





A TRADITION OF INDEPENDENT THINKING

# Working with emergent plurilingual learners in numeracy instruction

Dr Craig Neville & Dr Máire Ní Ríordáin Lecturer in Education





Fundamental principles when working with emergent plurilingual students.



What is a language repertoire and how do I support it? What are funds of knowledge?



Language proficiency, CALPS and mathematical discourse



What we'll cover...

#### Pedagogical approach



Zhang-Wu, 2017: CLR

University College Cork, Ireland Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh



#### Pedagogical approach



# 'Every teacher is a languages teacher.'





# Communication is fundamental to learning.







#### What does it mean to be plurilingual?

#### Multilingual mindset



Value-added Approach

Deficit Approach

## Plurilingual mindset



#### **Funds of Knowledge**

Strategies and bodies of knowledge accumulated in homes and communities [which allow pupils] to participate with people they trust (González et al, 2005, pg 91-92)



What is a language repertoire and how do I support it?

#### Language Repertoire

A set of various linguistic identities and associated codes, which one person can use in different situations.

(Finegan, 2014, p. 547).

We must **foster** the linguistic repertoires of all our students because their competence in one language will support their competence in other languages that they acquire as well as reaffirming their (pluri)linguistic and (pluri)cultural identity. My English that I speak from Cork

The Irish that I learnt In the Gaeltacht in Northern Ireland

> The Kosovan that I learn at Saturday school with my friends from school.

The Albanian that I speak with my parents.







Basic Interpersona Communicative Skills (BICS) Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALPS)

Basic language system used in face-to-face communication Proficiency only weakly correlated with academic success Formal and academic registers, high levels of literacy, specialised vocab

Strongly correlated to academic success

Cummins, 2000



## **The Mathematics Register**



We consider mathematical language as a distinct **'register'** within a natural language e.g. English or Irish.

,,, ,, Which is described as "*a set of meanings that is appropriate to a particular function of language, together with the words and structures which express these meanings."* (Halliday 1975, p.65).



### **The Mathematics Register**

Within the mathematics register different forms of mathematical language can be found.





## **The Mathematics Register**



This reinforces the view that the content of mathematics is **not** taught without language.



The process of learning mathematics involves the **mastery** of the mathematics register.



This allows students to communicate their mathematical findings in a suitable manner but **without this fluency**, students are **restricted** in the ways that they can develop or redefine their mathematical understandings.

(Meaney, 2005)



### Major Design Principles (Erath et al., 2021)

For language learning to be a catalyst for mathematics learning, materials and instruction should:

- Engage students in rich discourse practices
- Establish various mathematics language routines
- Connect language varieties and multimodal representations
- Include students' multilingual resources
- Use macro-scaffolding to sequence and combine language and mathematics learning opportunities,
- Compare language pieces (form, function, etc.) to raise students' language awareness.



Dimensions	Mathematical Richness To what extent is the mathemat- ics discussed clear, correct, and well justi- fied (tied to conceptual underpinnings)?	Cognitive Demand To what extent do classroom interac- tions create and maintain an envi- ronment of intellectual challenge?	Equitable Access To what extent do activity structures invite and support active engagement from the diverse range of students?	Agency To what extent do students have opportunities to conjecture, ex- plain, and argue, thus to develop- ing agency and authority?	Use of Contributions To what extent is student reasoning elicited, chal- lenged, and refined?	Discursive Demand To what extent do students en- gage in rich dis- course practices? (additional di- mension)	Connecting Registers To what extent are language reg- isters and repre- sentations sys- tematically and explicitly con- nected? (addi- tional dimension)
Level 0	The content is purely rote OR disconnected or unfocused OR consequential mathematical errors or lan- guage inaccura- cies are not addressed.	Classroom activi- ties are structured so that students mostly apply familiar proce- dures or memo- rized facts.	Classroom management is problematic to the point where the lesson is dis- rupted, OR a significant num- ber of students appear disengaged and there are no overt mechanisms to support engage- ment.	The teacher initi- ates conversa- tions. Students' speech turns are short (one sen- tence or less) and shaped or con- strained by what the teacher says or does.	The teacher may note student an- swers or work, but the student reasoning is not surfaced or pur- sued. Teacher actions are lim- ited to corrective feedback or encouragement.	No explicit demands to ver- balize own ways of thinking, procedures, or solutions OR students only report their processes of calculation.	The content is primarily addressed in only one register/ representation OR Different regis- ters/representa- tions: are juxta- posed but not related to each other.
Level 1	The content is relatively clear and correct BUT connections between proce- dures/calcula- tion strategies, concepts, possi- bly contexts and the meaning- related language are either <i>limited or su-</i> <i>perficial</i>	Classroom activi- ties offer possibil- or language rich- ness or problem- solving challenge, BUT teaching interac- tions tend to "scaffold away" the challenges and mostly limit stu- dents to providing short responses to teacher prompts.	The participation of students is evenly distributed or the teacher gives support so that a variety of students can par- ticipate in activi- ties BUT the students do not necessarily carry out higher order activities related to content.	Students have a chance to talk about mathemati- cal content, their own ideas, and meaning-related interpretations BUT "the student pro- poses, the teacher disposes": class discussions and student ideas are not explored or built upon.	The teacher refers to student's thinking and student's mean- ing-related lan- guage, perhaps even to common mistakes BUT Ideas with learn- ing potential are not taken as a ba- sis or problem- atic ideas are not used as chal- lenges.	Students are explicitly asked or are used to explaining mean- ings and justify- ing concepts, their own ways of thinking, procedures, and solutions BUT formal and mean- ing-related lan- guage resources are not or incor- rectly linked with each other.	Content or tasks are translated into another represen- tation/register BUT changes are al- ways conducted in the same direction.
Level 2	The content is relatively clear and correct AND connections between proce- dures/strategies, concepts, con- texts and mean- ing-related lan- guage are addressed and explained	The teacher's hints or scaffolds encourage and support students in "productive struggle" in build- ing understanding and engaging in mathematical practices or lan- guage issues. AND Level of demand is maintained by appropriate scaf- folds or prompts.	The teacher actively supports (and to some degree achieves) broad and mean- ingful participa- tion OR What appear to be established partici- pation structures result in such participation.	Students put forth and defend their ideas and used terminology or meaning-related language. Tea- cher may ascribe ownership for students' ideas in exposition, <i>OR</i> students respond to and build on each other's ideas.	The teacher solic- its student think- ing and individ- ual use of mean- ing-related lan- guage AND subsequent instruction responds to those ideas by building on productive beginnings or emerging misun- derstanding or language errors.	Students are ex- plicitly asked or are used to ex- plaining mean- ings and justify- ing their own ways of thinking, procedures and solutions AND formal and mean- ing-related lan- guage resources are correctly re- lated.	The explicit con- nection between several regis- ters/representa- tions is stimu- lated. AND real- ized by verbaliz- ing the connec- tion. OR. Changes are con- ducted flexibly in different directions.

Prediger, S. & Neugebauer, P. (2021). Capturing teaching practices in languageresponsive mathematics classrooms Extendin g the TRU framework "teaching for robust understanding" to L-TRU. *ZDM-Mathematics Education*, **53**, 289-304, <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11</u> <u>858-020-01187-1</u>



FIG. 2 L-TRU framework: language-responsive mathematics teaching for robust understanding (Adaptations from Schoenfeld's TRU (2013) are marked in grey if they concern language and in *italics* if they were necessary to capture relevant differences in our data set more closely)

• For acquisition of mathematical discourse, the goal of numeracy educators is to provide comprehensible linguistic input to learners by integrating it with content:



- Numeracy educators should ensure that '**social interactions**' form the basis of communication in numeracy lessons. This is how language is best acquired.
- Numeracy educators should assess prior knowledge through their L1, including acknowledging alternative methodologies for notation.
- Numeracy educators must foster a **safe and secure** learning environment.





Prior to any lesson, analyse the discourse of your chosen lesson for:

Key concepts	Verbs in communicative forms	Connectors	Sequencing Words	Asking questions
Mutiplication	Multiplied byis/equals Times byis/equals 'seven twos' are	And Also But	Firstly, Then, Next, Step 1/2/3 Finally	What ismultiplie d by?





Can you explain to me in Spanish what 7 x 2 equals? Write as you say it. Sí, siete por dos son catorce.

## **Be consistent**





Seven Multiplied by Two Equals fourteen
---

So in English, we express this as seven multiplied by two equals fourteen. Can you repeat that for me?

Seven multiplied by two is fourteen.





Seven	Multiplied by	Тwo	Equals	fourteen
Seven	Multiplied by	Three	Equals	Twenty-one

Here's another. Seven multiplied by three is twentyone. Can you repeat that, too?

Seven multiplied by three is twenty-one.





Seven	Multiplied by	Тwo	Equals	fourteen
Seven	Multiplied by	Three	Equals	Twenty-one
	Multiplied by		equals	



Seven multiplied by ten equals seventy.

#### Repeat with scaffolding





Seven	Multiplied by	Тwo	Equals	fourteen
Seven	Multiplied by	Three	Equals	Twenty-one
	Multiplied by		equals	



Seven multiplied by ten equals seventy.















For problem-based questions, adopt a **Narrow Reading** approach. This ensure that the input you are providing is highly comprehensible, i.e. it barely changes structure. These should also be based on the discourse structures that you have been working with.



-If two multiplied by three is six, then what is six multiplied by two?

-If two people are multiplied by three oranges, then how

many oranges are there?

-If two people eat three apples, then how many apples



have been eaten?







#### Language proficiency.



#### Overall gaining language proficiency and mastering the mathematics register is complex and slow



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

• Erath, K., Ingram, J., Moschkovich, J., & Prediger, S. (2021). Designing and enacting instruction that enhances language for mathematics learning: a review of the state of development and research. *ZDM Mathematics Education* **53**, 245–262. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-020-01213-2</u>

• European Commission (2018). *Companion to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.* Brussels / Strasbourg.

• Finegan, E. Language: Its structure and use. Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2014.

• González, N., Moll, L. and Amanti, C. (eds) (2011) *Identity Texts: The Collaborative Creation of Power In Multilingual Schools.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

• Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). Learning to mean—Explorations in the development of language. Edward Arnold.

• Krashen, S. (1988) Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Prentice-Hall International.

• Meaney, T. (2005). *Challenging perspectives in mathematics classroom communication*. Information Age Publishing.

• Prediger, S. & Neugebauer, P. (2021). Capturing teaching practices in language-responsive mathematics classrooms Extending the TRU framework "teaching for robust understanding" to L-TRU. *ZDM- Mathematics Education*, **53**, 289-304, <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-020-01187-1</u>

