



**Title of Project**

Making Meaning across Modes: English Language  
Learners and their Academic Writing within a Digital Space

**Researcher**

Briana Ronan  
Teachers College, Columbia University  
[brianaronan@gmail.com](mailto:brianaronan@gmail.com)



Briana Ronan

**Research Supervisor**

Dr. JoAnne Kleifgen

---

**Background of the Study**

In recent years, scholars and policy-makers have raised alarms regarding the literacy education of adolescent students. Disappointing results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and other assessments on the reading and writing proficiency of adolescent students have prompted some to declare a national literacy crisis (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). Particularly disheartening are the scores of adolescent English Language Learners (ELLs), who score significantly lower than their English proficient peers on tests of their academic literacy (NAEP, 2011). Such assessments rely heavily on the written mode as a primary means of evaluating students. What is often forgotten in the school context is that writing is a communicative act, one that involves a variety of social roles and modes of meaning making.

This dissertation addresses this oversight by bringing together research on literacy, bilingualism, and multimodality. The study examines data collected from an innovative project that seeks to integrate content area literacy practices in an interactive, multimodal online space. The goal of the project is to improve the teaching and learning of academic literacy for Latino ELLs through the use of technology. In doing so, it directly addresses The International Research Foundation for English Language Education's (TIRF's) research priority on the optimal uses of technology in the delivery of English language instruction.

**Research Questions**

This dissertation study drew on data collected from a larger research project, called *STEPS to Literacy*. The original project included a 1:1 computer writing intervention that took place in an eighth-grade social studies class in the fall of 2011. Over the course of six instructional sessions, English Language Learners studied the U.S. Civil Rights Movement through an examination of multimodal curricular resources, which included photographs, videos, and historical documents. While they discussed the resources with peers and instructors, the students took notes and drafted



essays in an online writing space. This study examined how the student participants in the *STEPS to Literacy* project assembled meaning from across these varied multimedia resources and socially situated literacy tasks. The specific research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What semiotic resources do English Language Learners students draw upon to make meaning in and around an online writing space?
2. How do English Language Learners assemble meaning from these semiotic resources in order to accomplish the writing tasks?
3. What role do students' linguistic repertoires play in the meaning assemblage and text creation process?

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

The dissertation study focused on four 8<sup>th</sup> grade English Language Learners (ELLs) from a New York City middle school. Primary data sources included video camera recordings and screen capture recordings of the students as they engaged in online note taking tasks. The camera and screen capture videos were transcribed using ELAN (Wittenburg Brugman, Russel, Klassmann, & Sloetjes (2006), a video annotator, which allowed for the synchronization and transcription of students' online and offline interactions along a common timeline. Each student's interactions were transcribed across four different tiers in ELAN: online navigation, curricular resources, written, spoken and gestural modes. The resulting multimodal transcripts were analyzed using an embedded analytical approach that incorporated tools from conversation analysis, context analysis and multimodal discourse analysis. Additional discursive concepts from multimodal discourse analysis (e.g., *resemiotization* from Iedema, 2001; 2003) and bilingual education (e.g., *translanguaging* from Garcia, 2009; Williams, 1994) guided the analysis of students' multimodal/multilingual meaning making across turn-by-turn moves.

### **Findings**

The findings of this dissertation research are reported as they relate to each research question:

1. What semiotic resources do English Language Learners students draw upon to make meaning in and around an online writing space?

Data logs of students' online actions revealed that while all students did access the online curricular resources during the intervention, the regularity with which they accessed these resources varied by student. A close analysis of the ELAN transcriptions revealed insights into how each student used the online resources during the writing activities. Online interactions varied in accordance with each student's (1) individual interests, (2) language preference and (3) online browsing habits. These findings contribute to the growing body of research on the variability of students' reading and research practices in online spaces (McEneaney, Li, Allen, & Guzniczak, 2009).



2. How do English Language Learners assemble meaning from these semiotic resources in order to accomplish the writing tasks?

Analysis of multimodal transcripts revealed how, throughout their writing activities, the focal students drew upon a number of meaning making strategies that spanned modal boundaries. For example, in one highlighted transcript, one student appropriated and merged her peer's *spoken* utterances as well as the *written* text from an online resource in order to draft a note. In another second highlighted transcript, a third student and a research assistant worked together to interpret Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech. By juxtaposing the written language of the text with information gained from previous lessons, they created a new entry into understanding and appropriating the complex academic discourse of the speech. In each of these instances, the students' text constructions emerged as a result of collaborative resemiotizing moves (Iedema 2001, 2003).

For all four of these students in this study, collaboration and interaction with others during the writing task played a key role in supporting their interpretation and synthesis of all types of online resources, including images and written texts. By appropriating language and juxtaposing meaning from other texts, including peer and instructor talk, the students assembled new interpretations of the online resources. The key to this assemblage process was social interaction that spanned modal and linguistic boundaries. The students' cross-modal meaning making generally followed the resemiotization model that Iedema (2003) proposes. However in Iedema's (2003) model these resemiotizing (cross-modal) moves unfold in a linear, sequential manner. In my analysis, I found that talk and writing occurred simultaneously and were layered in interaction so that each mode informed the shape of the other.

3. What role do students' linguistic repertoires play in the meaning assemblage and text creation process?

Analysis of students' written and spoken text production revealed a dynamic intersection of multiple languages, including different varieties of Spanish and English. In one focal interaction, two students employed African American Vernacular English as a bridge to academic English writing. In another interaction, a different pair of students collaborated in translating an online resource from English to Spanish. For the students in this study, the interchanging of different languages, *translanguaging* (Garcia, 2012; Williams, 1994, 200, and (3) expanding school-sanctioned narratives and conventions in writing. These findings broaden the concept of translanguaging beyond previous studies' emphasis on teacher-centered pedagogical uses. Translanguaging in this study was not a premeditated and teacher-controlled practice, but rather emerged as an unplanned, student-managed collaborative practice. For the students in the *STEPS to Literacy* project, translanguaging was a primary means to understanding and making themselves understood in the face of challenging academic tasks.

### **Pedagogical Implications**



This study has important implications for language and literacy instruction of English Language Learners. Recently, education reform efforts in the U.S. have resulted in the development of new standards for ICT-mediated literacy practices. For example, the Common Core standards for writing state that students are expected to use the Internet in order to (1) produce and publish writing, (2) collaborate and interact with others, and (3) gather and integrate information from a variety of sources (Leu et al., 2013, p. 1155). The focal students in this study engaged in all three of these tasks. They were able to do so largely because they were exposed to a variety of online texts (e.g., written documents, images, graphs, and multimodal media) and engaged with these materials through a number of interactional activities, including whole-class discussion, pair, and small group work. These interactional activities provided important opportunities for the students to work together in order to pool their linguistic resources, background knowledge, and technological expertise.

Educators can support students' academic literacy by providing opportunities for students to collaborate in the writing process, especially during activities in which students are expected to interpret and respond to multimodal, nontraditional texts that may be particularly challenging. Collaborative opportunities can also be spaces that allow students to use their home languages and literacies as entry points into the curricular content. By providing the opportunity for such variability, online spaces allow for student-centered learning experiences, where students can assemble understandings and develop texts on their own terms.



## References

- Atkinson, P. (1988). Ethnomethodology: A critical review. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14(1), 441-65.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bailey, B. (2000a). Social/interactional functions of code switching among Dominican Americans. *Pragmatics*, 10(2), 165-193.
- Bailey, B. (2000b). Language and negotiation of ethnic/racial identity among Dominican Americans. *Language in Society*, 29(4), 555-582.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bartlett, L. (2007). To seem and to feel: Situated identities and literacy practices. *Teachers College Record*, 109(1), 51-69.
- Bartlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the Heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Barton, D. (2007). *Literacy: An introduction to the ecology of written language* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Baynham, M. (1995). *Literacy practices*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextualities: Volosinov, Bakhtin, literary theory, and literacy studies. In A. Ball & S. W. Freedman (Eds.), *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning* (pp. 53-65). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bezemer, J. & Kress, G. (2008). Writing in multimodal texts: A social semiotic account of designs for learning. *Written Communication*, 25(2), 166-195.
- Bezemer, J. & Mavers, D. (2011). Multimodal transcription as academic practice: A social semiotic perspective. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(3), 191-207.



- Björkqvall, A. and Engblom, C. (2010). Young children's exploration of semiotic resources during unofficial computer activities in the classroom. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 10(3), 271-293.
- Black, R. (2007). Digital design: English language learners and readers reviews in online fiction. In M. Knobel & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *A new literacies sampler* (pp. 115-137). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Black, R. (2009). English-Language learners, fan communities, and 21st-century skills. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 52(8), 688-697.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(4), 304-333.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401-417.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). Introduction: Multiliteracies: The beginnings of an idea. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 3-8). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164-195.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2008, March). *Flexible bilingualism in heritage language schools*. Paper presented at Urban Multilingualism and Intercultural Communication, Antwerp, Belgium.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Cremin, L. (1975). Public education and the education of the public. *Teachers College Record*, 77(1), 1-12.
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 585-592.
- Davies, J. (2006). Escaping to the borderlands: An exploration of the Internet as a cultural space for teenaged Wiccan girls. In K. Pahl & J. Rowsell, (Eds.), *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice* (pp. 57-71). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.





- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (Vol. 2). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dicks, B., Soyinka, B., & Coffey, A. (2006). Multimodal ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 77-96.
- Domingo, M. (2012). Linguistic layering: Social language development in the context of multimodal design and digital technologies. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 37(2), 1-22.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (2006). Editors' introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Conversation analysis* (Vols. 1-4, Vol. 1, pp. xxi-xxxvii). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Eco, U. (1976). *A theory of semiotics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Erickson, F. (2006). Definition and analysis of data from videotape: Some research procedures and their rationale. In J. Green, J. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in educational research* (3rd ed., pp. 177-191). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fu, D., Houser, R., & Huang, A. (2007). A collaboration between ESL and regular classroom teachers for ELL students' literacy development. *Changing English*, 14(3), 325-242.
- Gándara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed school policies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(8), 714-725.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). Semiotic social spaces and affinity spaces. In D. Barton & K. Tusting (Eds.), *Beyond communities of practice: Language, power and social context* (pp. 214-233). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.



- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books Inc.
- Genishi, C. (1981). Codeswitching in Chicano six-year-olds. In R. Durán (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 133-152). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489-1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2007). Environmentally coupled gestures. In S. Duncan, J. Cassell, & E. Levy (Eds.), *Gesture and the dynamic dimension of language* (pp. 195-212). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1), 8-23.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1996). Formulating planes: Seeing as a situated activity. In Y. Engeström & D. Middleton (Eds.), *Cognition and communication at work* (pp. 61-96). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1964). Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6, part 2), 137-154.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1977). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *RELIC Journal*, 8(2), 1-34.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148-164.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano- López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6(4), 286-303.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective, Part A*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.





- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Heller, R., & Greenleaf, C. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Hoffman, D. (1999). Culture and comparative education: Toward decentering and recentering the discourse. *Comparative Education Review*, 43(4), 464-488.
- Hull, G. & Nelson, M. (2005). Locating the semiotic power of multimodality. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 224-261.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Iedema, R. (2001). Resemiotization. *Semiotica*, 137(1-4), 23-39.
- Iedema, R. (2003). Multimodality, resemitotization: Extending the analysis of discourse as multi-semiotic practice. *Visual Communication*, 2(1), 29-57.
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Tripp, L. (2010). *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out: Kids living and learning with new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *The structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix-xvi). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jewitt, C. (2005). Multimodality, “reading,” and “writing” for the 21st century. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(3), 315-331.
- Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), 241-267.
- Jewitt, C. (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Jiménez, R. T. (1997). The strategic reading abilities and potential of five low-literacy Latina/o readers in middle school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32(3), 224-243.
- Kleifgen, J. (2001). Assembling talk: Social alignments in the workplace. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34(3), 279-308.
- Kleifgen, J. (2013). *Communicative practices at work: Multimodality and learning in a high-tech firm*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.



- Kleifgen, J., & Kinzer, C. (2009). Alternative spaces for education with and through technology. In H. Varenne & E. Gordon (Eds.), *Perspectives on comprehensive education series: Vol. 2. Theoretical perspectives on comprehensive education: The way forward* (pp. 139-186). Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Kleifgen, J., Kinzer, C., Hoffman, D., Gorski, K., Kim, J., Andrea, A., & Ronan, B. (forthcoming). An argument for a multimodal, online system to support English Learners' writing development. In B. Anderson & C. Mims (Eds.), *Digital tools for writing instruction in K-12 settings: Student perception and experience*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Knobel, M. & Lankshear, C. (2007). *A new literacies sampler*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kress, G. & Street, B. (2006). Forward. In K. Pahl & J. Rowsell, (Eds.), *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice*. (pp. vii-x). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kristeva, J. (2002). "Nous deux" or a (hi)story of intertextuality. *Romantic Review*, 93(1-2), 7-13.
- Lam, W. S. E. (2009). Multiliteracies on instant messaging in negotiating local, translocal, and transnational affiliations: A case of an adolescent immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 377-397.
- Leander, K., & Boldt, G. (2012). Re-reading "a pedagogy of multiliteracies": Bodies, texts, and emergence. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 20(10), 1-25.
- Leander, K., & McKim, K. (2003). Tracing the everyday "sittings" of adolescents on the Internet: A strategic adaptation of ethnography across online and offline spaces. *Education, Communication & Information*, 3(2), 211-240.
- LeCompte, M., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- LeCompte, M., & Schensul, J. (2010). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research: An introduction*. Plymouth, UK: Altamira.



- Lee, S. (2006). Constructing anatomy literacy: Use of computer-based media in a dissecting laboratory. In L. Rex (Ed.), *Discourse of opportunity: How talk in learning situations creates and constrains* (pp. 193-228). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Lemke, J. (2006). Towards critical multimedia literacy: Technology, research, and politics. In M. McKenna, D. Reinking, L. Labbo, & R. Kieffer (Eds.) *International handbook of literacy & technology, Volume II* (pp. 3-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Leu, D., Kinzer, C., Coiro, J., Castek, J. & Henry, L. (2013). New literacies: A dual level theory of the changing nature of literacy, instruction and assessment. In D. Alvermann, N. Unrau & R. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (6th ed., pp. 1150-1181). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 641-654.
- Livingstone, S. (2008). Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: Teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New Media & Society, 10*(3), 393-411.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages, Supplement 1. In C.K. Ogden & I.A. Richards (Eds.), *The meaning of meaning* (pp. 296-336). London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Manyak, P. (2002). "Welcome to salón 110": The consequences of hybrid literacy practices in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(2), 421-442.
- McEneaney, J., Li, L., Allen, K., & Guzniczak, L. (2009). Stance, navigation, and reader response in expository hypertext. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(1), 1-45.
- Menken, K. (2006). Teaching to the test: How No Child Left Behind impacts language policy, curriculum, and instruction for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 30*(2), 521-546.
- Mills, K. (2009). Multiliteracies: Interrogating competing discourses. *Language and Education, 23*(2), 103-116.
- Mills, K. (2010). A review of the "digital turn" in the new literacy studies. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(2), 246-271.
- Moje, E. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(2), 96-107.



- Moje, E., Overby, M., Tysvaer, N., & Morris, K. (2008). The complex world of adolescent literacy: Myths, motivations, and mysteries. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 107-154.
- Montes-Alcalá, C. (2000). Attitudes toward oral and written codeswitching in Spanish-English bilingual youths. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the U.S.* (pp. 218-227). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2011). *2011 Writing Assessment Results*. Retrieved March 8, 2014 from [http://nationsreportcard.gov/writing\\_2011/](http://nationsreportcard.gov/writing_2011/)
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2013). *2013 Mathematics and Reading Results*. Retrieved March 8, 2014 from [http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading\\_math\\_2013/#/homepage-slides](http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2013/#/homepage-slides)
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies designing social futures. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 9-37). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Norris, S. (2004). *Analyzing multimodal interaction: A methodological framework*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ochs, E. (1979) Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Ono, H., & Zavodny, M. (2008). Immigrants, English ability and the digital divide. *Social Forces*, 86(4), 1455-1479.
- Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (2006). *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Prain, V. (1997). Multi(national)literacies and globalising discourses. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18(3), 453-467.
- Purcell, A. K. (1984). Code shifting Hawaiian style: children's accommodation along a decreolizing continuum. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 46, 71-86.



- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language in Society*, 50, 696-735.
- Saussure, F. de. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Scollon, R. (1998). *Mediated discourse as social interaction*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Scollon, R. (2008). Discourse itineraries: Nine processes of resemiotization. In V. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew, & R. H. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in discourse studies* (pp. 233-244). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in new literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77.
- Street, B., Pahl, K. & Rowsell, J. (2009). Multimodality and new literacy studies. In C. Jewitt (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis* (pp. 191-200). London, UK: Routledge.
- Suchman, L. (1987). *Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine communication*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (1983). Bilingualism without tears. In M. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching* (pp. 35-46). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing social semiotics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Varenne, H. (2007). Alternative anthropological perspectives on education. *Teachers College Record*, 109(7), 1539-1544.
- Vasudevan, L. (2010). Education remix: New media, literacies, and emerging digital geographies. *Digital Culture and Education*, 2(1), 62-82.
- Vehviläinen, S. (2009). Student-initiated advice in academic supervision. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42(2), 163-190.
- Vološinov, V.N. (1973) *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka and I.R. Titunik, trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (original work published 1929).
- Ware, P. & Warschauer, M. (2005). Hybrid literacy texts and practices in technology-intensive environments. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43, 432-445.



- Wiley, T. & Wright, W. (2004). Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the “age of accountability.” *Educational Policy* 18(1), 142-168.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Wales, Bangor, UK.
- Williams, C. (1996). *Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation*. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39-78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.
- Wittenburg, P., Brugman, H., Russel, A., Klassmann, A., & Sloetjes, H. (2006). *ELAN: A professional framework for multimodality research*. Paper presented at LREC 2006, Fifth International on Language Resources and Evaluation, Genoa, Italy.
- Zentella, A. C. (1981). ‘Tá bien, you could answer me en cualquier idioma’: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms. In R. Durán (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 109-132). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.