



# Effectiveness of Language Support and Subject Teaching

Yash Dharad, Assistant Professor G. Anburaj

Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, S. India

**Abstract.** This study investigates the effectiveness of language support in enhancing subject teaching, particularly for non-native speakers facing challenges in understanding complex academic terminology. Through a survey of students, it was found that teacher oral explanations are the most common form of language support still, the technical language and limited exposure outside the classroom remain significant barriers. While interactive methods like class discussions and digital resources improved comprehension, the findings suggest a need for more varied and innovative language support strategies. Unexpectedly, students heavily relied on online resources and traditional glossaries, highlighting gaps in personalized support. This study opens avenues for further research into subject-specific language support, the role of technology, and the long-term impacts of such interventions on academic success. The findings underscore the importance of integrating diverse language support methods to ensure educational equity and inclusivity.

**Index Terms-** non-native speakers, academic terminology, interactive learning, digital resources, bilingual materials, education inclusivity, technical vocabulary.

## I. Introduction

As classrooms grow more and more culturally and linguistically diverse, demands for diversity/inclusivity in modern education landscape have increased. In such contexts, language can function as either a powerful key to unlock knowledge or the major hurdle that hampers learning. Understanding the curriculum is closely linked with language skills to grasp content which for many students, especially those who attend school through a medium other than their native tongue tends to hinting towards English. This state of affairs has brought the broader matter of content-language support in subject courses to educational prominence. Language support involves providing students with additional resources and instructional methods to help close the gap between their language abilities and the academic demands of the curriculum. This may include supplementary language courses, the incorporation of multilingual teaching materials, the use of simplified language during instruction, and the blending of language learning with subject-specific training. The rationale for these approaches is clear: when students struggle to understand the language in which subjects are taught, their capacity to engage with and retain the information presented is significantly hindered. The necessity for effective language support is particularly critical in subjects that require a deep understanding of complex terminology and



concepts, such as mathematics, physics, and history. Even minor linguistic misunderstandings in various subjects can lead to substantial gaps in comprehension and academic performance. Educators and educational institutions are challenged to ensure that all students, irrespective of their linguistic backgrounds, have access to equitable learning opportunities.

This study seeks to investigate the efficacy of linguistic support in improving subject teaching outcomes. It aims to investigate how language aid tactics affect students' subject matter comprehension, classroom engagement, and overall academic success. The study also looks into the opinions of educators, who play an important role in adopting these tactics and monitoring their influence on student learning. By examining both student and instructor comments, this study hopes to provide a thorough picture of how language support can be adjusted to improve educational outcomes. This study seeks to investigate the efficacy of linguistic support in improving subject teaching outcomes. It aims to investigate how language aid tactics affect students' subject matter comprehension, classroom engagement, and overall academic success. The study also looks into the opinions of educators, who play an important role in adopting these tactics and monitoring their influence on student learning. By examining both student and instructor comments, this study hopes to provide a thorough picture of how language support can be adjusted to improve educational outcomes. This research aims to explore the effectiveness of linguistic support in enhancing educational outcomes in various subjects. It focuses on how language assistance strategies influence students' understanding of content, participation in the classroom, and overall academic performance. Additionally, the study examines the perspectives of faculties, who are crucial in implementing these strategies and assessing their impact on student learning. By analysing feedback from both students and teachers, this research aspires to offer a comprehensive understanding of how language support can be tailored to optimize educational results.

## II. Problem Statement

In today's diverse classrooms, many students, particularly non-native speakers, struggle to understand complex subjects like science and mathematics due to language barriers. The academic terminology and specialized language used in these subjects can be difficult for them to grasp, which in turn hampers their learning and academic performance. Often, language support is provided separately from subject teaching, making it challenging for students to apply their language skills in academic settings. Furthermore, many teachers are not adequately trained or equipped to incorporate effective language support into their lessons, leaving students with additional hurdles to overcome.

This study focuses on the pressing issue of language barriers in understanding complex subjects, as it directly affects students' ability to engage with critical content and achieve academic success. In a globalized world, where educational and career success is increasingly tied to language proficiency, addressing these barriers is essential for promoting inclusivity and equity. By exploring the



effectiveness of language support in improving subject comprehension, this research aims to show how tailored language assistance can enhance students' learning experiences, boost their academic outcomes, and contribute to a more equitable and accessible education system.

### **Research Gap**

While there has been many research on the value of language support in education, the majority have concentrated on the efficacy of bilingual programs as a whole or on general language acquisition. Nevertheless, little study has been done expressly to look at how language limitations affect students' comprehension of difficult subjects like science and math. There are few insights into how integrated language support can enhance content-specific learning since existing scholarship frequently divides language instruction from subject teaching. By concentrating on the efficacy of targeted language support in removing language obstacles during topic teaching—particularly in challenging academic disciplines—this study seeks to close this gap. Comprehending this connection is crucial for creating interventions that boost comprehension of the subject matter while also improving linguistic proficiency.

### **III. Literature Review**

The link between language proficiency and academic success is well-established in educational research. Cummins (2000) introduced the concepts of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), which highlight how students can often struggle with academic language, even if they're comfortable with everyday conversation. In subjects like science and mathematics, where more complex language and higher levels of cognitive engagement are required, this challenge becomes even more pronounced for non-native speakers.

More recent research has emphasized that language support should be integrated into subject teaching rather than treated separately. Gibbons (2015) argued that students learn more effectively when language support is embedded directly into lessons, rather than being taught in isolation. His work suggested practical strategies like scaffolding, visual aids, and simplifying complex language, which can help students better understand difficult topics.

Research by Short and Echevarría (2016) on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model also supports this view. Their findings show that when teachers incorporate language goals into their subject lessons, non-native speakers improve both their comprehension and overall academic performance. Despite these insights, much of the existing research has focused on general language support, without delving into its specific impact on subjects that involve abstract concepts and technical vocabulary.



This study aims to build on this existing knowledge by focusing more closely on how targeted language support affects students' ability to understand complex subjects. By doing so, it hopes to fill a gap in current research on how integrating language support into core academic subjects can enhance the educational outcomes of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

#### **IV. Result Analysis**

##### **Types of Language Support Used and Their Impact**

The survey results indicated that teacher's oral explanations (Option A) are the predominant form of language support utilized in subject classes. This method is particularly effective as it allows educators to clarify complex concepts and respond to students' questions in real time. Many students reported that these verbal explanations help them grasp difficult material, creating a dynamic learning environment where they feel more engaged and involved. The immediacy of oral explanations fosters a sense of connection between teachers and students, which is crucial for building confidence among learners who may struggle with the language. However, despite the benefits of oral explanations, many respondents also cited significant challenges they face in understanding technical terms (Option A) related to their subjects. These terms can be daunting, especially for non-native speakers who may not have encountered them before. Additionally, a considerable number of students pointed to limited exposure to the language outside the classroom (Option B) as a factor that exacerbates their difficulties. This lack of practice in real-world contexts can hinder language acquisition and lead to a disconnection between classroom learning and everyday language use. Consequently, while teacher explanations are valuable, it becomes evident that there is a pressing need for educators to provide supplementary resources that simplify technical language and encourage more opportunities for language practice outside of school.

##### **Perception of Language Support and Its Relevance**

When evaluating the effectiveness of language support in their lessons, a significant portion of students felt that it helps them understand key concepts (Option A). This feedback underscores the crucial role that effective language support plays in facilitating comprehension, especially in challenging subject areas. Students who believe that the support they receive aids their understanding are likely to be more motivated and engaged in their studies.

However, the survey also revealed a notable concern: some students expressed that the language support provided is sometimes confusing or unclear. This highlights an important aspect of the teaching process—while support is necessary, it must also be clear and contextually relevant. The potential for confusion can stem from several factors, such as the use of overly complex language, inadequate explanations, or insufficient opportunities for practice.

In terms of situational effectiveness, students indicated that language support is most beneficial during class discussions and activities (Option B). This finding suggests



that interactive learning environments are particularly conducive to comprehension. When students engage in discussions, they not only practice their language skills but also learn from their peers, fostering a collaborative atmosphere. Educators should consider creating more opportunities for these interactive sessions, as they appear to be instrumental in enhancing language understanding and application.

### **Effective Approaches to Overcoming Language Barriers**

The survey highlighted several effective strategies students employ to overcome language barriers. A prominent approach is the use of online portals with language resources (Option A). These digital resources provide students with 24/7 access to language materials, enabling them to learn at their own pace and revisit complex topics as needed. The flexibility that online platforms offer is particularly beneficial for students who may need additional time to grasp difficult concepts or those who thrive in self-directed learning environments.

Additionally, many students recognized the value of practice through group discussions. Engaging with peers allows for the sharing of ideas and clarifications in a supportive setting, which can greatly enhance understanding. These discussions also provide opportunities for students to articulate their thoughts in the language they are learning, reinforcing their language skills in practical contexts.

Despite the advantages of these methods, there remains a clear need for more structured support from the school. While online resources are effective, they cannot replace the need for personalized guidance. Therefore, combining the accessibility of digital tools with in-person support, such as tutoring or workshops, may yield the best results for overcoming language barriers.

### **Integration of Language Learning into Study Routines**

The integration of language learning into students' study routines is crucial for their academic success. The survey revealed that many students actively use subject glossaries and vocabulary lists (Option A) as part of their study strategies. These tools not only help familiarize them with important terminology but also serve as reference points during their coursework. The proactive approach of using glossaries indicates that students are aware of the need to enhance their vocabulary in order to engage meaningfully with their subjects.

In addition to glossaries, students highlighted the importance of having access to a library of bilingual subject materials (Option A). This resource enables them to compare content in both their native language and the language of instruction, thereby deepening their understanding of complex concepts. Access to bilingual materials is particularly advantageous in subjects that require a high degree of technical vocabulary, as it allows students to clarify their understanding without losing the thread of the lesson.

Furthermore, the use of mobile apps designed for language learning (Option D) has gained traction among students. These apps offer interactive and engaging



ways to practice language skills, making learning more enjoyable and less daunting. The combination of traditional resources, such as glossaries, and modern technology, like mobile apps, creates a well-rounded approach to language learning that can cater to various learning styles and preferences.

### **Enhancing Language Support through Additional Resources**

Finally, when considering additional resources to improve language support, students expressed a strong desire for a dedicated language support center (Option A). Such a center could provide targeted assistance tailored to the specific needs of non-native speakers, ensuring that all students have access to the support necessary to thrive in their studies. A physical space dedicated to language learning would also foster a sense of community among students facing similar challenges.

Moreover, the interest in mobile apps designed for language learning in subjects (Option D) reflects students' recognition of the need for engaging, technology-driven resources. These apps can provide supplemental practice and reinforce language skills outside the classroom. By investing in these resources, educational institutions can create a more inclusive and supportive learning environment that addresses the diverse needs of all students.

In summary, the results of this survey indicate that while existing language support strategies are beneficial, there is significant room for enhancement. By focusing on the integration of language support into subject teaching, fostering collaborative learning environments, and providing additional resources, educators can better equip students to overcome language barriers and succeed academically.

## **V. Discussion of Results**

The survey results provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of language support integrated into subject teaching. The Teacher's oral explanations emerged as the most commonly utilized form of language assistance. This preference aligns with the notion that verbal clarification of concepts in real-time significantly aids students in understanding complex material. However, the reliance on this method alone highlights the need for more varied strategies, as not all students benefit equally from oral explanations, especially when technical language is involved.

The difficulty understanding technical terms (Option A) and limited exposure to the language outside the classroom (Option B) were cited as the most prominent challenges faced by students. These issues emphasize the crucial role that consistent and targeted language support plays, not just in helping students pass exams, but in ensuring a deeper and more sustainable understanding of subject content. The language barrier is particularly prominent in subjects requiring precise understanding, such as science and mathematics, where terminology is often specialized and difficult for non-native speakers to comprehend.



The results also suggest that students find language support most beneficial during class discussions and activities (Option B). This reflects the importance of interactive learning environments where students can actively apply language skills and clarify doubts in real time. Engaging in class discussions provides opportunities for collaborative learning, allowing students to learn from both their peers and instructors, thus solidifying their comprehension.

## **VI. Unexpected Findings**

While many of the findings were consistent with expectations, there were a few unexpected results. One surprise was the overwhelming reliance on online portals with language resources (Option A) for external language support. Although technology-based resources are valuable, the heavy dependence on these tools suggests a possible lack of personalized in-person support, which can leave students feeling isolated in their learning process. This raises the question of whether schools are providing sufficient face-to-face language support, such as tutoring or language workshops, and whether students have easy access to these resources.

Another unexpected finding was the preference for subject glossaries and vocabulary lists (Option A) as a key method for integrating language learning into study routines. This suggests that students are taking a more traditional approach to learning subject-specific language, as opposed to newer methods like mobile apps or multimedia content. While glossaries are effective, they may not be the most engaging or comprehensive way for students to grasp nuanced subject terms, particularly in complex fields. It points to a potential gap in more innovative and interactive methods for language learning.

### **Minor Findings**

In addition to the main findings, several minor observations emerged from the survey. While most students preferred oral explanations, some valued visual aids, indicating a need for diverse teaching methods. A portion of respondents favored traditional printed materials over online resources, reflecting varied preferences. Informal peer discussions were also noted as beneficial for understanding, highlighting the importance of collaborative learning. Furthermore, support from family members proficient in the subject language was recognized as crucial for academic performance. Lastly, although mobile language-learning apps were popular, some students encountered usability challenges, suggesting the need for thoughtful integration of technology in education. These insights provide a nuanced understanding of language support complexities in the classroom.

### **Scope for Further Study**

The outcomes of this research highlight several directions for future exploration. One area worth deeper investigation is how various forms of language support function across different subjects. While oral explanations from teachers proved effective in certain contexts, this may not universally apply across all disciplines. Further research could explore the impact of alternative language support



strategies—such as digital platforms, peer-led discussions, and workshops—on student comprehension in subjects like science, math, and humanities.

Another promising avenue for research lies in examining the role of technology in providing language support. Given the heavy reliance on online tools and mobile applications by students, future studies could assess how effective these digital solutions are in improving subject understanding. Additionally, evaluating how these tools can be effectively combined with traditional, face-to-face support could offer insights into creating a more balanced and comprehensive approach to language learning.

There is also a need for long-term studies focused on the impact of language support. While most current research examines short-term outcomes, such as exam performance or assignment completion, it remains unclear how language support affects students' overall academic progress and retention of knowledge over an extended period. Investigating these long-term effects would provide a more complete understanding of the role language support plays in sustaining academic success.

## VII. Conclusion

This study underscores the critical importance of integrating language support into subject teaching, especially for non-native speakers facing difficulties in mastering complex academic terms. While students generally benefit from oral explanations provided by teachers, the research suggests that a more diverse range of support methods—such as digital tools, peer collaboration, and subject-specific resources—could enhance learning outcomes even further.

Despite notable improvements in language support, gaps remain, particularly in relation to how students comprehend technical vocabulary and apply language skills beyond the classroom. The reliance on online resources and traditional glossaries points to a need for more interactive and individualized forms of language assistance. In conclusion, the challenge for educators lies in making language support more accessible and effective for all students, regardless of their language background. By offering a variety of strategies tailored to different learning needs, educators can better equip students to overcome language barriers and excel academically. Future research should focus on refining these approaches and exploring innovative ways to support language learning in specific academic contexts.

## References

1. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
2. Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom*. Heinemann Educational Books.
3. Short, D. J., & Echevarría, J. (2016). The SIOP Model: A Professional Development Framework for a Comprehensive School-Wide Intervention. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(2), 108–116.





4. Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 1–27.
5. Zwiers, J. (2014). *Building Academic Language: Essential Practices for Content Classrooms, Grades 5-12*. John Wiley & Sons.
6. Bailey, A. L., & Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative Assessment for Literacy, Grades K-6: Building Reading and Academic Language Skills Across the Curriculum*. Corwin Press.
7. García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How Languages Are Learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
9. VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing Instruction: An Update. *Language Learning*, 52(4), 755–803.
10. Clegg, J. (2007). Moving Towards Bilingual Education in Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(3), 173–188.
11. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204.
12. De Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for Multilingualism in Education: From Principles to Practice*. Caslon Publishing.
13. Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The Roles of Language in CLIL*. Cambridge University Press.
14. McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Sandora, C. (2012). Direct and Rich Vocabulary Instruction Need Not Be Wordy. *Elementary School Journal*, 112(3), 305–321.
15. Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School*. Equinox.
16. Menken, K. (2008). *English Learners Left Behind: Standardized Testing as Language Policy*. Multilingual Matters.
17. Swain, M. (2005). The Output Hypothesis: Theory and Research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 471–484). Routledge.
18. Turner, M., & Cross, R. (2016). Making Space for Translanguaging: Emergent Bilingualism in a High School English Language Arts Classroom. *Language & Education*, 30(4), 323–344.
19. Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2007). *English Language Learners: The Essential Guide*. Scholastic Inc.
20. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge.
21. Jiménez, R. T., García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1996). The Role of Response to Instruction in the Development of Literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(3), 186–204.
22. Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (4th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
23. Gibbons, P. (2002). Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 58(6), 20-23.
24. Snow, C. E. (2010). Academic Language and the Challenge of Reading for Learning About Science. *Science*, 328(5977), 450-452.



25. Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2008). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*. Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
26. Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-Term Academic Achievement*. Santa Cruz: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
27. Rea-Dickins, P., & Gardner, J. (2000). *Evaluating Language Assessments*. Routledge.
28. Valdés, G. (2001). Learning and Not Learning English: Latino Students in American Schools. In
29. K. A. K. H. P. T. M. (Eds.), *The Latino Education Crisis: The Importance of the Academic Language* (pp. 109-132). Harvard Education Press.
30. Heller, M., & Martin-Jones, M. (2001). Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference. *Multilingual Matters*.
31. Ardasheva, Y., & Tretter, T. R. (2013). The Role of Teachers' Subject Matter Knowledge and English Language Proficiency in the Teaching of Mathematics to English Language Learners. *Mathematics Teacher Educator*, 2(1), 50–66.
32. McLaughlin, B. (1992). Myths and Realities About Second Language Learning: What Every Teacher Needs to Know. *Educational Leadership*, 50(7), 4–8.
33. Barac, R., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Syntactic Awareness and Bilingualism: The Role of Input in Early Bilingual Development. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(3), 586–598.
34. Bialystok, E., & Hakuta, K. (1999). *Bilingualism: Bilingualism Across the Lifespan*. Cambridge University Press.
35. Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistic Perspective*. Routledge.
36. Lyster, R. (2004). The Effect of the Teaching of French Immersion on Students' Performance in a Second Language. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(4), 505-524.
37. Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2013). *Foundations of Dual Language Instruction*. Pearson.
38. Wang, L., & Coleman, H. (2009). The Language of Learning: Challenges and Opportunities for Learning and Teaching. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(4), 413–428.
39. Lee, J. S. (2013). The Effects of Peer Interaction on ELLs' Academic Language Development in a Mainstream Classroom. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 92–103.
40. Pica, T. (2005). Evidence from Interaction in Second Language Learning: The Role of Negotiation in Language Acquisition. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 297–314). Routledge.
41. Cummins, J., & Davison, C. (2007). *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer.
42. Stoller, F. L. (2006). Establishing a Theoretical Foundation for Content-Based Instruction. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English Language Teaching* (pp. 165-181). McGraw-Hill.



43. Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: A Model for Teaching Learning Strategies. *The ESL Magazine*, 7(5), 6-8.
44. Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon Press.
45. Meyer, O. (2010). Towards a Language-Aware Pedagogy: The Role of Language in Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 38(2), 199-213.
46. Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Understanding Vygotsky: A Critical Perspective*. Harvard University Press.
47. Zwiers, J., & Crawford, M. (2011). *Academic Conversations: Classroom Talk That Fosters Critical Thinking and Content Understandings*. Stenhouse Publishers.
48. Burchfield, S. A., & Fawcett, L. (2015). Teaching Academic Vocabulary: A Key to Success in Content Areas. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(1), 10-19.
49. Abedi, J., & Lord, C. (2001). The Language Factor in Mathematics Tests. *Educational Assessment*, 7(4), 251-272.
50. Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-Term Academic Achievement*. Santa Cruz: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
51. Heller, M. (2007). Language and Power: Implications for the Education of Linguistic Minorities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 28(5), 384-397.
52. Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Wiley- Blackwell.
53. WIDA. (2020). *WIDA ELD Standards Framework: 2020 Edition*. WIDA Consortium. Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
54. Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Interaction and Second Language Learning: Two Adolescents' Perspectives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(3), 326-340.
55. Hu, G. (2002). Potential Cultural and Linguistic Barriers in Learning English: A Chinese Perspective. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 49(1), 37-54.
56. Hutton, M. A. (2006). Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners in Content Areas. *The Social Studies*, 97(5), 213-216.
57. Rodríguez, C. M. (2007). Effective Academic Language Practices for All Learners. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 43(1), 5-10.
58. Bunch, G. C. (2013). A SIOP for All: Using the SIOP Model to Support English Language Learners. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 106(2), 104-111.
59. Vega, A. (2014). Language and Content Integrated Learning (CLIL): A New Way of Teaching Languages and Content in Spain. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(3), 558-570.
60. Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for Teaching English Language Learners: Research, Theory, Policy, and Practice*. Caslon Publishing.
61. McCarty, T. L. (2011). Language, Literacy, and Power in Schooling. In *The International Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 265-270). Elsevier.
62. Bailey, A. L. (2007). Academic Language and the Challenge of Reading for Learning About Science. *Language Arts*, 84(6), 479-489.



63. Alexander, P. A., & Schallert, D. L. (2003). The Application of a Schema Theory Framework to the Teaching of Reading and Writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(2), 75-87.
64. Van der Werf, G. (2004). The Role of the English Language in the Globalization of Higher Education: The Case of France. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(4), 431- 445.
65. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.