from the second collaborative viewing session:

I just think that co-teaching in general is just good at keeping people's attention because they're seeing two different people. They're not hearing the same voice the whole time. Of course, it's a huge advantage from the planning standpoint as far as preparation, what you're gonna give them, what you're gonna do, who's gonna say what. All that planning increases the quality of the lesson and the actual delivery you know that the co-teaching format, I think is going to increase engagement. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn)

Shawn’s statement indicates his beliefs that a well-planned collaborative lesson “increased [ESL students’] engagement.” He also stated that two co-teachers “is just good at keeping people’s attention, which was enhanced when we planned the lesson together. Shawn described the fill-in-the blank notes, turn-and-talk, and exit slip as ways “we kept changing pace,” which he directly attributed to my input in the collaborative lesson (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn). To evidence the ESL students’ engagement, I provide Marisa’s notes to exemplify that she was listening to instruction and writing the answers in the blanks provided (See Figure 15 for Marisa’s Notes). By looking at Marisa’s notes, it is evident that she followed instruction by writing each vocabulary word in the provided blank. She also labeled the parts of each individual wave correctly. Marisa’s notes are one example of how the ESL teacher’s suggestion to provide fill-in the blank notes contributed to Marisa’s increased engagement. Shawn stated that he would
Transverse and Compressional (Longitudinal) Waves

Parts of the Wave

**Transverse Waves**
- Transverse waves do NOT require a medium in which to travel.
- A medium is the material in which a wave travels.
- Example: Light Waves

**Parts of a Transverse Wave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength</th>
<th>Amplitude</th>
<th>Trough</th>
<th>Rest line</th>
<th>Crest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Compressional Waves**
- Compressional waves REQUIRE a medium in which to travel.
- Example: Sound Waves

**Parts of a Compressional Wave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compressions</th>
<th>Rarefactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 15. Marisa’s notes
not have provided blanks for the students to fill in during instruction; rather, he would have
given the notes at the end of the lesson (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, May 10, 2018).
Hence, giving the notes in this way increased ESL student’s engagement during the lesson.

Li’s exit slip is also evidence of increased ESL students’ engagement (See Figure 16 for
Li’s exit slip in science). Shawn observed that Li’s exit slip was “perfect” and “she's smiling as
she's turning her paper in” (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn). Li was also the first
student to turn in her exit slip, which illustrates her engaged behavior to the end of class. By
looking at Li’s exit slip, it is obvious that Li labeled the parts of each wave correctly with
confidence because she smiled when she was the first student to turn in her exit slip. The ESL

![Parts of a Transverse Wave](image)

![Parts of a Compressional Wave](image)

**Figure 16.** Li’s exit slip in science
teacher’s role created opportunities for different suggestions for lesson activities (e.g., note taking, assessment), which led to increased ESL students’ participation in the science mainstream classroom.

The Content Teachers’ Positions and Renewed Understanding

Positions and Renewed Understandings in Language Arts

ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation because the content teachers’ initial students’ positionings in collaboration relate similarly to the ESL students’ classroom participation in ELA. For example, Emily positioned Li as a bright, active classroom leader during our first interview. During the first collaborative viewing session, Emily described Li’s classroom participation, stating, “But she's just like working, going, going, going. She checks in with me, yeah, already did that, already doing that. I'm going to keep working. I want a thousand of her” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily). Emily’s repetition of “going, going, going” suggest that Emily perceived Li to exhibit perseverance and determination in the ELA classroom, implying that Li continued to work on the assigned task until she had satisfactorily completed the task. Accordingly, Emily’s positioning of Li paralleled Li’s classroom participation. The most striking evidence to illustrate this claim occurred during the first co-teaching session. As Emily’s student positioning might predict, Li worked with her partner to organize and write her paragraph. Emily stated that she paired Li with her partner because of her ability to lead and encourage her group members to accomplish the task (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily). Li and her partner finished their paragraph before the other students in the class, and upon reading the paragraph, Emily chose Li’s paragraph as an exemplary classroom model. When asked to explain why she chose this paragraph as a model, Emily responded:
After I walked around and looked, she was the only one finished. She was one of the only ones totally finished. And she had all the parts of it that she needed to have. She and [her partner's name] together just whipped it out (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily).

Emily believed that Li “just whipped it out,” which suggests her satisfaction with Li’s ability to complete the task. She also favored Li’s intellectual contribution to the paragraph when she expressed that “she was the only one who finished” rather than using phrasing to imply a joint effort. Her positioning of Li is consistent throughout the entire collaborative viewing session where Emily continued to point out Li’s leadership in this partnership. Based on Emily’s justification for choosing Li’s paragraph, it is likely that Li finished her paragraph first; however, Emily mentioned that “she had all the parts she needed to have,” which implies that Li wrote the paragraph to Emily’s satisfaction. Li’s observable classroom behavior shows that Li beamed with pride because she wore a huge smile on her face as Emily read the paragraph to the class. Emily did note one mistake in the paragraph, which Li corrected immediately. Emily concluded, “She corrected [her partner], which insinuates that Li’s partner must have committed the mistake rather than Li given Li’s rapid movements to edit and correct the mistake in class. In the same way, Li’s paragraph supports Emily’s assertion that Li crafted a well-written, nearly perfect paragraph (See Figure 17). While Li did write a satisfactory paragraph, she also participated in ways (e.g., paragraph and classroom actions) that directly aligned with Emily’s positioning.

Figure 17. Li’s paragraph
In addition to Li’s example, Emily positioned Leo in such a way that is consistent with his classroom participation. As mentioned previously, Emily positioned Leo as “a happy kid” who was “eager to learn” during the first interview. She also described him as a student who “mostly does whatever anybody in the group tells him to do. He's not going to contribute new ideas or anything he thinks on his own” (Interview #1, March 29, 2018). Emily’s description shows that she positioned Leo as a student who only copied other students’ work and unwilling to contribute original ideas or thoughts. Leo’s participation corresponded accordingly with Emily’s positioning throughout the collaborative cycles. The most noteworthy example occurred during the second collaborative teaching session. In stating the directions verbally and in written-form on the assignment, Emily and I specified that the group needed to write in complete sentences. Leo’s group, however, interpreted these instructions to mean that students could make a bulleted list on their script. With two minutes remaining in class, one of Leo’s group members asked if they could make a bulleted list instead of writing in complete sentences. Emily told the group that she would prefer sentences rather than bullets as the directions specified, and the group should try to make changes before the class ended. While Leo attempted to change the bullets, he was not able to change all the bullets on the hand-written version of the script (See Figure 18). Leo also misspelled the character’s names (e.g., Titania and Oberon) and some words that make parts of the script unintelligible (e.g., took, give, deal, raise, warrior, agreement). Leo’s handwritten script exemplifies Emily’s positioning of Leo as student who copied his group members’ script. While it is entirely possible that Leo needed more time to proofread the script, it is evident from his frequently misspelled words that he listened to his group and attempted to copy what they were writing on their script. In commenting on Leo’s classroom actions in his group, Emily noted, “Leo is looking to see what [a group member’s name] is doing” which signifies that she believed Leo mostly copied the classmate’s work (Collaborative Viewing
Session #2, Emily). Given Leo’s shy and agreeable demeanor, it is unlikely that he would have asked his group members to slow down or even interject his opinion if not asked directly. Leo did ask to type his script after class because he expressed concern about his handwriting and the group’s decision to make a bulleted list (See Figure 19 for Leo’s typed script). The fact that Leo asked me after class to type his script further supports Emily’s positioning that Leo is a hard worker and “eager to learn” (Interview #1, Emily). His eagerness compelled him to advocate for himself when he knew he made mistakes and needed more time. His classroom actions that illustrate his eagerness and advocacy complement Emily’s student positioning.

![Figure 18. Leo's handwritten script](image)
ESL and content teachers’ collaboration also influenced ESL students’ participation by challenging Emily’s student positionings, which began to lead to new student perspectives. To exemplify this renewed perspective, Emily initially positioned Marisa as a quiet student, describing, “[Marisa is] so shy, didn’t say a word. I didn't know what her voice sounded like until Christmas” (Interview #1, Emily). Emily’s words suggest that she believed Marisa rarely participated verbally in class either in small or whole group discussions. However, Emily began to see a difference in Marisa’s typical participation as we collaborated to plan and teach lessons together. During the first collaborative teaching session, Emily called on each group to explain their contribution to the collaborative group handout without specifying the group’s
spokesperson. When Marisa and her group presented, Marisa volunteered to read in the following segment:

Emily: What about line 195?

Marisa: In line 195, [reads line 195] The rest I’d give to you [pauses] to you translated. This means that she wishes to be Hermia and not who she is.

Emily: That’s exactly right. So, Helena wishes to be like Hermia. (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Emily)

This segment highlights a difference in Marisa’s typical classroom participation and additionally contradicts Emily’s initial positioning that Marisa “didn’t say a word” in class. Marisa acts as a spokesperson in her group, volunteering to read and explain her group’s contribution. In a group of four, she could have chosen to sit quietly, yet without being called on directly, she spoke for her group. When asked to describe how Marisa’s participation in the co-teaching session contrasted with her typical participation, Emily explained:

She volunteered to read in front of the whole class to say what her group had decided, which is huge. I mean and I could hear her, sometimes at the beginning of the year she might speak, and it would be inaudible. But this time, you can hear what she's saying; her evidence is good. She explains it. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily)

Marisa exhibited confidence in being a spokesperson for her group. Consequently, Emily began to see Marisa in a new light as a student whom “you can hear what she’s saying.” Even more, Emily commented that her explanation was based on solid textual evidence. This description of Marisa’s classroom participation was different from Emily believing that “she didn’t say a word.” Marisa audibly explained her answer correctly in two complete sentences, which far exceeded Emily’s expectation for Marisa’s classroom participation. Seeing Marisa’s
participation in a new way highlights the potential for ESL and content teachers’ collaboration to help bring about renewed ESL students’ positionings.

Emily’s most striking change in student participation occurred with Juan. As mentioned previously, Emily characterized Juan as the distracted whom she found the most difficult to reach because his classroom actions did not always seem the most engaged based on Emily’s perceptions (Interview #1, Emily). These disengaged behaviors generally took the form of Juan starring off during whole group discussions and his lack of motivation and interest when engaged in a conversation about the content. Emily expressed frustration by stating that Juan always responded, “I don’t know” (Interview #1, Emily). Consequently, Emily’s interactive positioning of Juan led her to state that her participatory expectations for Juan was task completion and behaviors that reflected interest (e.g., talking to peers or teachers) in the ELA collaborative teaching session. While Juan did not exhibit completely different behavior characteristics in the first co-teaching session, he responded to my questions when I tried to prompt his thinking about the characters and plot of Act I. Juan also stayed after the bell rang to complete his paragraph during the first collaborative session even missing a few minutes of lunch to finish. When Emily witnessed Juan staying after the bell to finish his paragraph during the first collaborative session, she admitted:

I learned that my perception of Juan's participation is a little skewed because he participates in very small ways that I'm not catching until I watch the video, so like having you there to constantly connect with him helped me see that he's engaged more than I think he is. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily)

By admitting that her positioning of Juan “is a little skewed,” Emily began to realize that Juan may be exhibiting more participatory actions and behaviors than she initially thought. She also credited this changed perception to the ESL teacher’s connection and assistance in the classroom,
which she would not have realized apart from this collaborative experience. Emily’s statement that “he’s engaged more” referred to Juan’s actions of working to the bell to complete the assigned paragraph, which did not typically take place (See Figure 20 for Juan’s paragraph). Juan’s paragraph contained an assertion, evidence, and commentary, which was outlined in the rubric. He made a few errors in punctuation (e.g., no period before the last sentence and an extra comma in the last sentence); however, his paragraph illustrates that he worked to ensure completion. Juan’s reasoning for working after the bell is impossible to pinpoint. It is possible he stayed because he wanted to finish his paragraph. It is also possible he only stayed because I was standing by him to make sure he finished. By engaging in these classroom behaviors (e.g., working after the bell and completing the assignment in such a way that met the expectations on the rubric), Juan helped Emily understand his participation in a new light. Emily’s renewed understanding on Juan’s participatory actions will continue to be refined as she continues to engage in collaboration with the ESL teacher. She now knew to look beyond what she initially thought and see ESL students’ participation from new perspectives.

Shakespeare uses references to eyes because a person loves depends on their perspective. An example from the play is when Hermia said, “I would my father looked but with my eyes” (I.158). This example shows Hermia wishes to pick Lysander, and she wants her father to understand that. Another example from the play is when Hermia “o hell to choose love by another’s eyes” (I.1 142). The example also explains Hermia is mad because she can’t pick who she likes. Because love depends on each person, Shakespeare makes references to eyes and sight.

Figure 20. Juan’s paragraph

Positions and Renewed Understandings in Mathematics

The ESL and the mathematics teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by challenging Carol’s student positionings. Carol had strong notions of good
students. In her view, good students copied exactly what the teacher wrote on the board, sat in the front of the class, and remained relatively quiet throughout the class period. For example, in both co-teaching sessions, Carol arranged the student desks in rows and allowed students to select their seats without assigning them. The three ESL students in Pre-Algebra chose to sit close to one another in the back of the classroom. Noticing the same student arrangement in both co-teaching sessions, I asked Carol about the students’ seating arrangement, and she responded, “They’ve chosen to sit in those seats. It would not be my preference,” (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol). Carol admittedly did not like the students’ seating arrangement, yet she made no effort to assign students different seats. I additionally pointed out that the three ESL students chose to sit next to one another in the following conversation:

Amanda: I think it's interesting that these three all choose to sit together. Leo and Marisa are friends. Juan and Leo are friends.

Carol: But you know what I wish that given a choice they would choose the front, because that's where they need to be for the attention in math. But in eighth grade, I don't think there is a way to teach them that. But you know if you walk into a high school room or a college classroom and you have free choice, learn to take care of yourself, go to the front where you need to be. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol)

I proposed that the ESL students sat together because they were friends; however, Carol did not consider this reasoning and stated that the three ESL students in Pre-Algebra (Marisa, Juan, and Leo) sat in the back of the class. While she did not assign seats or specify this desire to students, she hoped that students would select this arrangement on their own. This excerpt makes known Carol’s belief that good students sit in front of the class “to take care of [themselves], suggesting that the ESL students did not know how ‘to take care of [themselves].” On the other hand, Li sat in front of the class in Algebra. Carol commented on her satisfaction of Li’s seating selection,
stating, “Li picked up front and in the middle. She does not want to be distracted by the others, but that just shows you she's more a self-advocate. She knows what to do to help herself” (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol). Based on Li’s seating preference, Carol positioned her as a “self-advocate” and one who “knows what to do to help herself.” In positioning students, Carol based this judgement solely on the students’ seat selection and did not consider alternative possibilities. Her perception about the students’ content and language abilities corresponded accordingly to their seating preferences. For instance, she positioned Li as “perfect” (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol). Li’s perfection resembled a student who frequently asked questions in class when she did not understand, chose the correct seating arrangement (e.g., a front row seat), and worked on the assigned task for the entire class period. There was one instance where Carol and I observed Li conversing with another student about an unrelated topic. Carol justified Li’s off task behavior in the following way:

   But [another student’s name] and Li are getting it done, and if you have a slight
   conversation, then it's a little brain break and then you come back. As long as you go
   back to focus, then we're good. But they don't get off track, so I'm okay with that.
   (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol)

This conversation highlights Carol’s rationale that Li must need a “little brain break.” It is not my intention to suggest that Li did/did not need a break or to suggest that she did not return back to work quickly. She did return to the task after two minutes talking to another student. However, Carol did not afford the other three ESL students a similar “break.” For example, early in the collaborative process, Carol described Juan’s typically classroom participation, stating, “He's often zoned out. You know that staring into space look. I've given him time to work on something, and he writes nothing on the paper” (Interview #1, March 30, 2018). During the first collaborative session, Juan did not bring his calculator with him to class. He turned to ask
another student for a calculator, and when the student did not have an extra one, Juan turned to me and asked me for a calculator. When Carol observed this behavior, she remarked:

        Carol: He never has one.
        Amanda: But, I run get him one from your desk, so he'll have one in just a minute.
        Carol: I wish he would get into the habit of picking it up when he comes in.

(Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

Carol’s statement highlights different student positionings for similar classroom behavior (e.g., engaging in side conversations with another student). Even though Juan talked to another student at the beginning of class to locate a calculator in preparation for the class period, he still exhibited an off-task behavior because he did not come prepared for class or “get into the habit of picking [the calculator] up when he comes in.” Alternatively, Li engaged in a similar conversation in the middle of class, and Carol’s assessment is that Li needed “a brain break.”

Carol’s classroom observation during the collaborative viewing sessions paralleled her perceptions about the students’ content and language abilities. When asked to describe Juan’s ability to meet content and language standards, Carol commented:

        He's very low. I know his reading level is low, and usually when the reading level is low, you do see that in the math class. They go together. I don't really know why exactly, but they do. He's gonna need a lot of support in high school. I'm not sure he's going to make it on the regular math track. He might be on the step-down math track, which isn't college ready, but I don't know if that's his game plan down the road. (Interview #1, Carol)

Carol’s positioning of Juan’s observable classroom participatory behaviors often corresponded with Carol’s perception of Juan’s mathematics and reading abilities, so much so that she concluded her doubt that “he’s going to make it on the regular math track.” This description went
as far to suggest that Juan might not receive all his mathematics credits to graduate from high school.

While Carol’s positioning of Marisa and Leo were not as blatant as Juan, she still positioned both students as “low in math” (Interview #1, Carol). Marisa and Leo were different because they exhibited different participatory classroom behaviors based on Carol’s perceptions. Unlike Juan, both Marisa and Leo were “quiet” yet “eager to learn,” which was only based on their willingness to take notes and complete the assigned task. Because of their seeming willingness to take notes and complete assigned tasks, she surmised both Marisa and Leo would be “okay in high school,” despite her positioning that they were both low in mathematics.

There was one instance where she lauded Marisa’s ability to copy the notes exactly as she did on the board, which corresponded with her notion of a good student. She contrasted Marisa’s observable classroom behavior with Juan’s. While Juan completed the notes entirely, he did not draw the lines as neatly as Marisa. Like Marisa, Leo drew the lines on every problem on his notes page (See Figure 21 for Marisa’s, Juan’s, and Leo’s notes page). In the next conversation, I suggested that Juan completed the notes, yet Carol still positioned Juan as not completely engaging in classroom behaviors as she expected:

I think he's pretty good at trying to fill it out, now he's, again you saw it in his notes, he doesn't copy down all the work. I mean he'll get the answer written down but sometimes without copying down the work I wonder if he really knows how to do it, whereas you look at Marisa's and she's writing down how I did it and that gives her something to look at. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

While Carol’s concerns about Juan’s notes might be reasonable, she stated that she “[wondered] if he really knows how to do it,” which doubted Juan’s mathematics ability. Her comment also fails to consider that both students were taking notes, which meant they both copied from the
board. As such, it is difficult to discern whether either student actually knew how to arrive at the correct answer without looking at the board at least while taking notes. Juan and Marisa copied all the answers correctly for three of the four questions; however, for number 7, Juan actually wrote down the correct answer by drawing the lines (e.g., 0.000008345) while Marisa did not write down the correct answer even though she drew the lines. This might actually suggest that Juan knew how to find the answer correctly while Marisa might not. Nonetheless, given that both students were copying the notes from the board, it is impossible to claim that either actually knew how to arrive at the correct answer. This conversation’s significance highlights how Carol was reluctant to position Juan in a positive manner even when he attempted to what Carol expected him to do, which in this case was coping directly from the board. Moreover, this conversation also emphasizes how Carol’s positioning of a good student took the form of copying exactly from the board. Thus, this shows how ESL and the mathematics teachers’ collaboration influenced student participation by emphasizing how the content teachers’ student positioning paralleled the students’ observable classroom behaviors.

Realizing Juan’s positioning in the mathematics classroom, I attempted to challenge Carol’s student positioning of Juan. By offering an alternative positioning of Juan, I hoped to draw Carol’s attention to the fact that Juan may appear unfocused when in actuality he struggled to keep up with the pace of the mathematics class. In the following conversation, Carol noticed Juan’s classroom actions and behaviors:

Carol: Leo is looking at the board, but I only worry that Juan misses some of the things by not looking at the board.

Amanda: Right. I think he's on an earlier problem, and he hasn't finished and he's trying to catch up, but he's not quite there and then he misses it.
Carol: That makes sense, yeah. You don't want to distract the work he's doing. And that makes sense.

Amanda: I think it's a combination of that and he does have a tendency to zone out sometimes, but when you're showing what he needs to do and correct, I mean he's very willing to change it.

Carol: Again, that's why it's nice when you're right there with him, because you can see what he's doing. To where if I'm doing a quick scan, I don't always know that he's not caught up, and I do try to go slow. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

---

**Figure 21.** Marisa’s, Juan’s, and Leo’s notes page
Carol stated that she wished Juan looked at the board more frequently during instruction because she expressed concern that “Juan misses some of the things by not looking at the board.” However, I positioned Juan as a student who tried to complete the expected task and willingly accepted feedback. My statement, “He hasn’t finished, and he’s trying to catch up,” suggests that I believed that Juan was participating. However, Carol’s pace, albeit not too fast, was ultimately too fast for Juan. Juan was not looking at the board because he was still working on the previous problem in an effort to understand. In doing so, Carol somewhat accepted my interactive positioning of Juan and at least admitted that her perception of Juan’s classroom behavior may be limited. For this reason, she stated, “That’s why it’s nice that you’re right there with him because you can see what he’s doing.” Based on this description, Carol positioned me as Juan’s advocate and the person who observed Juan classroom behaviors, thereby knowing how Juan acted in the mathematics classroom. In doing so, Carol considered an alternative for why he did not look at the board. What Carol thought was disinterest and unfocused behavior was Juan trying to work to “catch up” during instruction. In this way, Carol learned that Juan needed more time to process and work on the assigned task, which she may not have learned apart from collaboration. In commenting on what she learned in collaborative teaching and plan during the first collaborative cycle, Carol stated that this renewed student perspective contributed to her learning, stating:

I think it's just the different perspective of the students because you know them in a different way. You have a different relationship than I do. Yours is not as much pressure, so they can go to you. And you can give me insight into some of what they're thinking. Like you watched Juan and to me he's got his head on his desk and looks shut down, but you realized he's working, like you said, he's slower. He's trying to catch up and that's a big difference. And I never gonna see that when I look out and see a kid with his head on
his desk. I think asleep. Checked out. You know? So, I mean it's really neat to see that; that's a different idea. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Carol)

Carol interactively positioned me as a relational teacher, which afforded an opportunity to see Juan’s classroom behavior in a new light. By offering this alternative perspective, I helped create Carol’s learning opportunities. Thus, the ESL and mathematics teachers' collaboration contributed to students’ participation because collaboration illuminated the mathematics teachers’ student positionings and how these positionings aligned with the ESL students’ participation. Through reflection and conversation, collaboration challenged the mathematics teacher’s positioning, thereby offering a new and different student perspective.

**Positions and Renewed Understandings in Social Studies**

The ESL and social studies teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by shedding light on the content’s teacher’s students’ positionings. Kassie’s interactive positioning paralleled Li’s participatory actions in the classroom. With other students (e.g., Leo, Marisa, Juan), there was evidence to suggest that collaborating to plan for and teach ESL students challenged Kassie’s students’ positionings. In describing Li, Kassie commented, “She is great. She's very participatory, always does her work, always helps her group, raises her hand, does well on tests, does well on assignments, tries really hard, she's wonderful” (Interview 1, Kassie). Kassie’s description distinguishes Li as a student who actively participates in the social studies classroom. She evidenced this participation with Li’s observable actions (e.g., “always does her work,” “always helps her group,” “raises her hand,” “does well on tests,” “does well on assignments,” “tries really hard,” and “she’s wonderful”). During both collaborative co-teaching sessions, Li exhibited these participatory actions in the classroom, which suggested that Kassie’s positioning of Li corresponded with her participation. As mentioned, previously, during the first collaborative cycle, Li made a perfect score on the exit slip (See Figure 12 for Li’s exit slip in
social studies). This perfect score paralleled Kassie’s positioning that “she does well on tests” and “she does well on assignments.” In another example, during the second co-teaching session, Li worked on the assigned task until completion. For the first part of the lesson, Li found three reasons (e.g., promoting witchcraft, acting immorally, and encouraging war and bloodshed) to support that Joan of Arc was a negative historical figure (See Figure 22 for Li’s first reason). Li’s work sample made obvious her participatory actions to complete the assigned task. In writing a character trait, Li used the sentence frame (e.g., Joan of Arc was…) to form a well-written sentence using the past progressive tense. She cited textual evidence, stated its significance, and acknowledged the counterclaim. In commenting on Li’s participation, Kassie stated, “Li did a fantastic job and her quality of work was great” (Reflective Journal #2, Kassie). Kassie interactive position of Li during the last collaborative session was similar to her initial student positioning, which suggested that Kassie’s positioning of Li paralleled her classroom participation.

**Reason 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choose the connotation: positive or <strong>negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give a character trait to describe Joan of Arc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan of Arc was promoting witchcraft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cite evidence to support what you think.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to Article 2, Joan had “invoked(summoned) demons, and evil spirits, consulted them, associated with them, had made and had with them compacts, treaties and conventions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tell why this evidence is important/significant.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This evidence is important because Joan was worshipping the devil and getting help from the evil spirits to help lead France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledge the other side.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although some might think she was a visionary from saint, they need to realize she was a visionary from devil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 22. Li's first reason**

While Kassie’s student positioning of Li corresponded with her classroom participation, Kassie’s students’ position of Leo, Marisa, and Juan began to change as she worked in
collaboration with me. Kassie initially described Leo as a hard worker but stated he struggled to master the content and language standards. She also explained that Leo was a quiet student “who lacks confidence to be a leader in his group” (Interview #1, Kassie). In observing Leo’s actions, Leo helped his group members delegate responsibilities by choosing which question each member would answer. More specifically, when another group member was struggling with the instructions, Leo leaned over, pointed to his group member’s question, told him to look for the answer in the passage and write the answer in the box provided (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Kassie). Leo’s actions exemplify a class leader who contributed to his group by helping group members and by completing his part of the assignment. Kassie and I assigned Leo’s group the fifth pillar (e.g., Hajj), and Leo’s self-designated question was the fifth question (See Figure 23 for Leo’s answered question). Leo’s answered question accurately answers the question, showing his ability to read through the passage and find the correct answer. In commenting on Leo’s classroom participation, Kassie noted how Leo exhibited different participatory behaviors than he typically would, suggesting, “He even took a leadership role for a little bit in his group by helping out another student. His quality of work was great” (Reflective Journal #1, Kassie). Kassie’s positioning of Leo is different than her initial student position. This renewed understanding of Leo’s classroom behavior is attributed to working in collaboration and reflecting on her pedagogical practices and students’ participation with an ESL teacher. Thus, ESL and social studies collaboration afforded Kassie the opportunity to see a different and new positioning of Leo that she may not have witnessed had she not collaborated to plan for and teach ESL students in the social studies classroom.

| 5. How do Muslims celebrate the pilgrimage? | Pilgrims may celebrate with a four-day feast. |

Figure 23. Leo's answered question
Kassie’s interactive positioning of Marisa also changed as she engaged in collaboration with an ESL teacher. Kassie described Marisa as a hardworking, quiet student who struggled to access the content and language standards. While Kassie believed Marisa struggled with articulating her thoughts, she pinpointed reading as the area in which Marisa struggled most, stating, “I would think that [reading is] her biggest difficulty” (Interview #1, Kassie). In defining her reading struggles more specifically, Kassie did not believe that Marisa could complete a skill that required her to do more than “straight recall,” suggesting that Marisa might not be able to read a difficult passage, synthesize information, and write a well-written argument (Interview #1, March 31, 2018). However, in the second collaborative teaching session, Kassie and I observed these exact participatory actions in class. The activity required that students read primary sources, synthesize these sources, and select three reasons to support whether Joan of Arc was a positive or negative historical figure. On commenting on the difficulty of the assigned task, Kassie reported:

I think any time you ask students to read primary sources from like the 1300s that is going to be difficult anyways. I noticed that a lot of the difficult words they put the definition in parentheses afterwards, so it might not have even been necessarily the words it might have been the language in which they said things, so I think it's difficult to read those quotes and understand what it is saying to begin with and then to kind of extrapolate your own thoughts, and find the character trait that would come from this quote. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Kassie)

Kassie specified that the language in the primary sources made the assignment difficult. Even considering this difficulty, student did not recall information from the text; instead, students had to “read the quote...extrapolate [their] own thoughts and find the character trait that would come from the quote.” Despite the difficulty of the task, Marisa completed all parts of the assignment,
showing that she could synthesize and form an argument from a difficult primary source. (See Figure 24 for Marisa’s third reason). Marisa’s third reason exemplifies that she developed a claim, cited textual evidence, stated its significance, and acknowledged a counterclaim. She conveyed her ideas intelligibility for each section. In discussing Marisa’s participation, Kassie commented:

Kassie: And I with Marisa, she always does her work but tries really hard. But hers was correct. Genuinely correct.

Amanda: And she did it independently?

Kassie: She did it independently. Her answers were what I would expect of a non-ESL student. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Kassie)

Kassie’s explanation states her renewed perspective of Marisa’s work quality. Marisa did not only complete the task, she also completed the assignment correctly and independently. When Kassie commented “her answers were what I would expect of a non-ESL student, she suggests that Marisa’s work was comparable to eighth grade students who did not receive language services. Kassie credited Marisa’s work quality to the structure and scaffolded way we designed the lesson, which was made possible as we worked together in collaboration. Thus, the ESL and social studies teachers’ collaboration influenced Marisa’s classroom participation by challenging Kassie’s positioning an ESL student’s work quality.

Collaboration also influenced Kassie’s positioning of Juan. As mentioned previously, Kassie initially positioned Juan as the most difficult to reach and a student who struggled to meet language or content standards, stating, “I'm not sure he's passed a test yet, so I think it's either a retake or I just kind of give him a close to passing grade so I would say that he is not [performing on grade level]” (Interview #1, March 31, 2018). Based on Kassie’s initial positioning, she did not expect Juan to complete the assignment or be able to synthesize information while reading.
Figure 24. Marisa's third reason

However, in the second collaborative viewing session, Kassie commented on Juan’s changed work ethic and quality:

Kassie: I think the formative assessment normally in class, if I was going around and saying, “how are y'all doing”, it would be good, and then I would ask a question, but I would pose it in a way that I am basically telling you the answer and you just have to acknowledge that you're a human and be like yeah, I agree, but I think we this I'm seeing that we're asking them actual questions where they have to actually know what they're doing and what they're talking about and they have a reason for it. And I felt confident in asking kind of harder questions. Like I didn't feel like I had to go up to them and be like okay, you're bad, like the bad comments what does bad mean? I think I could be like why did you put this sentence and they would know. I just felt more confident that they knew what they were doing and maybe it was their behavior or reading over their work or as I
was walking around class or watching the video, but they just seemed to get this more than a typical day.

Amanda: You mentioned their behavior. How is their behavior changed?

Kassie: They're just typically like Juan would have his head on the desk or he would be staring at his Chromebook and like would not have written a thing. The other two are always behaved. So, their behavior did not necessarily change, but I think Juan specifically is the one whose behavior is always kind of been an issue, and I think the fact that he was up, alert, typing, talking about the assignment to Leo was huge.

(Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Kassie)

While Kassie’s words suggest her satisfaction with the ESL students’ participation during the second collaborative teaching session, she specifically emphasized Juan’s changed behavior. She foregrounded her claim with describing Juan’s seemingly typical classroom behaviors (e.g., head on the desk, staring at his Chromebook, and off task). However, on this assignment, “[Juan] was up, alert, typing, talking about the assignment to Leo was huge.” Kassie attributed Juan’s changed behavior to the rigor of the assignment, which is evidenced in her introductory statement that “I am basically telling you the answer and you just have to acknowledge that you're a human and be like yeah, I agree.” In seeing Juan’s changed behavior, she began to see him in a new light and reconsider how she designed lessons that influenced students’ participation. Juan’s increased participatory is evinced in his work sample from the second collaborative session (See Figure 25 for Juan’s first reason). His work shows how he worked to complete the first reason and accurately explains a reason with textual evidence to support why Joan of Arc was a negative historical figure. He additionally understood how to formulate a counterclaim. Kassie stated her amazement with Juan’s work ethic and quality in her reflective journal, commenting:
I was most impressed with Juan. He really was on task the whole time and he seemed to understand what we were doing and why more than he ever has. His quality of work was higher, and he participated way more. (Reflective Journal #2, Kassie)

Kassie’s words note how well Juan participated in class so much she “was most impressed with Juan.” Although Juan did not complete the assignment without errors, he surpassed all of Kassie’s expectations, which indicate Kassie’s changed positioning of Juan. This renewed student positioning was made possible in collaboration with an ESL teacher; hence, the ESL and social studies teachers’ collaboration influenced students’ participation by challenging Kassie’s students’ positionings.

**Reason 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choose the connotation: positive or negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joan of Arc was against social norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite evidence to support what you think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to Article 16 Jeanne had been many time with gentleness by noble person of both sexes too give up her men's dress and resume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell why this evidence is important/significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This evidence is important because she is not to be wearing mens clothes instead of wearing ladys clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge the other side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although some might think that she is cool , they need to realize she wear men clothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 25.* Juan’s first reason

**Positions and Renewed Understandings in Science**

Collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by bringing attention to how Shawn’s positionings of ESL students influenced their participatory actions in the science classroom. For example, Shawn positioned Li as the high performing student, stating:
Her work samples and her communication skills in class is above most of the non ELs. She is in the top half of the class for sure. She's probably in the top third. Maybe top fourth. I mean she's up there. (Interview #1, Shawn)

Shawn’s positioning of Li suggests that he did not believe Li needed language supports because she consistently made the highest scores (e.g., “top third...maybe top forth”) in the class. He also indicated that her classroom participation was high. He evidenced her high participatory actions, explaining, “She volunteers to answer questions. She asks questions. She'll go work a problem on the board. She is full on engaged when we do group work; participation is very high from her” (Interview #1, Shawn). Shawn’s description of Li is consistent with her observable classroom participation. During the first collaborative teaching session, Li raised her hand to volunteer to answer a question in class and walked to the board to draw the Lewis Dot Structure for Oxygen. In addition to volunteering an answer and drawing it on the board, Li also took notes, which consisted more than the appropriate drawings for covalent bonds (See Figure 26 for Li’s notes). She also wrote the steps beside the drawings, even though Shawn did not write the steps on the board during his instruction. She also articulated the steps in forming covalent bonds when working with her partner. The next excerpt is the discussion that occurred between Li and her partner during the turn-in-talk segment in the first collaborative teaching session:

Li: Our first step is to write the Lewis Dot Structure of each nonmetal and then we have to circle the shared pairs.

Partner: So, okay, like Carbon has four valence electrons and Hydrogen having just having one. So, you would circle two electrons to make a pair (shows Li how to circle electrons for Carbon and Hydrogen). And like step two, you would change the circles to lines.
Li: So, we’ve changed the circles to lines, and we need three more Hydrogens so that Carbon will have eight (Li draws three more hydrogen molecules).

Partner: Okay, now step three, we write the molecular formula, which in this case is CH₄ because we have one Carbon and four Hydrogens. We put the C first because Carbon makes up all of the biological life on Earth.

Li: Yeah, that’s right (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Shawn).

This conversation shows that Li initiated the discussion with her partner and indicated that three additional Hydrogen elements were needed to form the covalent bond, which contributed to her and her partner’s ability to ultimately write the molecular formula (e.g., CH₄). Her classroom actions aligned with Shawn’s description that “she [was] full on engaged when we do group work.” The ESL and science teachers’ collaboration revealed that Shawn’s positioning of Li corresponded with her classroom participation, which is evidenced by her work sample and partner discussion. The fact that Li’s classroom participation corresponded with Shawn’s poisoning sheds light on how teachers can enhance an ESL students’ participation.

*Figure 26. Li’s notes*

Another example of how Shawn’s positioning aligned with an ESL student’s participation is with Leo. Shawn positioned Leo as a hard worker and a student helper for Juan, explaining:

I think is a big benefit to Juan is currently that he is working with Leo a lot. They’re good buddies, and Leo helps him. But, in my opinion on that, that's not detracting from Leo’s
classroom experience, him having to try to re-explain to Juan what we just learned is just deepening Leo’s' understanding. (Interview #1, Shawn)

In both collaborative teaching sessions, Leo completed both assigned tasks and was seated next to and partnered with Juan. During the second collaborative teaching session, Juan asked Leo to borrow a pencil at the beginning of class, and when Leo gave Juan a pencil, Leo told him to write the notes on the screen (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Shawn). The following excerpt from their turn and talk during the same co-teaching session illustrates how Leo helps Juan stay on topic during their partner discussion:

Leo: Juan, what is letter A on a compressional wave?
Juan: It’s uh–
Leo: Here, look at the notes. (points to letter A)
Juan: Compressions.
Leo: yeah, what is letter B?
Juan: Rare–something.
Leo: Yeah, that’s it. (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Shawn)

By initiating the discussion, Leo positioned himself as a student who wanted to complete the assigned task, which was to quiz his partner on the parts of each wave. When Juan did not know the answer, Leo directed him to the notes where he could find the answer. This action created an opportunity for Juan to find the correct answer, which Juan seized. Leo’s action aligned with Shawn’s positioning of a student helper because he directed Juan to the place where he could find the answer to his question. In addition to this particular action, Leo also gave Juan a pencil to take notes and instructed him to write the words on the screen, which in effect told Juan to take notes. Leo’s exit slip from the second collaborative session shows that he understood how to label the parts of each wave (See Figure 27 for Leo’s exit slip).
His completion of the assignment and his discussion show Leo’s hard work ethic because he demonstrated commitment to complete the assigned task. His participatory actions further corresponded with Shawn’s positioning, which highlight the various ways in which teachers’ positions impact an ESL student’s participation.

In the same way, Shawn’s positioning of Marisa matched her observable classroom actions. As mentioned previously, in the first interview, Shawn described Marisa in the following way:

Marisa is sweet as pie, always on task, very shy, and very hard to hear. She talks so [so is emphasized] softly. Smiles a ton. Always gets her work done. Very successful with her grades not necessarily As but she is a B level kid that works hard and gets it done.

(Interview #1, Shawn)

Even though Shawn positioned her as “shy and very hard to hear,” he praised her personality and the fact that she “always [got] her work done” and was “very successful with her grades.” In the

**Figure 27.** Leo’s exit slip
first collaborative teaching session, Marisa took notes by writing exactly what Shawn wrote on the board, which showed that she knew the steps to form covalent bonds on her exit slip (See Figure 28 for Marisa’s notes). By looking at Marisa’s exit ticket, she correctly wrote the Lewis Dot Structure for Nitrogen and Chlorine. She circled the shared pairs and wrote the correct molecular formula. She emphasized the line in one covalent bond, mostly likely to suggest that she knew how to complete step two. Her actions aligned with Shawn’s positioning that she completed all tasks with accuracy. There was some evidence with Marisa to indicate that Shawn’s positioning of Marisa changed as a consequence of collaboration. As mentioned previously, he positioned Marisa as “very hard to hear.” In the first co-teaching session, he asked Marisa the following question:

Shawn: How do I draw the dots for Oxygen? Let’s see, who can I call on? Marisa?

Marisa: Two dots on both sides and two other dots.

Shawn: That’s right. (draws them on the board) Like Marisa said, Oxygen has six valence electrons. (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Shawn)

Marisa answered Shawn’s direct question, which shows her content knowledge that Oxygen has six valence electrons. Her answer seemed to correspond with Shawn’s earlier position; however, what is significant here is how he discussed Marisa’s comment in the first collaborative viewing session. When asked why he called on Marisa, Shawn responded in the following way:

Yeah, and I actually heard her, most of the time she says it so quietly that I can’t hear, but I actually heard her. Two dots on both sides and two other dots…this is Marisa, always paying attention and knowing what to do. I called on her because I wanted to give her an opportunity to show what she knows and give her confidence. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn).
Shawn’s explanation initially begins to compare her typical classroom participation (e.g., “most of the time she says it so quietly that I can’t hear”) to her participatory actions in the collaborative teaching session (e.g., “I actually heard her”). While Shawn did not specify why he thought we “actually heard her” during the viewing session, he did note that her classroom participation increased in collaboration (Reflective Journal #1, Shawn). For this reason, Shawn’s thoughts are included here as evidence to indicate how Shawn changed his positioning while engaging in collaboration.

Juan’s example provides stronger evidence to suggest that Shawn’s positionings changed when talking about this particular ESL student. When asked to describe how Juan typically completed tasks, Shawn reported, “[He] struggles, I feel like he doesn't do any work outside of this building. I think every bit of anything he does gets done between 8 and 3, and so a lot of things are partially done” (Interview #1, Shawn). Shawn’s positioning of Juan highlights how Juan “[struggled]” to complete the tasks assigned to him. Shawn also indicated that Juan was not always on task during class. In watching the first collaborative teaching, Shawn noticed a change

Figure 28. Marisa’s notes
in Juan’s classroom actions. When asked to comment on Juan’s participation, he reported:

Shawn: But, Juan, though it’s hard to tell if he’s actually taking notes.
Amanda: Okay, I understand that. I guess I know he is because I saw a copy of his notes and made of copy of them after the teaching session, so I know that he was taking notes. So, sure, sometimes I notice that he does stare off and he does doodle on his paper, but overall, he has the same notes as what the students have. This shows me that he’s actually taking notes.
Shawn: See, that’s why I’m glad we’re doing this because I wouldn’t have known that otherwise. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn)

By positioning Juan as a student who struggled to complete tasks, Shawn based his initial observation (e.g., “It’s hard to tell if he’s actually taking notes”) on his previous students’ positioning. However, I responded in a way that focuses on Juan’s observable classroom actions because he completed the notes in class (See Figure 29 for Juan’s notes). By looking at Juan’s notes, it is evident that he followed along during instruction. His drawing suggests that he knew to include the Lewis Dot Structure, circle the shared pairs, and write the molecular formula. He also wrote “Part 1,” “Part 2,” and “Part 3” to distinguish between the three steps. While Juan did not finish writing the molecular formula for CH₄, he did include four Hydrogens on his notes, which indicate he knew that the molecular formula should have been CH₄. He also wrote the correct molecular formula for H₂O, which suggest that he knew how to write the molecular formula correctly. Therefore, in my response to Shawn, I tried to position Juan as a student who took notes in class like the other students. Shawn response (e.g., “That’s why I’m glad we’re doing this because I wouldn’t have known that otherwise”) suggests the impact that collaboration can have on his students’ positioning. Without participating in collaboration and reflecting on the co-teaching session, Shawn might have thought that Juan did not complete the notes. Thus, the
ESL and science teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by introducing an alternative perspective that brought about renewed understandings about ESL students’ participation.

![Figure 29. Juan's notes](image)

**ESL and Content Teachers’ Planning and Teaching Acts**

**Collaborative Planning and Teaching Acts in Language Arts**

The ESL and the language arts teacher’s collaboration influenced ESL students’ classroom participation by engaging in planning and subsequently teaching acts that either created or constrained possibilities for ESL students’ participation. More specifically, the collaborative outcome produced two lesson plans based on the content and language standards. Planning to create lessons and ultimately teaching the created lessons either influenced the ESL students’ participation in the ELA classroom. To exemplify how the created lessons generated (or constrained) possibilities for ESL students’ participation, Emily and I wanted to give ESL students an opportunity to engage in small group discussions. To this aim, we designed the lesson so that all students worked on a collaborative group handout created in Google Documents. The entire class had editing rights on the document, which permitted each student to write on the actual document. During the first co-teaching session, Leo and three group members...
worked to complete the collaborative group handout (See Figure 30 for Leo’s collaborative group handout). Based on Leo’s group collaborative group handout, Leo discussed the lines from the play and completed the question correctly. However, in observing Leo’s observable actions and behaviors during his group’s discussion, Leo did not contribute to the discussion verbally. He was on the document throughout the entire discussion, listened to the discussion, and was able to write a paragraph about Shakespeare references to eyes and sight, which met the content and language objectives. Nonetheless, engaging in planning and teaching actions (e.g., creating a collaborative lesson plan where all students had editing rights to the document constrained to some extent Leo’s classroom participation. While engaging in noticeably on task behaviors (e.g., looking at the document and making eye contact with peers), Leo did not have to participate verbally in the small group discussion. In fact, it might have been easy for Leo who was interactively positioned as “shy” and “quiet” to let the other group members answer the question without contributing his ideas to the conversation. Leo did not volunteer to share his group’s answer with the group during whole-group discussion; instead, he sat silently and listened to his group by looking at his group members and the handout appropriately. This claim is not to suggest that Leo did not participate. Leo’s paragraph (See Figure 4) serves as evidence that he did in fact participate by listening to his group; however, this claim is intended to illuminate how teachers’ collaborative planning and teaching acts constrained full participation in the ELA classroom.

*Figure 30. Leo’s collaborative group handout*
Emily and I noted how planning and teaching the lesson in such a way might have constrained ESL students’ full participation. In her reflective journal, when asked about changes to the first collaborative cycle, Emily commented that she wanted students to work in smaller groups, perhaps even in pairs, to “foster more conversation and independent work” (Reflective Journal #1, Emily). Emily’s words show that she desired to generate increased possibilities for “conversation.” Her desire to create opportunities for more “independent work” explains that she wanted each student to take more responsibility even while working in collaborative groups. By taking on more responsibility, students would be held accountable for their contribution, which would ultimately lead to more equitable and fair assessment practices. Emily explained her reasoning more fully in the second follow-up interview, stating, “If there are four people in this group, I can sit back and copy whatever everyone else does, yeah I don't have to contribute as much” (Interview #2, Emily). Emily’s justification evidences an earlier claim that questions Leo’s full participation. Had Leo worked in a smaller group (e.g., pairs) or asked to take a specific role in the group, then he might have participated more. This would have led to stronger claims about Leo’s classroom participation on the collaborative group handout during the small group discussion.

Given this understanding, our planning and teaching acts during the second collaborative teaching cycle opened up increased opportunities for ESL students’ participation. Students still worked in collaborative groups, but we strategically made the groups smaller and created the lesson so that each group member took responsibility for one part of the assignment. We also required all students to perform the written script, which generated additional opportunities for participation. The actual outcome was a performance where students showed their knowledge of the content and language standards in non-traditional ways. This performance served a two-fold purpose. First, the assignment align with the performance aspect of a play. Second, each student
had to show their knowledge of the play’s conflict. Allowing for performance-based activities where students show rather than write their understanding of the play heightened ESL students’ participation. In returning to Leo’s example, Leo performed the part of Willy Shakes. In doing so, Leo acted as the spokesperson on a Reality T.V. show and mediated the dispute between Oberon and Titania. The next excerpt is the transcript from Leo’s performance:

Emily: Group 1, if you’ll send Willy Shakes up to the interview chair. [Leo and his group walk toward the couch and chairs in the back of the classroom.] We’ll have our couple come sit on the conflict couch. All right, everybody, please give your attention to the stage at the back of the classroom as we watch Group 1 on the show, *Shake it Off.* Action.

Leo: I am Willy Shakes, and I am with Titania and Oberon. [Both students wave when their names are called respectively] How did the conflict start?

Titania: Do not get me started. [looks at Oberon] He pushes my buttons. He pushed it too many times, and this time he wants to take the boy away from me.

Oberon: Well, I’m sorry, I’m just trying to put the good boy, put the boy to good use instead of just pampering him all day. [Titania waves her hand as to brush off Oberon’s words.]

Leo: [looks at Titania] How did that make you feel?

Titania: It makes me angry [Leo nods his head] He won’t leave me alone about the boy, and I’ve already too him [pauses to look at Oberon and then back at Leo] I’m not giving him to him. And then he insults me. He says I have pointy ears and an attitude, and I don’t.

Oberon: Well, obviously you can see what I deal with here. I’m just trying to make him into a good warrior that’s good for the kingdom.

Leo: Now, that the anger is out, let’s come up with an agreement.
Titania: We can stop fighting [waves her hand again at Oberon] I’m tired. I just wanted him to be safe. I guess I’ll let you have him only if he can stay with me.

Oberon: Fine.

Leo: [smiles because an agreement is reached] Thank you. [looks at the audience and nods his head] (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Emily).

Leo’s transcript indicates that he understood his acting role in the play (e.g., Willy Shake). His words also show that he understood the conflict between Oberon and Titania enough to know that the characters needed to negotiate a compromise to solve the conflict (e.g., arrangement for the boy). Leo also understood the language standards because he assumed an imaginary role and used appropriate sentence structure (e.g., declarative and interrogative sentences) in his performance. Thus, Leo shows that he met the content and language objectives for this assignment and showed increased participation (e.g., appropriate head movements and verbal speech) from the first collaborative session. Moreover, Leo’s performance also evidences how collaborative planning and teaching acts opened up increased opportunities for ESL students’ participation.

In commenting on Leo’s performance during the second collaborative viewing session, Emily noticed Leo’s observable behavior and actions during and immediately after the performance in the following excerpt:

Emily: I love his confidence right here. He's not straight reading off the page. He's like looking at it and talking like a typical conversation.

Amanda: I know.

Emily: He's not looking down at the ground.

Amanda: No, he's looking at them. He's nodding his head.

Emily: Oh, and Leo says oh, thank you. Like he knows he did a good job.
Amanda: He did an awesome job.

Emily: He did a really good job.

Amanda: And Leo has a big smile on his face.

Emily: He feels good about it.

Amanda: I know. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Emily)

Emily’s description of Leo shows that he displayed the appropriate actions and behaviors of an actor (e.g., looking at the other actors, not reading the script verbatim, nodding his head), and in doing so, exuded confidence. His “big smile” indicates that Leo knew that he contributed to a good performance. Leo’s positive actions and reactions to the performance highlight how performance-based activities can lead to increased ESL student’s participation because this activity type gives more freedom to showcase their content and language knowledge in alternative ways. These alternative activities create opportunities for ESL students’ confidence to soar in the ELA classroom.

Moreover, Marisa’s performance in the second collaborative teaching session also exemplifies how the ESL and language arts teachers’ collaborative planning and teaching acts create increased opportunities for ESL students’ participation. As mentioned previously, Marisa exhibited increased participatory actions in the first co-teaching session than her typical classroom behavior by volunteering to share her group’s response to the class. However, in the second co-teaching session, Marisa was afforded the opportunity to engage in a more authentic task than her previous behavior because the ESL and content teachers designed the activity to open up the possibility for increased participation. In this way, Marisa assumed a character’s role and likewise exhibited the character’s personality. The following example provides a transcribed excerpt of Marisa’s performance with her group:
Emily: All right, up next we have Group 3, Oberon, Titania, and Willy Shakes. Make your way to the conflict couch and interview chair. [Students move toward the back of the room and sit in their places.] And Action!

Willy Shakes: Hi, I’m Willy Shakes. And here we have Titania and Oberon [points out each character respectively] What is the conflict between y’all and how did it start?

Marisa [playing the part of Titania]: We are uh trying to find out who will raise the boy because we have different raising methods.

Oberon: I have such a totally different raising method than her [waves her hand in front of Marisa] stupid one. I mean, she’s such an airhead [looking at Marisa].

[Class says oh and laughs; Marisa also attempts to hold back a smile/laugh.]

Willy Shakes: So, what is y’all’s plans for the boy?

Marisa: I want to care for him and love him. Also, I promised a friend um I would um take care of him like, like the caring man he is.

Oberon: I want him to become big and strong and become a knight, and I would train him not, so he’s not just a little boy who’s always just stuck in the house with his mother.

Willy Shakes: Okay, now that we’ve got all this anger out, how will we resolve this?

Titania: I guess uh some days I’ll uh let him train with him [lifts her hands as if she’s not sure] and he’ll let me have him to take care of him.

Oberon: Sounds like a plan.

Willy Shakes: Thank you. (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Emily)

Marisa’s performance shows how the lesson activity generated increased opportunities for Marisa to exhibit the personality traits of Titania. Marisa took a leading role, which was more difficult than the part of Willy Shakes, who acts as the television show host. By doing so, she became a protective adoptive mother who wants to protect and pamper her son. Her motivation
contradicted her husband’s wish that the son should train as a warrior. As such, Marisa’s words and body language indicate that she understood Titania’s motivation. Emily likewise noted Marisa’s participation, commenting, “The easier part is to be Willy Shakes, and she took one of the ones that required emotion, and she had a little attitude in there” (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Emily). Emily’s statement emphasizes how Marisa showed greater “emotion” and a “little attitude” as she acted out her part; hence, reiterating how our planning and teaching acts provided space for Marisa’s increased participation.

**Collaborative Planning and Teaching Acts in Mathematics**

The collaborative planning and teaching acts during the first cycle constrained opportunities for student participation in the mathematics mainstream classroom. The students’ desk arrangement for Pre-Algebra and Algebra classes were in rows, which did not afford students opportunities to engage in participatory behaviors aside from the previously mentioned conversations with the ESL or mathematics teacher. The actual teaching actual engaged students in a lecture on the mathematics concept (e.g., scientific notation) and had students work on practice problems to reinforce this concept, which did not require heightened student participatory behaviors. For this reason, in order to support students’ participatory behaviors, it is necessary to look at task completion. In this regard, all ESL students completed the notes page as Carol delivered instructions and received assistance from me as the ESL teacher when they needed to ask a question or gain clarification on the mathematics skill.

However, the planning and teaching acts during the second collaborative cycle encouraged opportunities for student participatory behaviors. These opportunities extended to include more performance-based activities that afforded ESL students’ possibilities for participation. For example, during the second collaborative cycle, rather than creating practice problems for students to complete to show their mastery of the content standards, we instead
asked students to visually demonstrate their knowledge of geometric vocabulary through the coloring sheet. In this way, students showed that they identified geometric angles and applied this knowledge through using different colors (See Figure for 31 Leo’s coloring sheet). Leo’s coloring sheet depicts an alternative to traditional mathematics vocabulary activities and highlights Leo’s content mastery. More traditional approaches might have required Leo to match the term with the definition, which may not adequately show Leo’s content understanding. This lesson approach started with how students would more than likely see and apply their vocabulary knowledge, which provided a more authentic context for vocabulary learning. Further, it did not penalize Leo for learning the language by focusing on spelling or pronunciation of the vocabulary words. Nonetheless, Leo showed his content vocabulary knowledge by correctly coloring the various angles.

Figure 31. Leo's coloring sheet

Moreover, the second collaborative cycle also gave students to engage in kinesthetic participatory behaviors. Carol and I moved the student desks to the classroom perimeter and used duct tape to put mini transversals around the room for students to physically demonstrate their knowledge of the content vocabulary by putting their feet on the angles as they appeared on the screen. Carol and I created a Google presentation that included the geometric angles instructed.
along with popular music. Students had to quickly change their footing to match the correct angle. Carol and I circulated the room to check students’ understanding and help accordingly. In watching ESL students during the second collaborative cycle, Carol acknowledged how our planning and subsequent teaching acts created opportunities for students' participation:

Carol: Let's see if I see—no I think just the moving around they're so much happier.

Amanda: Would you attribute that to the lesson design, so how we created the lesson?

Carol: Yeah, we created movement.

Amanda: Yeah, more opportunities for them to move around and for them to participate in mathematics.

Carol: Leo, there, he got it. And then once they figured out. You know, once you had corresponding, every time it came up you could go to the same one. Or, they could go to different ones.

Amanda: I think it's good because they're repeating in a fun, engaging way. I just love the activity. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol)

Carol’s explanation that “we created movement” signified how the lesson design of the activity was a planning act that encouraged ESL students’ participation. Carol also commented on Leo’s understanding of corresponding angles, which further demonstrates how multiple performance-based activities encouraged Leo’s participation. What distinguished this lesson from more traditional lessons was that it encouraged all students’ participation. Students had their own transversal and was able to practice and eventually demonstrate their content mastery in a “fun, engaging way.” Carol also reported, “This is the best that this unit has ever come through,” which signifies her satisfaction the students’ content mastery and lesson design (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol). Thus, the ESL and the mathematics teachers’ collaboration opened up opportunities for ESL students’ participation by engaging in planning and teaching acts that
encouraged more performance-based activities where students could show rather than tell their content understanding. Based on Carol’s perception, these collaborative planning and teaching acts made a significant impact on students’ mathematics and content mastery.

**Collaborative Planning and Teaching Acts in Social Studies**

During the first collaborative cycle, Kassie and I designed the lesson so that students had to share information with the class. We structured the lesson so that students found the information in the reading passage and possibly received teachers’ feedback before their presentations in order to alleviate students’ fear of having the wrong answer. In doing so, we opened up possibilities for students to participate in a whole-group discussion. This next conversation highlights the ESL students’ increased participation during the first collaborative teaching session:

Amanda: Is there any evidence that this is different or similar from the ESL students’ typical participation?

Kassie: I think their participation level was greater, and I think that was because we made them participate. But I think it's easy for me as a non-ESL teacher for me to shy away from calling on them or giving them a role in class because I know it makes them nervous, so I appreciated that we're going to break it down for you where you feel confident, so I think their speaking in class and taking ownership was very, very different. They all behaved as they typically do as far as Leo and Marisa and Li all like working to find the answer and doing their thing. And Juan participated more because we were constantly checking in with him, so that was a positive. So better, it was like they were more part of the class than they typically are.

Amanda: What do you mean by "more part of the class?"
Kassie: We gave them an opportunity to take a role and share their answer with the class.

(Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

Kassie’s statement suggests that she did not typically give the ESL students a specific role in the assignment; rather, students worked in groups without dividing responsibilities. She also did not design lessons for participation or “call on [ESL students]” to answer questions. Her statement, “I think it's easy for me as a non-ESL teacher for me to shy away from calling on them or giving them a role in class,” evidences this claim. By positioning herself as a “non-ESL teacher,” Kassie realized that she could not share the same experiences as her ESL students as a monolingual English speaker, thereby intending to practice empathy with the ESL students. While it is generally positive for Kassie to practice empathy, she was empathic to the point where she set low expectations for students’ classroom participation. By planning the activity so that students had to take a participatory role, we created “an opportunity” for ESL students to participate by “[taking] a role and [sharing] their answer with the class.” While Kassie reported that the students were well-behaved (e.g., worked to complete the task), she learned how to include ESL students in whole-group discussion in a way where they would not be nervous and have confidence that they knew the correct answer.

To exemplify ESL students’ increased participation, the next excerpt emphasized Marisa’s contribution to the whole-group discussion:

Kassie: How much money are Muslims required to give and to whom?

Marissa: Uh, they give about one-fortieth, uh, (looks at Kassie and Amanda) to the poorer neighborhood.

Amanda: Good.
Kassie: Beautiful, yes, one-fortieth, so 2.5%, if I make a hundred dollars, the expectation is I would give $2.50 of that to the poor, or my poorer neighbors. Good job!

(Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Kassie)

Initially positioned as a quiet student who rarely participated in class (Interview #1, Kassie), Marisa answered aloud and explained her answer correctly to the class. By allowing Marisa the space to find and verify the answer, we engaged in teaching acts that encouraged Marisa’s participation in a way that Kassie self-reportedly stated was different than what typically occurred. Hence, ESL and content teachers’ collaboration paved the way for ESL students’ increased participatory actions.

While there is evidence that our planning and teaching acts encouraged increased students’ participation, there is also evidence to show that particular teaching acts constrained ESL students’ participation. For example, students worked in collaborative groups to divide responsibilities after we delivered instructions and explained the model. As mentioned previously, Leo began the conversation to divide responsibilities with his group members about the fifth pillar (e.g., Hajj); this action support that he reflexively positioned himself as the group’s leader. They began working on their question. As I walked by this group, I noticed all group members working quietly and reading the passing silently to themselves. Since I knew Leo struggled with reading, I went over to the group and said directly to Leo, “Do you want me to read the passage aloud to the group?” Leo affirmed that he did want me to read the passage, so I stood next to Leo and began to read. After I read half of the passage, I noticed that Leo was the only one listening to me read the passage. The rest of his group was finished reading and moving on to their question. I felt I had to finish reading the passage and did not call on another group member to read (Collaborative Teaching Session #1, Kassie). By reading the entire passage to Leo’s group, I constrained opportunities for Leo to participate. Instead of working in a group,
Leo worked with the ESL teacher as his partner, which minimized Leo’s full group participation. Reflecting on my choices, I admitted that I wished that I would have acted differently during the first collaborative viewing session:

Amanda: Okay, so during this collaborative groups, I notice that I go over and help Leo and read the passage. I thought that that was an interesting choice although I did think it would help Leo. I think that Group Member A and Group Member B were kind of doing their own thing, and I wish that I would have allowed for Leo to participate more with them instead of with me. I don't think Leo minded because of his demeanor. He wants to accomplish the assignment, and he doesn't care who is helping him. But, maybe not? Maybe he wanted to participate with his group, and I constrained his chances because I read the whole time. I wish I would have let him participate, and I feel like I shut down the opportunity for him to interact with these two, and I think that could have been a powerful opportunity had I given him the opportunity to do that.

Kassie: That's hard though. If I were you and knowing Group Member A and Group Member B, Group Member A is one of the smartest of the class and she kind of goes off and does her own thing, and doesn’t worry helping other people, nor ask everyone if they have their part. She is like I did my job; now I'm gonna sit here and read.

Amanda: And that's exactly what she does. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie)

In reading the passage entirely for Leo, I interactively positioned him as a struggling reader. Moreover, by not calling on another student to read, I denied Leo’s full participation in the group. Kassie’s response to my reflection show that she understood my choice and attempted to alleviate my concern (e.g., “That’s hard though). Her words, “If I were you,” suggest that she might have made a similar choice had she noticed Leo’s group working quietly. It is also true that Student A completed her question quickly and accurately, and by the time I had finished
reading, she was reading a book independently, which supports my statement, “And that’s exactly what she does.” Nonetheless, while I agree I should not have made Leo read aloud, I could have called on Student A at the beginning, which might have opened up opportunities for the group members to engage in a conversation about the reading without the teacher’s assistance. Therefore, this example typifies a teaching act that constrained an ESL student’s participation in the social studies classroom.

Another example that restricted ESL students’ participation is Kassie’s decision to type Juan’s answer rather than letting Juan type his own answer. When students were working in small groups, Kassie first checked on Juan and his group. While she did not read the passage to Juan, she typed Juan’s answer for him rather than making Juan type the answer himself. During the first collaborative viewing session, Kassie admitted, “I shouldn't have typed for him” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Kassie). By typing for him, Kassie interactively positioned Juan as a helpless student who could not type the answers. This positioning led to Juan allowing Kassie to type his question for him when he was capable of typing his answer without assistance. Had Kassie afforded Juan the opportunity to type his own answer, he might have exhibited increased participation and further contributed to his group. Thus, in this way, Kassie’s teaching act constrained Juan’s participation.

During the second collaborative teaching session, our planning and teaching acts opened up opportunities for ESL students’ participation. Kassie reflected on how our planning acts contributed to this participation in the second collaborative viewing session:

I think they're participating way more. I think maybe part of that is because we put more responsibility to do it themselves. I also think that they are working with partners with someone they're comfortable with makes them more participatory. I just think this class setup for this class at least is so helpful for this group because they are a good class and
they are on task most of the time, but I think they're more engaged and paying attention when it's a smaller group. I think. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Kassie)

In planning the lesson, we designed the activity so half of the students found reasons why Joan of Arc was a positive historical figure, and half of the students found the opposite claim. By engaging in this particular planning act, each student became an expert on one side, which “put more responsibility” on each student. We paired students together so that they could learn about the alternative side. Students also had free seating at the beginning of class so that they would be partnered “with someone they're comfortable with,” to discuss both sides. Planning the lesson so that students worked in partners with each person taking a different side ensured that both students participated.

The evidence that this planning act increased ESL students’ participation is made obvious when listening to the students’ conversations. The next conversation provided is Li’s transcript while talking to her partner:

Li: Joan of Arc was a promoting witchcraft. It says, according to article 2, "Joan had invoked or summoned demons and evil spirits that consulted them and associated with them and had um them compacts, treaties, and conventions. This evidence is important because Joan was worshipping the devil and getting help from the evil spirits to help lead France to victory. Although some might think she was a visionary saint, they need to realize that she was a visionary from the devil. Okay, what did you write down from my explanation?

Partner: I wrote down that it needed more information because it didn't really like, just because they thought she promoted witchcraft, I mean they could have thought that, but like she also helped them in battle, like helped the French in battle, so they could just be saying that.
Li: Definitely. Why was Joan a positive figure?

Partner: Joan of Arc's ability as a military leader was great. According to Duke, Joan was most skillful and wonderful in all she did but for warlike things, bearing the lance, assembling an army, ordering military operations, directing artillery. This evidence is important because it shows how Joan was a great military leader being good at about everything that was needed to win a battle. Although some might think Joan was a troubled youth, they need to realize that this troubled youth had great skills that would go on to defeat them. So, what did you think of my reason, Li?

Li: Strong information.

Partner: Why do you think it's strong?

Li: She talks about how skillful Joan of Arc is and how she helped the French military win the Hundred Years War.

Partner: So, on the last part, what did you put?

Li: Joan of Arc was a negative historical figure because she was blamed for witchcraft, and she also summoned the devil and evil spirits to help her win the war between England and France. (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Kassie)

Li’s discussion with her partner shows that she understood the content objective of evaluating both sides and forming a well-informed opinion. Hence, this conversation shows how collaboration increased an ESL student’s participation specifically when talking about the content objective. Leo and Juan chose to be partners, and their conversation also shows that they fulfilled the expectations of the assignment:

Leo: Do you wanna go first?

Juan: You go first.
Leo: Okay. She is a strong military leader. My evidence is according to Jean, “Everyone wondered that she could act with as much wisdom and foresight as a captain who had fought for twenty or thirty years.”

Juan: You made a strong point.

Leo: Okay, what did you say?

Juan: That she was wearing men’s clothes.

Leo: What’s your evidence?

Juan: She’s not supposed to be wearing men’s clothes. She should be wearing lady’s clothes. Do you think it’s strong?

Leo: Yes. (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Kassie)

Both Leo and Juan articulated a reason why Joan of Arc is a positive or negative historical figure and supported this claim with evidence, albeit Leo’s evidence was a direct evidence from the primary sources. Juan’s evidence was an inference about the information he read in the primary source about why Joan of Arc violated social norms. Their conversation exemplifies how the ESL and social studies teachers’ planning and teaching acts opened up increased potential opportunities for ESL students’ participation. While the first collaborative cycle required students to participate in whole-group discussion, it did not necessarily afford opportunities for students to discuss in smaller groups. By listening to students’ conversations with their partners, there is stronger evidence that the ESL students read primary sources, developed a claim, and argued their point of view with a partner. For this reason, the ESL students had increased opportunities to participate because of the ESL and social studies teachers’ collaborative planning and teaching acts.
Collaborative Planning and Teaching Acts in Science

The ESL and science teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation through engaging in planning and teaching acts that either constrained or enhanced ESL students’ participation. The planning and subsequent teaching acts were gradually more productive in affording ESL students the opportunity to participate. Thus, there were increasingly more planning and subsequent teaching acts in the second collaborative cycle that encouraged ESL students’ participation. During the first co-teaching session, Shawn lectured about covalent bonds and decided at the beginning of class that he did not want to give the students the notes during his lecture; rather, he wanted to wait. Thus, Shawn’s last-minute decision constrained opportunities for ESL students’ participation except for the few students whom Shawn selected to speak. As previously mentioned, Shawn selected Marisa and Li to answer a question, and both answered the question correctly.

When I reviewed the notes, I gave the same example as Shawn’s previous example and additionally called on Juan and Leo to answer questions. I decided to incorporate the turn and talk in order to give ESL students an opportunity to participate in a way that is not structured or forced. Directly calling on students to answer questions might force students to answer questions when they would not have chosen to participate otherwise in the discussion. While this is still participation, students did not engage in voluntary participation. By incorporating the turn and talk, I aimed to elicit voluntary participation. However, this teaching act did not elicit participation among all four ESL students. Marisa, for example, sat quietly during the turn and talk and did not utter a word. The following excerpt is a transcription of Marisa’s turn and talk during the first collaborative teaching session:

Partner: Step one, we need to draw the Lewis Dot Structure.

(Marisa looks at her partner; she does not nod or validate this response in any way.)
Partner: (on seemingly observing Marisa’s lack of contribution) Okay, step number two, we circle the shared pairs. What do we need to do for step number 3?

(Marisa only looks at him and back at her paper.)

Partner: Marisa? What do you think?

(Marisa stares at him, saying nothing.)

Partner: Okay, we write the molecular formula.

(Marisa stares back her notes) (Collaborative Teaching Session, Shawn)

Marisa’s actions indicate she only minimally contributed to the discussion because she only stared at her partner. My teaching act had the opposite effect of what I intended in Marisa’s case because she did not speak at all or show an observable action that indicated her participation.

During the first collaborative viewing session, Shawn and I discussed Marisa’s constrained participation:

Amanda: I decided to do a turn and talk because I wanted to give students a chance to discuss what they had learned or at least articulate the steps in forming covalent bonds. I like turn and talks because they give students an opportunity to talk about what’s being discussed.

Shawn: I use turn and talk a lot. I love to hear what the kids are saying. Sometimes what they won’t say in big groups, they’ll say in smaller groups.

Amanda: Yeah, I definitely agree. I noticed that Marisa listened to her partner, but she didn’t say anything.

Shawn: Yeah, maybe her partner wasn’t the best choice. I feel like she might have said more had she been seated by someone else. Maybe [Another student’s name]?

Amanda: Yeah, maybe. Too, though I think it’s important to mention that, and you can tell me whether you agree with me or not, but I don’t always think participating means
that a student has to say something. In this case, while Marisa didn’t say anything, she listened to her partner, so, here that’s where I look and see the student’s notes and then too the practice example, are they getting this?

Shawn: Oh, I definitely agree, I don’t think you have to be talking to be participating. I just think Marisa was in a bad seating arrangement because she is never going to talk to that student.

Amanda: Yeah, in the future, we’ll make sure we group them with someone else, maybe the other student’s name that Shawn mentions earlier].

Shawn Well, yeah, we could do that. But I don’t know that [the student’s name] would be the best partner. In that class it’s just hard because you have so many that don’t really get it. It’s hard to place kids in the perfect spot.

Amanda: Oh, I definitely agree with you. It can be challenging to pair students. I just said [the student’s name] because we mentioned her before. I’d just like to see her seated with a different person, someone whom she might speak more with. Or, at least do more than stare.

Shawn: Yeah, we can try. (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn)

This conversation highlights that we attributed Marisa’s constrained participation during the turn and talk to her seating arrangement; thus, we learn that another partner might encourage more participation in the second collaborative teaching session. Without talking to Shawn, I would not have known that Marisa’s seating arrangement was not ideal for Marisa. In talking to Shawn, I learned that the next lesson needed to give students increased opportunities to talk in a structured way (e.g., sentence frames to discuss the topic). During the next collaborative teaching session, we paired Marisa with the student mentioned earlier, which did enhance Marisa’s participation.

This conversation is a transcribed excerpt from Marisa’s turn and talk:
Partner: I wanna go first.

Marisa: Okay. Uh, quiz me.

Partner: What is letter A on a compressional wave?

Marisa: Letter A is the compressions on a compressional wave.

Partner: What is letter B on a transverse wave?

Marisa: The wavelength.

Partner: What is letter D?

(Shawn interrupts discussion to give the exit slip.). (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Shawn)

Marisa’s discussion with her partner shows increased participation from the first collaborative teaching session. Marisa answered her partner’s question using the sentence frame to help her craft her response. Hence, her discussion illustrates how collaboration influences ESL students’ participation by engaging in planning and teaching acts that open up opportunities for ESL students’ participation.

Shawn also believed that Li’s partner during the turn and talk created opportunities for her increased participation. The next example is a transcribed excerpt from their turn and talk discussion:

Li: What is letter A on a transverse wave?

Partner: The crest.

Li: What is letter A on a compressional wave?

Partner: The compression.

Li: What is letter B on a compressional wave?

Partner: Rarefaction

Li: What is letter B on a transverse wave?
Partner: The amplitude.

Li: What is letter C?

Partner: The trough. (Collaborative Teaching Session #2, Shawn)

Based on Li’s conversation with her partner, it is evident that the two students were completing the assigned task, demonstrating their understanding of the language and content objective. If given more time, it is obvious that Li and her partner would have taken turns, and Li would have answered the questions. Engaging in planning and teaching acts that opened up possibilities for participation (e.g., the turn and talk) increased opportunities for ESL students’ participation. In commenting on students’ participation, Shawn observed the following:

Shawn: I think we changed [the lesson] in a way that required more participation than I initially had planned, and I think it was a worthwhile change.

Amanda: From the first lesson to the second? Or from your original intention?

Shawn: Correct. Right.

Amanda: And you're talking the changes that we made, we included where they talked to their partner?

Shawn: Right. Right.

Amanda: How did you envision the lesson originally?

Shawn: Previously, I would have probably given them a notes page but not at the time we did. I would have given them close to the end of class and had the blanks filled out already. So, having them filling them out is a good improvement that you came up with. And then, the quiz each other thing, I have done that before, but I didn't have it included for this lesson, so I think the addition of those two things probably bumped it from a B level lesson to an A.

Amanda: Anything else you wanna say about the students or anything about the lesson?
Shawn: All four of them really did well. The engagement level was fantastic. All four completed the tasks they were asked with complete integrity and the exit slips, they’re quiet they're working on their own paper doing exactly what they should be. I really think it was fantastic for all of them. I think it was a winning day. (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Shawn)

This conversation illustrates how our planning and teaching acts (e.g., fill in the blank notes and turn and talk) increased opportunities for ESL students’ participation during the second collaborative teaching session. Based on Shawn’s perceptions, “it was a winning day,” which signifies his overall satisfaction with the ESL students’ participation. Thus, engaging in specific collaborative planning and teaching acts can either constrain or enhance ESL students’ participation.

**Chapter Four Summary**

This chapter discussed the study’s findings related to how collaboration influenced the content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students. In answering the first research question, collaboration influenced content teacher’s learning because it created space for content teachers to negotiate lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role. In doing so, they learned how to create lesson activities based on the content and language objectives, share teaching roles in the collaborative teaching sessions, incorporate language strategies into lessons, assess the ESL students’ work, and reimagine the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream content classroom. The second question attended to how collaboration influenced the ESL students’ participation during the collaborative teaching sessions. Collaboration influenced the ESL students’ participation because it generated opportunities for the ESL teacher’s increased role in mainstream content classrooms, afforded
content teachers the space to reflect (differently) about ESL students, and showed how teachers’ planning and teaching acts enhanced (or constrained) ESL students’ participation.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

This study examined the influences of collaboration on content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students and ESL students’ participation. Previous literature recommends additional studies on ESL and content teachers’ collaboration because it is an underexplored and undertheorized area of study (Peercy, 2018; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). A more nuanced understanding of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration ultimately paves the way to providing ESL students with equitable learning opportunities because it combines teachers’ expertise and strengthens collegial partnerships (Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2012; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Further, a refined understanding of teachers’ interactions in collaboration contributes to a more informed understanding about teachers’ perceived learning opportunities and students’ participatory learning outcomes (Peercy, 2018). Therefore, this study found that collaboration influenced content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students because collaboration created a space for teachers to learn by negotiating lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role. This study also found that collaboration influenced the ESL students’ participation by emphasizing the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream content classroom and illuminating how content teachers’ student positionings, planning, and teaching acts enhanced or limited opportunities for ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms.

Given the above-mentioned findings, this study built on previous studies on ESL and content teachers’ collaboration and ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms. This investigation also used positioning theory and a sociocultural learning
perspective to explore secondary ESL and content teachers’ collaboration. As such, this study’s findings contribute to the existing literature that attends to (a) teachers’ learning opportunities to plan for and teach ESL students in collaboration, (b) the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream content classrooms, and (c) ESL students’ participation in secondary mainstream classrooms.

This chapter will begin with a discussion of how this study’s findings relate to previous studies on ESL and content teachers’ collaboration and ESL students’ classroom participation. After this discussion, this chapter will explain how this study’s findings contribute to the field of second language teaching and learning and conclude with practical implications about how to initiate and sustain collaborative partnerships in secondary mainstream classrooms.

Empirical Contributions

This section discusses how this study’s findings relate to previous studies; thus, this discussion will focus its explanation around the following three themes: (a) teachers’ learning to plan for and ESL students in collaboration; (b) the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream classroom based on the ESL and content teachers’ perceptions; and (c) the ESL students’ participatory outcomes in the collaborative teaching sessions.

Teachers’ Learning in Collaboration

This study found that collaboration created a space for teacher learning where teachers learned to plan for and teach ESL students as they negotiated lesson plan designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role. Thus, this study corresponds with previous studies that argue that ESL and content teachers learn in and through collaboration (Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2012; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018; Giles & Yazan, forthcoming 2019; Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). Negotiating multiple meanings mediated content teachers’ learning opportunities to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms. By grappling with these meanings,
content teachers developed a more informed understanding about collaborative planning and teaching with an ESL teacher. More directly, they learned how design lessons with both content and language objectives, share teaching roles, include language strategies into lessons, assess ESL students, and reimagine the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream classroom.

For example, in Emily’s case, Emily negotiated the use of her previously created lesson design template. In doing so, she “used and created tools to make sense of [our] communication and to negotiate what to teach and how” (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014, p. 5). That is, the previous created lesson planning template was a tool that mediated Emily’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). As she shared planning responsibilities with me, she “externalised and often re-conceptualised [her] understanding” about how to plan for and teach ESL students in the language arts classroom (Martin-Beltran & Peercy, 2014, p. 7). More specifically, she learned how to create a new lesson template that would incorporate language strategies (e.g., scaffolding and sentence frames) into the lesson. Her willingness to change the assignment completely to include language strategies and create a different lesson plan design led to her renewed understandings about how to plan for and teach ESL students in the language arts classroom. Her words, “I wish that I had been scaffolding their paragraphs all along,” illustrate the impact of Emily’s perceived learning (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Emily). During the second collaborative cycle, Emily sought ways to give more performance-based instructional activities (e.g., skit performance) and add language objectives to the co-constructed “shared rubric” (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014, p. 9). Emily’s learning impacted the way she wanted to view future lessons, specifically in making lessons more “manageable” in ways “that still [show ESL students’] growth” (Interview #3, Emily). Emily learned to challenge her existing lesson design approach to make the lesson more
accessible to ESL students. Thus, Emily’s lesson design negotiation was crucial in how she thought about, planned for, and taught ESL students.

While Shawn’s negotiation was not as smooth as Emily’s experience, he also developed a more refined understanding about planning for and teaching ESL students in the science classroom. His tendencies to act in ways that positioned him as a traditional teacher made creating the lesson and engaging in collaborative planning and teaching more difficult. This finding is consistent with Martin-Beltrán & Peercy’s (2014) finding “that collaborative teaching was [not] without its challenges even despite learning opportunities experienced in collaboration” (p. 11). Shawn’s positioning as a traditional teacher led him to overlook my suggestions about alternative teaching methods that could have led to Shawn’s increased learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the science classroom. Nonetheless, Shawn’s belief that we shared similar student-centered goals (Peercy, Ditter, & Destefano, 2016) created opportunities for Shawn to share the instructional space with me as a co-teacher. This negotiation generated opportunities for Shawn to “connect [his] teacher knowledge and expertise to the lesson content, while negotiating roles” in collaboration (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016, p. 12). In verbalizing the content objectives, Shawn made known what he wanted to teach during the lesson, which allowed me space to offer my assistance in creating parts of the lesson. In turn, Shawn gained an increased awareness of language strategies, which contributed to his learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the science classroom.

Overall, the study’s findings speak to the potential for content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in collaboration. In negotiating lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role, content teachers learned to share the planning and instructional space with an ESL teacher. In doing so, they developed a deeper understanding of how to design lessons, teach, and assess ESL students in the
collaborative mainstream classroom. Likewise, each content teacher’s negotiation was unique and based on the content teacher’s personalities and previous experiences. Their learning was also gradual and processual (Johnson & Golombek, 2016). This meant that planning and teaching two lessons were crucial to their learning because the first lesson was experimental as the content teachers had never planned or taught with an ESL teacher prior to engaging in collaboration with me. Therefore, this study attests to the need for ongoing collaborative interactions with an ESL teacher in order to continually refine their understandings (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018; Peercy, 2018).

**The ESL Teacher’s Role**

My role as the ESL teacher was crucial to initiating and sustaining collaboration with content teachers and influencing ESL students’ participation. The content teachers cited infrequent and informal interactions (Bell & Baecher, 2012) with previous ESL teachers, admitting that they had never engaged in collaborative planning or teaching with an ESL teacher. While Shawn vaguely remembered a collaborative teaching partnership with an ESL teacher, he was certain that the former ESL teacher never took a lead teaching role. Emily, Kassie, and Carol did not have previous experience co-teaching with an ESL teacher. Thus, collaborating with me was a new and satisfactory experience. When asked to elaborate on the collaborative teaching experience, each content teacher credited my content and language knowledge as an asset which made collaboration worthwhile and enjoyable. This view of the ESL teacher challenges earlier research that reported the ESL teacher’s relegated role in collaborative interactions in the mainstream classroom (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2002; Flores, 2012; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Pawan & Craig, 2011). The distinguishing characteristic that contributes to the ESL teacher’s increased role in the mainstream classroom was my knowledge about how to incorporate languages strategies in order to help the ESL
students access the content standards and my willingness to take a lead role in the mainstream classroom.

For Kassie, she was a novice teacher in her third year of teaching, so her only experience in co-planning and co-teaching with an ESL teacher was with me. While she cited collaborative opportunities with the technology coach and special education teacher, she did not feel these collaborative experiences aligned with her ideal co-teaching notions. She distinguished me from other co-teachers by saying that “we're on an equal playing field” (Interview #2, Kassie). She attributed this “equal playing field” to my content knowledge and my “lead role” in planning and teaching the lesson. By offering to share in instructional planning and teaching, Kassie positioned me as an asset and a dependable person who helped her teach the content to students. This meant that I did not hesitate to create parts of the lesson even if it meant there was an unequal division of labor. This positioning was markedly different than Kassie’s previous co-teaching experiences so much so that she lauded our collaboration as “wonderful” experience (Interview #3, Kassie). The ESL teacher’s content knowledge and willingness to share planning and instructional responsibilities were crucial factors that influenced Kassie’s opinion that she and I were on “equal playing fields.” Kassie’s ESL teacher’s view is unique because she had no prior experience working with me in any other capacity besides my ESL teacher’s role. While my ESL teacher’s role was always “socioculturally-mediated” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112), it was not based on my past experiences as a content teacher in Kassie’s case; instead, for Kassie, it was based on our former experiences in collaboration. That is, collaborating with me afforded her the opportunity to inform her opinion that the ESL teacher was a valuable part of the social studies classroom because I as the ESL teacher offered to create the lesson activity.

Carol’s experience was different than Kassie’s because she had nineteen years of total teaching experience. Carol taught with me when I was a language arts teacher, so she also
viewed me as a content teacher as well as an ESL teacher. For Carol, however, she cited my mathematics content knowledge, specifically stating that I was not “afraid of math” as the distinguishing factor three different times (i.e. Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Reflective Journal #2, Interview #3). She also appreciated my instructional planning and teaching contribution during the collaborative process, believing that I did “so much more than anybody else has ever done before” (Interview #3, Carol). Carol’s view is important in light of her tendencies to rely on previous created materials that she usually found online to teach the mathematics lesson. This tendency made collaboration challenging (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014) because it was difficult for me to share in planning responsibilities to the point where Carol did not learn “anything new” during the first collaborative cycle. In response to Carol’s perceived non-learning, I resolved to not leave the upcoming collaborative planning session without sharing planning responsibilities regardless if this meant I had to create the entire lesson during the second collaborative cycle. Carol commented on my determination and motivation in sustaining collaborative efforts in the final interview:

You didn't give up on us, you know when we forgot or something else came up you did not give up on us. Some people might have, you know, but if something didn't work out, you're just very patient about it, well okay, we'll just find another time, we'll make this work. And that was good. (Interview #3, Carol)

My above-mentioned perseverance along with my content knowledge and contribution during the planning and teaching sessions served to create a favorable collaborative experience for Carol. These qualities and characteristics ultimately led to Carol’s renewed awareness about the ESL teacher’s role in the mainstream content classroom.

These findings call attention to the ESL teacher’s agency in sustaining collaborative efforts with content teachers (Duff, 2012; Kayi-Aydar, 2015; Priestley, Edwards, Priestley, &
Miller, 2012). Duff’s (2012) definition of agency refers to actions that a teacher might do, which were all crucial in leading to an increased ESL teacher’s role at Starcreek. As the above example exemplifies, I resolved to create parts of the lesson as contributions to the collaborative planning sessions during the second cycle. However, agency can refer to choosing to not act in particular ways. For example, in collaborating with Shawn, he objected to my suggestion to allow the students to become experts and teach parts of the lesson to their peers during the second co-teaching session. I could have criticized his traditional teaching style or insisted that we implement my suggestion, which might have created more opportunities for ESL students’ participation if actually implemented. Instead, I chose to agree with Shawn’s suggestion even when it contradicted my own teaching notions. I weighed my options and decided that not insisting on my suggestions would ultimately work to sustain my collaborative efforts with Shawn even if it did not bring out increased ESL students’ outcomes. In this way, sustaining collaboration was my priority, because if we did not sustain our collaborative efforts, then collaboration would not have had a chance to impact Shawn’s learning nor the ESL students’ classroom participation.

Even though Shawn’s example is an obvious example of a decision to not take action, Emily’s example illustrates a subtler example. As a language arts teacher with experience teaching language arts at Starcreek, I was confident that I could create a lesson based on content and language standards without Emily’s help. However, creating the entire lesson without Emily’s help did not align with my collaborative teaching notions. It also more than likely would not have created a favorable collaborative experience with Emily. Thus, in all collaborative planning sessions, I deferred to Emily as the ultimate content authority by asking, “Is this okay with you?” (Collaborative Planning Session #1, Emily). This question was crucial in sharing the instructional planning space because it included Emily’s input. Asking and including Emily’s
opinions were subtle ways that I deferred to Emily’s content teacher’s authority even when I shared equal claim. My deference contributed to a co-planning and co-teaching space where both teachers offered expertise (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016), which led to a satisfactory collaborative experience.

In consideration of all four teachers, my agency was supported by my previous experiences as a content teachers and professional relationships (Duff, 2012; Kayi-Aydar, 2015; Priestley et al., 2012). Initiating collaboration when it was not the teaching norm was made possible by my previous experiences in this sociocultural context. Situated deeply into this context at Starcreek, I had acquired the social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977) needed to initiate and sustain these collaborative partnerships. These findings, then, speak to the ESL teacher’s agency with the reminder that all actions are always “socio-culturally mediated,” backed by my professional relationships and previous experiences at Starcreek (Ahearn, 2001, p.112).

Just as the findings strengthened the ESL teacher’s role, the findings also showed that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration can build and strengthen collaborative partnerships. This increased professional relationship is consistent with previous studies on collaboration (Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2012; McClure, 2012; Peercy, DeStefano, Yazan, & Martin-Beltrán, 2016; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). Focusing on student-centered outcomes helped create and sustain enjoyable teaching partnerships (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Emily stated that she and I did not encounter challenges in collaboration because she believed we shared similar teaching philosophies (i.e. related to student-centered goals and outcomes) and trusted each other. When I suggested that Emily and I needed to change the lesson activity, I risked alienating Emily’s content contribution and our collaborative efforts. However, Emily welcomed my suggestions, saying:
I didn't question when you wanted to change something, and I was like yeah, that's for the better of the students, so let's go with it. I think you trusted me too to know that we're doing the right thing. (Interview #3, Emily).

In working together, Emily and I trusted each other to make decisions based on student-centered goals. Thus, an outgrowth of our collaborative relationship was “high levels of trust between colleagues, the ability to participate meaningfully in collaborative dialogue with a specific outcome in mind, and deep examination of classroom practice” (Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2012, p. 51). When teachers trust each other, they want to listen and implement each other’s ideas (Peercy, Martin-Beltrán, Yazan, & DeStefano, 2017). In doing so, collaboration built and strengthened our teaching partnership.

**ESL Students’ Classroom Participation**

ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation. More specifically, this study found that collaboration opened up space for the ESL teacher’s increased role and shed light on the fact that teachers’ positioning acts created (or constrained) opportunities for ESL students’ participation. These findings corroborate earlier literature that emphasize the teacher’s impact on ESL students’ participation (Duff, 2001; Harklau, 2000; Kayi-Aydar, 2014; Martin-Beltrán, 2010, Yoon, 2008).

For example, opening up space for the ESL teacher in the mainstream content classroom created opportunities for the ESL teacher to focus more intently on the ESL students, which increased ESL students’ participatory actions. Juan completed all parts of the collaborative group handout including the paragraph during the first collaborative cycle and decided on the couple for his group during the second cycle. This classroom participation was markedly different from Juan’s typical classroom actions based on Emily’s perceptions. She attributed Juan’s increased classroom participation to the ESL teacher’s increased role in the language arts classroom.
because she admitted that Juan did not usually complete tasks “when the ESL teacher is not present” (Reflective Journal #2, Emily). The ESL teacher provided another teacher whom Juan could ask questions and ensure that he continued to stay on the assigned task. In this way, co-teaching allowed for Emily and me to [take care] of [all] the students in the classroom (Gladman, 2015, p. 141). Juan also did not respond with “I don’t know” during the co-teaching sessions (Interview #1, Emily). Had the ESL teacher not been present in the room, Juan might continue to express stated confusion (e.g., “I don’t know”). With two teachers, he had opportunities to ask Emily and me questions, which provided another teacher who could answer Juan’s questions and clear up any confusion with the content.

There is also evidence to support that content teachers’ ESL students’ positioning parallel ESL students’ participation in the mainstream classroom (Yoon, 2008). Carol’s example is the most noteworthy example of how content teachers’ positionings shape ESL students’ classroom practice. Carol held strong notions about how good students performed in the mathematics classroom. According to Carol, good students sat in the front of the classroom. Her view was especially interesting since she did not assign students a particular seat. During both co-teaching sessions, Juan, Leo, and Marisa sat close together in the back of the classroom. Contrasting the three ESL students’ seating choice with Li’s, she praised Li for choosing a seat in the front row. She commented, “She's more of a self-advocate. “She knows what to do to help herself” (Collaborative Viewing Session #2, Carol). Carol positioned Li as a good student, and in using Li as a comparison, she critiqued Juan, Leo, and Marisa for their seating choices. The ESL students’ positioning shaped the students’ classroom participation. Li completed all tasks and asked questions, satisfying Carol’s notion of a good student. Even when Juan, Leo, and Marisa completed all tasks, they did not participate in a way that was pleasing to Carol, or at least
compared to Li. Therefore, Carol’s ESL students’ positioning shaped the ESL students’ participation.

Moreover, these findings also are consistent with earlier studies that report teacher collaboration affects students’ participation (Gladman, 2015; Giles & Yazan, forthcoming; Spezzini & Becker, 2012). More specifically, collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation by drawing attention to how teachers’ collaborative actions either enhanced or constrained collaboration. Shawn’s positioning as a traditional teacher who preferred lecture over collaborative groups limited opportunities for ESL students’ participation, especially during the first co-teaching session. Marisa, a typically shy and quiet student, did answer correctly a question about covalent bonds when Shawn called on her specifically. Strictly calling on students to answer questions during a lecture does not elicit as much participation as designing an activity where students work in collaborative groups. Hence, Shawn and my collaborative teaching acts did not create ample opportunities for ESL students to participate in the science classroom during the first collaborative cycle; that is, we constrained ESL students’ participation.

However, during the second co-teaching session, Shawn and I strategically planned an activity where students worked with their partners to quiz each other about the parts of the two types of waves. During this activity, Marisa and her partner discussed the parts of the wave (i.e. content information) without being directly called on to answer. Giving students opportunities to discuss content on their own accord, albeit guided, elicits more authentic classroom participation. In this way, our planning and teaching acts opened up an opportunity for Marisa to ask and clarify the information learned with a partner, thereby increasing Marisa’s classroom participation in the science classroom.

**Theoretical Contributions**
Given the above-mentioned empirical contributions, this study also makes theoretical contributions. More specifically, the findings attest to (a) sociocultural notions of teacher learning, (b) more professional development opportunities situated in everyday teaching routines where teachers are the experts, and (c) positioning theory as a lens to understand ESL and content teachers’ collaborative acts and ESL students’ participation in the mainstream classroom.

**Sociocultural Learning Notions**

The study’s findings build on existing studies that align with sociocultural learning notions (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2016). The four content teachers’ learning was a mediational process through which they continually negotiated and re-negotiated meanings in collaboration. In negotiating these various meanings, teachers underscored the notion that learning is a “complex, developmental process that is the result of participation in the social practices and contexts associated with learning and teaching” (Johnson, 2009, p. 10). Teacher interactions is a critical component of teachers’ learning processes, because it is within these interactions, that teachers develop new understandings about their teaching practices. In engaging in collaboration with an ESL teacher, all four content teachers began to rethink their teacher identities, their views about ESL students, and the actual teaching activity (Johnson & Golombek, 2016). They negotiated meanings and “co-construct[ed] knowledge” (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014, p. 1; see also Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016), which included grappling with knowing how to collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream classrooms.

The findings speak to the potential for collaboration to be “mediational space” (Martin-Beltrán & Peercy, 2014, p. 5) where teachers learn from each other (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016), which rejects traditional cognitive learning perspectives. Instead of focusing on the teacher’s mental processes, “one must look at the social activities that the individual engages to
see how they reappear as mental activities in the individual” (Johnson, 2006, p. 237). It is within these interactions and social activities that teachers make visible their learning processes and gain increased awareness about planning for and teaching ESL students in the mainstream classroom; this complex learning process ultimately transforms the teaching activity and leads to teachers’ learning. The complex learning processes of teachers in and through participation in “job-embedded” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 17) communities foreground sociocultural learning notions and prevent the tendency to assume that learning occurs immediately or instantaneously. All four content teachers developed a greater awareness of learning how to plan for and teach ESL students; yet, their learning is not complete. With continued collaborative interactions with the ESL teacher, one expects that they will continue to negotiate meanings, and in doing so, continue to develop more refined understandings about working with the ESL teacher and students in collaboration in the mainstream classrooms.

**More Situated Professional Development Opportunities**

This study’s findings support earlier studies that call for professional development opportunities where teachers are situated in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; see also Bocala, 2015, Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, and Smith, 2017). This view of teacher professional development challenges traditional approaches where an expert, usually an outside professional, lectures teachers on how to improve their pedagogical practices (Lieberman & Miller, 2014; Smith, 2017). Instead, professional development situated around teachers’ “everyday routines” (Bocala, 2015, p. 349) in job-embedded contexts promotes content-specific material, teachers’ active learning, modeling, support, reflection, and commitment (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). In addition, situated professional development encourages teachers’ choice (Smith, 2017), expertise (DuFour, 2004), and voluntary participation (Ahmed Hersi, Horan & Lewis, 2016).
The four teachers voluntarily engaged in ESL and content teachers’ collaboration to plan for and teach ESL students in the content classroom. By participating, they engaged in learning opportunities that focused on content-specific material where the teachers were experts. This professional development also cultivated teachers’ collaboration and reflection about their pedagogical practices in mainstream content classrooms. In this way, ESL and content teachers’ collaboration created a space for teachers’ situated professional development that “construct[ed] opportunities for teachers to analyze, try out, and reflect on the new strategies” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 7). More specifically, ESL and content teachers planned and taught lessons based on the content standards where they were the experts in their subject areas. In planning and teaching lessons together, they experimented with co-created lessons and reflected on their implementation to work to promote ESL students’ equitable learning opportunities in mainstream content classrooms.

**Positioning Theory as a Lens for ESL and Content Teachers’ Collaboration**

Positioning theory afforded the opportunity to explore how content teachers position themselves and others in collaboration (Davies & Harré, 1990). Understanding content teachers’ reflective and interactive positioning acts created a storyline of collaboration (Harré & Moghaddam, 2003). By analyzing this storyline, we ascertain a more nuanced understanding of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration. The collaborative storylines of the four teachers were dynamic, multiple, and indicative of the teachers’ positionings and repeated acts in collaboration. The storylines are crucial to examine in light of how ESL teacher’s relegated role in the mainstream classroom, or at least less important status when compared to the content teacher, which can make collaboration more difficult (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2002; Flores, 2012; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Pawan & Craig, 2012). Moreover, building on these earlier studies on ESL and content teachers’ collaboration, this
study used positioning theory to shed light on how teachers’ positioning acts either created or limited learning opportunities in collaboration (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003). In this way, the four content teachers positioned themselves, the ESL teacher, and their students in dynamic and multiple ways that revealed the extent to which they engaged in learning opportunities to plan for and teach ESL students.

For example, Kassie’s reflexive position as a novice teacher led her to rely completely on me in planning for and teaching ESL students in the mainstream classroom. She likewise positioned herself as a content teacher who lacked training and experience in working with ESL students. She simultaneously positioned me as her collaborative teaching partner with equal status in the social studies classroom who knew how to help ESL students access the content standards. I accepted Kassie’s interactive positioning and created the activity to scaffold the reading passages and give each student a specific role in the lesson activity. Our actions created increased opportunities for Kassie’s learning to plan for and teach ESL students because she learned how to make the reading passage comprehensible to ESL students in the social studies classroom. Kassie’s positions and acts were repeated during the second collaborative cycle, which created a storyline that showed that Kassie shared the instructional space with an ESL teacher in order to plan for and teach ESL students in the social studies classroom.

In another example, Carol’s multiple and dynamic positions created a storyline that made collaboration more difficult because she was not as willing to change or use a different lesson activity at least during the first collaborative cycle. Carol’s positioning as an experienced mathematics teacher led her to look for ready-made online activities, which were not designed with ESL students in mind. While she interactively positioned me as a content teacher who knew mathematics and how to accommodate lessons for ESL students, she did not easily relinquish her own self position and actions to look for online materials. These positions and acts created a
storyline where Carol did not learn new strategies, which constrained her learning opportunities in collaboration with an ESL teacher during the first cycle. Carol’s non-learning produced multiple yet productive effects. First, by not learning new language strategies, Carol did not share the instructional co-teaching space with me; thus, my role resembled that of a classroom assistant during the first collaborative teaching session. Second, she delegated responsibility to me for instructing ESL students. Third, it provided the catalyst I needed to continue to volunteer to create parts of the lesson in an effort to influence Carol’s renewed understandings. These renewed understanding occurred during the second collaborative cycle. In this way, Carol’s storyline provided a nuanced portrait of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration.

**ESL Students’ Participation as a Social Construct**

This study corroborates previous studies that argue that ESL students’ participation is socially constructed (Harklau, 2000) based on teachers’ student positionings and acts in collaboration (Harklau, 2000; Kayi-Aydar, 2014; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2008). This means that the four content teachers’ ESL students’ positionings shaped the ESL students’ classroom participation in the content classroom. To illustrate, the four content teachers positioned Juan as an unmotivated and unaware student. This unfavorable positioning affected how they viewed Juan’s participation in the content classroom. Even when Juan completed all tasks, he did not receive the same praise from teachers as other ESL students in the content classroom, especially when compared to Li. Whether confronted with Carol’s perceived representation of a good student or other teachers’ notions of underperformance, Juan consistently did not participate in the content classrooms like the other ESL students based on the content teachers’ perceptions. This finding speaks to how teacher and often institutional representations of students are socially shaped over time to mold a students’ educational
trajectory into seemingly static categories (e.g., unmotivated student or below average student (Harklau, 2000) or “positional identities” (Kayi-Aydar, 2014, p. 688).

There is evidence, however, to suggest that a teacher’s different perspective on ESL students’ participation can work to provide a renewed perspective on ESL students’ participation. I attempted to shed light on how Juan did participate in the content classroom despite content teachers’ student positionings, which led to renewed understandings of students’ participation. For example, Emily acknowledged how Juan completed all tasks, thereby participating more than usual than when I was not present in the language arts classroom. Carol also acknowledged that my role gave the ESL students another person in whom they could ask questions and receive help. In addition, Kassie’s renewed understanding about lesson designs for ESL students influenced her notions about ESL students’ participation. Put another way, she was impressed with the ESL students’ work samples, especially Juan’s, in the social studies classroom. When offered an alternative student perspective on Juan’s task completion, Shawn replied, “That’s why I’m glad we’re [collaborating] because I wouldn’t have known [Juan’s task completion] otherwise” (Collaborative Viewing Session #1, Shawn). In this way, a teacher’s alternative perspective can work to challenge teachers’ seemingly static student representations of ESL students’ participation.

**Practical Implications**

In light of the above-mentioned empirical and theoretical contributions, this section makes practical implications for educational stakeholders who wish to implement more collaborative instructional models between ESL and content teachers as a means for teachers’ professional development. Educational stakeholders should (a) create schedules conducive to ESL and content teachers’ collaboration, (b) encourage teachers’ voluntary participation, (c) acknowledge teachers’ collaborative efforts as professional development, and (d) urge content
and ESL teachers to cross the boundaries of their respective subject or content areas. In making these recommendations, I acknowledge that additional resources that require time and funding may need to be considered before collaborative teaching models become the teaching norm in mainstream classrooms across the U.S. Nonetheless, I argue that the time and funding constraints can be partially overcome if ESL and content teachers remain committed to increasing student-center outcomes and begin with small and realistic expectations for collaboration. That is, engaging in collaborative planning and teaching will result in additional and perhaps unforeseen challenges (Peercy, 2018); however, a willingness to navigate the challenges is crucial to sustain ESL and content teachers’ collaborative efforts if we are going to work together to promote equitable educational outcomes for ESL students.

**Schedules Conducive to ESL and Content Teachers’ Collaboration**

Educational stakeholders, namely administrators with power and resources, need to create schedules where ESL and content teachers can engage in collaboration with specific and allotted time for collaborative planning and teaching (DelliCarpini, 2018; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018; Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). As Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano (2016) state, “When teachers are not supported in maintaining a consistent routine together, they are unable to engage in truly equal coteaching in which both teachers’ skills are used to their fullest to benefit not only ELLs, but all students” (p. 18). An unequal division of labor and teaching responsibilities occur when specific schedules are not created for collaboration. This means that one teacher ends up bearing the brunt of the responsibility (e.g., the content teacher) when the collaborating teacher has additional responsibilities during the collaborative planning and teaching sessions (Giles, 2018). These unequal responsibilities can work to exacerbate teachers’ unequal roles in the mainstream classroom, which do not lead to fruitful collaborative efforts.
ESL and content teachers not only need schedules for collaborative teaching, they also need additional planning time where teachers can meet and discuss the lesson activity based on the content and language standards. This may mean that educational stakeholders need to look for alternative ways (e.g., an online conferencing tool or a shared Google folder) to engage in collaborative planning (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). A planning guide and/or lesson planning template (see Appendix E) might help teachers make productive use of planning time, which is focused on the content and language outcomes (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Yet, “being flexible with one another” (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016, p. 10) is critical because teachers’ schedules and plans inevitably change and sometimes go awry for various unexpected reasons. Therefore, creating schedules for collaborative planning and teaching time with a degree of flexibility is paramount to initiating collaborative teaching models between ESL and content teachers.

**Teachers’ Voluntary Participation**

Educational stakeholders should also encourage ESL and content teachers to participate voluntarily in collaboration (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018; Pawan & Ortloff, 2011; Hargreaves, 1994). Forced collaboration can result in doing more harm than good because teachers may not understand the worth and value of collaboration (Ahmed Hersi, Horan, & Lewis, 2016). This misunderstanding leads to teachers thinking that collaboration is just another educational trend that is fleeting (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Instead, in order for collaboration to produce teachers’ and ESL students’ learning outcomes, teachers need to recognize the need for collaboration and seek out other willing colleagues who also seek to improve their pedagogical practices for ESL students in collaboration. Thus, sustaining collaborative efforts necessitates teachers’ “non-coercive persuasion that working together is both enjoyable and productive” (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 192). This voluntary
collaborative partnership might be initiated by ESL or content teachers because they will ultimately work to sustain the collaborative partnership.

**Teachers’ Collaboration as Professional Development**

Educational stakeholders should likewise recognize collaboration as an effective means to improve their own pedagogical practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018; Smith 2017). When teachers work together for student-centered goals relevant to content-specific objectives, they engage in reflective inquiry to improve their own practice. Collaboration as professional development acknowledges teachers’ expertise in choosing and carrying out their own learning opportunities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; DuFour, 2004; Smith, 2017). Recognizing the teachers as experts additionally affords the opportunity for teachers to reclaim their voice and “contribute their understandings, beliefs, values, aspirations, practices and concerns and work to make sense of this information in ways which broaden the collective knowledge base about teaching and learning” (Smith, 2017, p. 23).

This view of professional development calls educational stakeholders to rethink traditional learning opportunities through the lecture-method (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), and instead encourages teachers to improve their pedagogy with other professionals in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Without changing views on what counts as learning opportunities in professional development, collaborative efforts cannot be realized to their fullest potential. Learning in collaboration encourages teachers to lean on each other’s support, thereby “allowing teachers to take risks, solve problems, and attend to dilemmas in their practice” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 10). In doing so, teachers resist working isolation (Bair, 2013) and build trust with colleagues (Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2012), which ultimately serve to strengthen collegial partnerships and teachers’ learning opportunities.
Crossing Content-area Boundaries

Educational stakeholders lastly should urge ESL and content teachers to cross the boundaries of their respective subject areas in order to initiate and sustain collaborative planning and teaching partnerships (Baecher, 2002; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018). Crossing these boundaries means that content teachers will have to learn more about second language acquisition and language strategies in the mainstream classroom. This will also require ESL teachers to refine their expertise about material related to mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts, even though they may not feel equipped initially to cross these lines. That is, they “need to be able to anchor their language instruction to meaningful content” (Baecher, 2002, p. 161).

Crossing content areas boundaries are important because teachers have to see their collaborating partner as a valuable addition or asset to the planning and teaching activity (Baecher, 2002). Without an attempt to establish equal knowledge contributions, teachers will not see the value in collaboration. Increased learning about content and ESL instruction works to help balance equally the division of labor in collaboration so that collaborating teachers share planning and instructional responsibilities (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016). In this way, both teachers have contributed equal expertise with familiarity of their collaborating teacher’s content area, which works to create sustainable collaborative partnerships.

In order to enable teachers to cross content boundaries, departments of education at universities should consider creating coursework in programs of study. For preservice ESL teachers, this might require classes where teacher candidates explore different content areas and develop strategies to help ESL students master the different subject areas. For preservice content teachers, this requires at least a course related specifically to planning for and teaching ESL
students in the mainstream content classroom. Collaborative partnerships between secondary departments of education might strengthen these learning opportunities for preservice teachers. For example, preservice ESL and ELA teachers might collaborate to plan and teach a lesson together for a project that helps both ESL and ELA teachers satisfy course of study requirements.

Future Directions

This study found that ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced the content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classroom. That is, teachers learn through negotiating meanings (e.g., lesson designs, teaching roles, language strategies, assessment techniques, and the ESL teacher’s role) in collaboration. Further, ESL and content teachers’ collaboration influenced ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classrooms by creating space for the ESL teacher’s increased role and shedding light on how content teachers’ positions and acts affect ESL students’ participation. Therefore, given these findings, this study contributes to the field of second language teaching and learning because it provided a nuanced understanding of ESL and content teachers’ collaboration, specifically in how content teachers learn to plan for and teach ESL students. In doing so, this study speaks to the potential for teacher learning in collaboration, which attests to sociocultural learning notions. Lastly, this study contributes to the field because it shows how teachers’ collaborative efforts impact ESL students’ participation in the mainstream content classroom.

In light of these contributions, additional studies are needed to continue to understand the ways in which ESL and content teachers collaborate to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream content classrooms. First, this study is limited to four content teachers’ learning in collaboration. In this way, a future study might investigate how additional secondary teachers across multiple content areas learn to plan for and teach ESL students in the content classroom (Peercy, 2018). An additional study might focus on one content teacher’s perspective over a
longer period of time (e.g., an academic year) with increased collaborative efforts (e.g., more than two lessons). Second, this study is limited to teachers’ perceptions of ESL students’ participation. Thus, a future study might explore ESL students’ participation from the ESL students’ perspectives (Peercy, Ditter, & DeStefano, 2016), which would emphasize and authenticate the ESL students’ voices (Gladman, 2015). Third, this study focuses on the content teachers’ learning to plan for and teach ESL students in the mainstream classroom. As such, a future study might scrutinize ESL and content teachers’ collaboration from the ESL teacher’s perspective, particularly considering the ESL teacher’s relegated role in the mainstream content classrooms.
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APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The Design and Implementation of Collaborative Lesson Plans for ESL Students

You are invited to participate in a research study that examines the perceptions and challenges of creating and implementing lesson plans using qualitative research methods. You were selected as a possible participant because you are currently a content area teacher employed at a middle school in a suburban area in the southeastern part of the United States and are working with ESL students. As indicated in the recruitment materials, this study utilizes three semi-structured interviews to explore your perceptions and challenges of working with ESL students and reflective journals to document your thoughts on the co-teaching experiences throughout this study. This study additionally utilizes at least four videotaped collaborative sessions in which you work with the ESL teacher to design lessons for ESL students based on the content and English proficiency standards.

I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. This study is conducted by me, Amanda Giles, a doctoral student at the University of Alabama. My supervising faculty advisors are Dr. Miguel Mantero and Dr. Bedrettin Yazan, professors of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Alabama.

What is this study about? What is the investigator trying to learn?
The purpose of my proposed study is to understand the perceptions and challenges of content area teachers as they work with the English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher to design lesson plans that respond to the needs of students with linguistic and cultural needs based on content and English proficiency standards.

Why is this study important or useful?
This study will show how these experiences influence the teacher’s ability to co-construct and implement lesson plans for ESL students and offer instructional tools and strategies to teachers working with ESL students.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?
You have been asked to be a participant in this study because you are a content area (mathematics, science, social studies, and/or language arts) teacher at a middle school in a suburban area in the southeastern part of the United States. I am the ESL teacher and researcher in this study, so I will be a researcher-participant in this study. Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and participation will result in minimal risk to you. You may terminate your participation in this study at any point during this study, and leaving this study will not affect our professional relationship in any way.

How many people will be in this study?
About 36 practicing content area teachers will be participants in this study as well as the ESL teacher(s) will participate in this study.

What will I be asked to do in this study?
If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things:
You will be asked to take part in at least three audio recorded interviews and at least four video recorded collaborative planning sessions in which we design lesson plans to meet the needs of diverse students. I will also ask that we co-teach the lessons together and reflect on this collaborative effort in reflective journals in order to document our thoughts, perceptions, and challenges throughout this process.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and there will be no penalty if you refuse to answer questions or withdraw from the study. It is not a school and/or district requirement. Your decision to participate will have no impact on the researcher’s treatment of you throughout the study. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized in any way or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify.

**How much time will I spend being this study?**
Each one of the interviews will probably take about 30-45 minutes, so you will be spending 90 to 135 minutes during the interviews. Each one of the collaborative planning sessions will probably take about 45 minutes to 60 minutes, so you will be spending 180 minutes to 240 minutes during the collaborative planning sessions. Each one of the reflective journals will take about 15 minutes to 30 minutes, so you will be spending 30 minutes to 60 minutes completing the reflective journals. Each one of the co-teaching classroom sessions will take 55 minutes, so you will be spending 110 minutes during these co-teaching classroom sessions. Your total participation (interviews, collaborative planning sessions, reflective journals, and co-teaching sessions) in this study will take 410 minutes to 545 minutes.

**Will being in this study cost me anything?**
The only cost to you from this study is your time.

**Will I be compensated for being in this study?**
Participants will not be compensated for their participation in this study.

**What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?**
It is possible that you may experience very low levels of anxiety during the interviews, collaborative planning sessions, and co-teaching classroom experiences, although the investigator will make sure to make the experience as enjoyable and relaxing as possible. You are encouraged to ask the researcher questions throughout the duration of the study, and you may refuse to answer any of the questions and withdraw from the study at any time without affecting our professional relationship in any way.

The researcher will not reveal any kind of participation information which she learns through your involvement in individual interviews, planning sessions, and co-teaching experiences. The researcher will be using pseudonyms to keep your identity confidential while sharing the excerpts from the data. Apart from a pseudonym to replace your name, when sharing the findings, the researcher will use pseudonyms to replace the names of the institutions where you received teacher education or taught, while disseminating the results emerging from the data collected. In any case, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer in the investigator’s computer.

**What are the benefits (good things) that may happen if I am in this study?**
There are no benefits for participating in this study.
What are the benefits to science or society?
The investigator hopes to contribute to the ongoing research on collaboration between the content area and ESL teachers. Additionally, the researcher hopes to contribute lesson plans and/or models for ESL students based on content and English proficiency standards.

How will my privacy be protected?
The investigator will make sure that the meeting for the interviews, collaborative planning sessions, and co-teaching experiences will be at a date, time and place, which is convenient for you and your privacy. Participants may complete the reflective journal at a date, time and place, which is most convenient for you and your privacy.

How will my confidentiality be protected?
The researcher will not reveal any kind of participation information which she learns through your involvement in individual interviews, collaborative planning sessions co-teaching classroom experiences, and reflective journals. The researcher will be using a pseudonym to keep your identity confidential while sharing the excerpts from the data. Apart from using a pseudonym for you, when sharing the findings, the investigator will use pseudonyms to replace the names of the institutions where you received teacher education or taught, while disseminating the results emerging from the data collected from you. The researcher is the only person who will view the video recorded data, so no other person will view the video. Transcribed excerpts from the video will be utilized when sharing from the data, but the researcher will keep your identity confidential by using pseudonyms as to not disclose your identity or location. Data will be recorded and transcribed by using code numbers and a separate list matching names and numbers will be kept on the password protected computer until data collection is complete, then the matching list will be destroyed. In any case, all data will be stored on the investigator’s password-protected computer. All data will be destroyed ten years after the completion of the study: all paperwork about the research will be shredded. Manuscripts submitted for publication will not include any information about you by name or location.

What are the alternatives to being in this study? Do I have other choices?
The alternative to being in this study is not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?
Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify. Additionally, your participation or lack of participation will not affect our professional relationship in any way.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (IRB) is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The IRB may review study records from time to time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?
If you have any questions about the study, please ask them now. If you have questions about the study later, please reach the principal researcher, Amanda Giles, at 205-529-8509 or amanda.k.giles@gmail.com.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a person in a research study, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of The University of Alabama, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at [http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html](http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html) or email the Research Compliance office at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

**Optional Study Elements**

During the three interview sessions, I may audio record our conversation for data recording and analysis purposes. I will not record your interview if you indicate your preference not to be recorded. During the collaborative planning sessions, I will video record our work and conversation for data collection and analysis purposes. I will be the only one who views the videotaped collaborative sessions, so no other person will be viewing the video. I will not record your collaborative planning sessions if you indicate your preference to not be recorded. Additionally, I may collect, read, and analyze your reflective journals for data analysis.

Initial one of the following to indicate your choice:

_____ (initial) I agree to be audio recorded during the three interview sessions, and I will also write reflective journals in which I critically reflect on the collaborative co-teaching experiences.

_____ (initial) I do not agree to be audio recorded during the three interview sessions nor do I wish to write a reflective journal reflecting on our co-teaching experiences.

_____ (initial) I agree to be video recorded during the four collaborative planning sessions.

_____ (initial) I do not agree to be video recorded during the four collaborative planning sessions.
I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I agree to take part in this study. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

__________________________________________  __________
Signature of Research Participant              Date

__________________________________________  __________
Signature of Investigator                      Date
Dear Parent and/or Guardian:

Your son or daughter is invited to participate in a research study to show how teachers work together to meet the needs of English language learners in a middle school in order to more effectively teach these students. This study will also help teachers and researchers understand how teaching influences student outcomes. This will help us learn to make good teaching choices for English language learners in the future.

This study is being conducted by Amanda Giles, under the direction of Dr. Miguel Mantero and Dr. Bedrettin Yazan, professors in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Alabama. Your son or daughter is invited to participate because your child indicates an additional language on a home language survey, and tests show that your child needs additional assistance learning English. Since he/she is also under 18 years of age, we must have your permission to include him/her in the study. I am asking about 35 other middle school students who are English language learners at this school to be in this study.

What will be involved if your son/daughter participates? If you decide to allow your child to participate in this research study, he/she will participate in video-recorded classroom teaching sessions in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. There is no time commitment outside of the regular school day, and your student will not be required to complete any work and tasks beyond the regular classroom requirements. Your child will also be asked to turn in samples of student work. This work will not extend beyond the regular classroom requirements.

Are there any risks or discomforts? There are no foreseeable risks to your child for participating in this study. To help minimize the discomfort of video-recording, we are recording classroom sessions during the school day during your child’s regular scheduled classroom times. We will also tell all students to not talk about the classroom teaching sessions, but we cannot promise this. You child should not say or do anything during the classroom teaching sessions that he/she does not want recorded.

Are there any benefits to your son/daughter or others? There are no direct benefits specific to your child. We hope that this collaboration will help your child learn, and this study will help improve instruction in the future.

Will there be compensation for participation? There is no compensation for participation in this study.

Are there any costs? There is no cost to participating in this study.

Participation is not required. Your child’s participation is completely voluntary, and his/her participation will not affect our relationship in any way. If you or your son or daughter change your mind about his/her participation, your child can be withdrawn from the study at any time.
Your son’s/daughter’s privacy will be protected. Any information obtained through the video-recorded teaching sessions or student work samples will remain anonymous and confidential. The data collected will be saved on the principal investigator’s password protected computer. Information obtained through your child’s participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have any questions about this study, please ask me now. If you have questions later, you can call Amanda Giles at the University of Alabama at 205-439-2133 or amanda.k.giles@gmail.com. If you have questions or concerns about your rights in a research study, please contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Amanda Giles
Principal Researcher

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT YOU WISH YOUR SON OR DAUGHTER TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.

YOU MUST INITIAL THAT YOUR CHILD CAN PARTICIPATE IN THE VIDEO-RECORDED TEACHING SESSIONS AND THAT WE CAN COLLECT STUDENT WORK SAMPLES. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES YOUR WILLINGNESS TO ALLOW HIM/HER TO PARTICIPATE.

YOUR SON’S/DAUGHTER’S SIGNATURE INDICATES HIS/HER WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE.

________ (initial) My child can participate in video-recorded classroom teaching sessions in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

________ (initial) My child can turn in student work samples that can be used to supply evidence of classroom teaching practices.

______________________________________________________________________

________ (initial) My child cannot participate in video-recorded classroom teaching sessions in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

________ (initial) My child cannot turn in student work samples that can be used to supply evidence of classroom teaching practices.

_______________________________  ________________________
Parent/Guardian’s Signature         Date
Student Script

Dear Student:

I am a graduate student at the University of Alabama. I am doing a study of how teachers work together to meet the needs of English language learners in a middle school in order to more effectively teach these students. This study will also help teachers and researchers understand how teaching influences student outcomes. This will help us learn to make good teaching choices for English language learners in the future.

You are asked to participate in this study because you are a student who indicates an additional language on a home language survey, and tests show that you need additional assistance learning English in your classes. Your parents know that I am asking you to be in this study, and it is okay with them. I am asking about 35 other middle school students who are English language learners at this school to be in this study.

This study requires that I video-record and/or take photographs of lessons being taught with your classroom teacher in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. My main focus is to improve instruction and not directly on you as the student.

The study also requires that I turn in work samples of your work in order to show how you are responding to our classroom teaching practices. I will protect your identity, so no students’ first or last names will be used on the documents that I turn in. I will destroy all video recordings and photographs as soon as the typed record is made. If you do not want to be video-recorded, you should not be in this study. If you do not want me to use student work samples, you should not be in this study.

If you agree to participate in the study, you will participate in video-recorded classroom teaching sessions in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. You also agree that I can use your student work samples as part of your participation in the study.

I will not tell anyone outside the study what you said by using your real name during the video-recorded classroom session or show your real name on the student work samples. I will write a report on the study that talks about student outcomes but will not give your real name, so no one will recognize you. I will ask students in your class to not talk about what was said in class outside of the classroom, but I cannot promise this. You can control this by not saying or doing anything during class that you would not want to have repeated.
You are a student volunteer. You are helping me, but you do not have to unless you want to help. This is your free choice. If you start the study and decide that you do not want to continue, just let me know. No one will be mad you, and this will not affect our relationship in any way.

I do not think there are any risks or harm to you in this study. You may find the study helpful because your classroom teachers and I are working together to help you learn. It may also make you feel good to know you are helping me help other students in the future.

If you have any questions about this study, please ask me now. If you have questions later, you can call Amanda Giles at the University of Alabama at 205-529-8509 or amanda.k.giles@gmail.com. You can also ask your parents questions if you wish. If you have questions or concerns about your rights in a research study, please contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461.

If you agree to be in this study, please sign your name on this letter below. You can have a copy of the letter to keep.

Thank you very much for your interest.

Sincerely,

Amanda Giles
Principal Researcher

__________________________________________________
Name of Participant Date

___________________________________________________
Person Obtaining Consent Date
APPENDIX D: PROTOCOLS

Interview #1

1. Describe any experiences learning about ESL students through formal education (i.e. college classes) and/or any professional development experience.

2. Describe the ideal role of a content area teacher as he/she helps the ESL student attain English proficiency and master the content area standards.

3. Do you feel like you are equipped to serve ESL students in your classes? What challenges do you encounter? How do you deal with them? Who do you ask for help?

4. Explain your experiences working with ESL students in your content area classes. What are the benefits and challenges in working with ESL students?

5. What is the ideal education for ESL students so that they do not fall behind in content area classes and attain English proficiency?

6. What are your thoughts on including the ESL student in mainstream content area classes from the first day of arrival?

7. Tell me about your experiences with collaborating with the ESL teacher throughout your professional career.

8. What should be the ideal role and responsibility of the ESL teacher?

9. Describe the ESL student as a student in your class.

10. Describe the ESL student’s ability to meet the content standard.

11. Describe the ESL student’s ability to meet language standards.

12. How would you describe the ESL student’s typical class participation?

13. What does the ESL student need to be successful in your classroom?

Interview #2

1. How do you plan lessons for your ESL students? What do you think about as you approach this lesson? What are the challenges in this lesson plan design?

2. How is this lesson plan approach similar and different in how you design lessons for both ESL and mainstream students?

3. Describe how you assess (formal and informal) the work of the students in your class. To what extent is this similar and/or different to how you assess the work of ESL students?
4. Explain how you design lessons to foster a multicultural perspective (i.e. using the child’s L1, prior and background knowledge, content, etc.).

5. Describe the ideal co-teaching experience. What are the benefits and challenges of co-teaching?

6. To what extent do you think the collaborative co-teaching session reflected your ideal co-teaching experience?

7. Describe the ideal role of the ESL and content area teachers in the co-teaching experience. To what extent do you think the collaborative co-teaching session reflected these ideal roles?

8. What would you change in future collaborative planning and co-teaching sessions to improve the planning and teaching of ESL students?

9. What did you learn in collaborating to plan, design, and implement a lesson for ESL students?

10. Describe the ESL student’s classroom participation.

**Interview #3**

1. To what extent has this collaborative experience affected your approach to teaching ESL students?

2. What have you learned from this collaborative experience?

3. How would you approach the design of future lesson plans for ESL students? Would it be similar or different from this experience? Explain your reasoning.

4. Explain your thoughts on co-teaching. What are the benefits and challenges of working with another teacher?

5. To what extent has this experience changed the way you will work with ESL students in the future?

6. To what extent has this experience changed the way you view your role as the content area teacher in working with ESL students?

7. To what extent has this experience changed the way you view the role of the ESL teacher?

8. Is there anything else you want me to know as someone who is interested in collaboration and working with teachers to best serve the ESL students in this building?

9. How has the ESL student’s participation changed?

10. Should I need additional information and/or clarification, would you mind if I contacted you for needed information?
Reflective Journals #1 and #2

So far, we have collaboratively planned and taught a lesson on…

Collaborative PLANNING Sessions

Describe your role as the content teacher during the planning sessions. What knowledge did you contribute?

Describe my role as the ESL teacher during the planning sessions. What knowledge did I contribute?

Describe how our created lesson met the content and language objectives.

Describe how we assessed the content and language objectives (formal/informal).

In thinking about moving into the 2nd collaborative cycle, describe the changes you would make.

Collaborative TEACHING Session

Describe the content teacher’s role(s) during the collaborative teaching session.

Describe the ESL teacher’s role(s) during the collaborative teaching session.

Describe the interactions between both teachers.

Describe the changes you would make to the collaborative teaching session.

Describe the benefits and challenges of our co-teaching experience.

Student Outcomes-Participation and Outcomes

Describe how our collaboration influenced the ESL student’s classroom participation and quality of work.
APPENDIX E: LESSON PLANNING TEMPLATE

Daily Collaborative Teaching Lesson Plan

Subject:

Co-teaching session date:

Content Standard:

Content Objectives:

Language Standard:

Language Objective:

Key Vocabulary:

Assessment:

Materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Co-teaching Model</th>
<th>Content Teacher’s Role</th>
<th>ESL Teacher’s Role</th>
<th>Comments or Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Beginning:** (e.g., warm up, review, preview of lesson) | □ One Lead-one assist  
□ Two teachers, same content  
□ One teach, one assess  
□ Preteach-teach  
□ Reteach-teach  
□ Multiple groups | | | |
| **Middle:** (e.g., student practice, check for understanding, individual work) | □ One Lead-one assist  
□ Two teachers, same content  
□ One teach, one assess  
□ Preteach-teach | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End: (e.g., exit slip, closing, assessment)</th>
<th>One Lead-one assist</th>
<th>Two teachers, same content</th>
<th>One teach, one assess</th>
<th>Preteach-teach</th>
<th>Reteach-teach</th>
<th>Multiple groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reteach-teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Found in Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018, p. 44; adapted from Murawski 2009