



Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction



Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction

2023 Volume 24



Published under the authority of:



TEXAS ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Affiliate of the National Association for Bilingual Education

Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction 24(1) 2023



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Texas Association for Bilingual Education

2022-2023 Executive Board.....i

Editorial Advisory Board for Current Issue.....ii

Editorial Introduction

Dr. Josefina V. Tinajeroiv

Entender las diferencias entre ambos idiomas. Inclusividad lingüística y conciencia metalingüística crítica en la preparación de maestras/os bilingües.

Dr. Sandra I. Musanti.....1

A Multitiered System Support Approach to Understanding the Cultural and Behavioral Characteristics of Students

Dr. Robert P. Trussell & Dr. Beverly A. Calvo.....23

The Spanish Proficiency of Heritage Language Speakers Seeking Bilingual Education Teacher Certification: Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs

Dr. Luis A. Rosado, Carla Amaro-Jiménez and Amanda A. Olsen.....40

Understanding the Influence of Professional Development on Teachers

Jesus J. Villa.....59

A Duoethnography: Preparing Preservice Teachers to use Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Pedagogies

Dr. Gina L. Garza-Reyna and Dr. Zulmaris Diaz.....72

Teachers of Multilingual Diverse Learners: Professional Development Needs Across Preservice, Inservice, and Higher Education Roles

Gregory Knollman, Kandace M. Hoppin, Patricia Rice Doran, & Laura Cometa.....94

Unexamined Ideas and Beliefs Shaping Efficacy and Implementation of a Dual Language Program for Better or for Worse

Drs. Jose Orozco and Dr. Michael Whitacre115

Book Review: Educating Across Borders: The Case of a Dual Language Program on the U.S.-Mexico Border

Claudia Cabrera.....132



**Texas Association for Bilingual Education
2023-2024 Executive Board**

President

Dr. Xóchitl Anabel Rocha
Texas Education Agency

Vice President

Dr. Liz Garza-García
Fort Worth ISD

Higher Education Rep.

Dr. Joy Esquierdo
UTRGV

Treasurer

Dr. Claudia García
UT San Antonio

Secretary

Altagracia Delgado
Aldine ISD

Constitution and Parliamentarian

Dr. Laurie Weaver
U of Houston Clear Lake

Legislative Chair

Hugo Hernández
Edgewood ISD

Past President

Dr. Olivia Hernández
TNTP

Instruc and PD Chair

Dr. Rolando Merchán
Pasadena ISD

BESORrepresentative

Aneth Jiménez
UTRGV

Parent Representative

Blana Gálvez-Pérez
Austin ISD

Bilingual ESL Rep.

Dra. Susana Franco-Fuenmayor
Pearland ISD

Public Relations Chair

David Nungaray
TNTP

Newsletter Editor

Dr. Lileana Ríos-Ledezma
UTRGV

Publications Chair

Dr. Josefina V. Tinajero
UT El Paso



EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR CURRENT ISSUE

Dr. María Arreguín

Professor
University of Texas at San Antonio

Dr. Iliana Alaniz

Professor
University of Texas at El Paso

Dr. Laurie Weaver

Professor
University of Houston—Clear Lake

Dr. Claudia T. García

Assistant Professor in Practice
University of Texas in San Antonio

Dr. Judith Márquez

Professor
University of Houston—Clear Lake

Dr. Joy Esquierdo

Professor
UT Rio Grande Valley



Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction



EDITOR

Dr. Josefina Villamil Tinajero
The University of Texas at El Paso



Editorial Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

The *Journal of Bilingual Education Research and Instruction* is committed to the exchange of educational data, studies, ideas, practices and information with researchers, practitioners and policymakers in this public forum. It is published online once a year and can be accessed at the TABE website homepage, TABE.org.

In this issue readers are invited to an in-depth examination of research, best practice, and advocacy topics that frame our work as bilingual educators. In the lead article, *Entender las diferencias entre ambos idiomas: Inclusividad lingüística y conciencia metalingüística crítica en la preparación de maestras/os bilingües*, la Dra. Sandra I. Musanti comparte un estudio cualitativo centrado en su práctica donde explora cómo aspirantes a docentes bilingües construyen el español pedagógico y desarrollan conciencia metalingüística en espacios de enseñanza y aprendizaje anclados en una pedagogía del translenguar. Next, in *A Multitiered System Support Approach to Understanding the Cultural and Behavioral Characteristics of Students*, Drs. Robert P. Trussell and Beverly Calvo present findings from a study that found that by using a Multitiered System Supports approach, many social and cultural characteristics of the school population can be identified.

Next, Drs. Luis A. Rosado, Carla Amaro Jimenez and Amada A. Olsen, share valuable information concerning possible reasons for the low student performance at the State level on the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT) and identify possible changes in their article, *A Spanish Proficiency of Heritage Language Speakers Seeking Bilingual Education Teacher Certification: Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs*. Then, Jesus Villa's article describes the voices of 5 dual language educators in a school that recently expanded the two-way dual language program to the middle school. In *Understanding the Influence of Professional Development on Teachers*, the author includes experiences, barriers, and successes shared by educators.

In *A Duoethnography: Preparing Preservice Teachers to use Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Pedagogies*, Dr. Gina L. Garza-Reyna explores a two-part research question and based on their research results shares ideas on how to redesign instruction focused on CLSP for preservice bilingual teachers in educator preparation programs. Next, Gregory Knollman, Kandace M. Hoppin, Patricia Rice Doran and Laura Cometa, discuss the need for ongoing PD for teachers serving diverse learners in *Teachers Multilingual Diverse Learners: Professional Development Needs Across Preservice, Inservice and Higher Education Roles*. Lastly, Dr. Jose Orozco and Dr. Michael Whitacre use itinerant Curriculum Theory to capture the subtle transformation of a dual language program in their article, *Unexamined Ideas and Beliefs Shaping Efficacy and Implementation of a Dual Language Program for Better or for Worse*.

A special feature of this issue is a book review by Claudia Cabrera of *Educating Across Borders: The Case of a Dual Language Program on the U.S.-Mexico Border* authored by Drs. Maria Teresa de la Piedra, Blanca Araujo and Alberto Esquinca.

Special thanks are due to the Editorial Advisory Board.

Sincerely,

J. Tinajero

Dr. Josefina V. Tinajero, Editor
The University of Texas at El Paso
tinajero@utep.edu



“Entender las diferencias entre ambos idiomas”. Inclusividad lingüística y conciencia metalingüística crítica en la preparación de maestras/os bilingües

Dr. Sandra I. Musanti, Professor
Bilingual and Literacy Studies Department, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Acknowledgments / Reconocimientos

Este estudio no sería posible sin la participación de mis alumnas y su inquebrantable compromiso con la educación bilingüe.

***“Entender las diferencias entre ambos idiomas”*. Inclusividad lingüística y conciencia metalingüística crítica en la preparación de maestras/os bilingües**

Abstract

Este estudio cualitativo centrado en mi práctica explora como aspirantes a docentes bilingües (ADBs) en dos cursos enseñados en español conceptualizan el rol del lenguaje en la educación bilingüe, construyen el español pedagógico y desarrollan conciencia metalingüística en espacios de enseñanza y aprendizaje anclados en una pedagogía del translenguar. En el marco de una pedagogía lingüística crítica y del translenguar, los resultados identifican tres desafíos en la preparación de maestros bilingües: conceptualizar la diversidad lingüística de los alumnos bilingües, repensar la inclusividad lingüística en la enseñanza bilingüe, y construir la conciencia metalingüística crítica para el desarrollo del español pedagógico. Implicaciones destacan la importancia de formar maestros con conciencia metalingüística crítica para formar docentes que capaces de negociar y desafiar los discursos contradictorios que legitiman ideologías monoglósicas y minorizan el español y las prácticas translingües de la comunidad.

Keywords: bilingual preservice teacher education, linguistic inclusivity, metalinguistic awareness, translanguaging, pedagogical Spanish

“Entender las diferencias entre ambos idiomas”. Inclusividad lingüística y conciencia metalingüística crítica en la preparación de maestras/os bilingües

La formación de docentes de educación bilingüe español e inglés presenta muy importantes desafíos en el contexto nacional (Alfaro, 2018) y estatal de Texas donde este estudio tiene lugar (Gauna et al., 2022); principalmente en términos de la escasez de maestros bilingües (Kennedy, 2020) y de la formación que estos reciben para dar respuesta a las necesidades de los estudiantes bilingües (Barros et al., 2020; Caldas et al., 2018). En las escuelas de Texas, los estudiantes latinos son el grupo de mayor crecimiento y representan el 52.9% de los estudiantes mientras que solo un 27.6% de los docentes son latinas/os, con una proporción de un docente con certificación en educación bilingüe cada 46.3 estudiantes (Houston University, 2020). Sin embargo, el estado de Texas exige maestras/os con certificación y habilidades lingüísticas en el idioma de los estudiantes para las aulas con 20 o más estudiantes bilingües (Texas Administrative Code 89.1201 2020). En este contexto es clara la necesidad de formar más docentes bilingües con una sólida preparación pedagógica y lingüística, para enseñar en ambos lenguajes y en todas las áreas de contenido (Aquino-Sterling, 2016; Gauna et al., 2022). Por otro lado, es urgente que los programas de formación docente bilingües prioricen la inclusividad lingüística y cultural, la claridad ideológica y las habilidades para desarrollar la bilingüidad (Alfaro, 2018; Bartolomé, 2004; García, 2015; Hernández, 2017; Panagiotopoulou et al., 2020; Solsona-Puig et al., 2018). La urgencia deriva de un contexto socio-histórico y político de constante cuestionamiento y debates ideológicos acerca de la educación bilingüe, su definición y su impacto (Alfaro, 2018). Las políticas educativas derivadas de estos debates han dado como resultado políticas lingüísticas restrictivas derivadas de una ideología monolingüe (Arias y Wiley, 2013; Chang-Bacon, 2021). En este contexto educativo se sigue privilegiando el inglés como lenguaje de enseñanza y de producción del conocimiento (Musanti & Cavazos, 2018). Por ejemplo, esto se refleja en el escaso énfasis del desarrollo de competencias lingüísticas en la formación de maestros bilingües y en programas con una oferta muy escasa de cursos en español (Gauna et al., 2022; Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017). Además, las investigaciones siguen mostrando la prevalencia de un discurso educativo contradictorio respecto de la educación bilingüe y el valor del bilingüismo como derecho educativo y como recurso de aprendizaje (Alfaro, 2018). En este sentido, la resistencia a propuestas pedagógicas que integran una visión lingüística inclusiva como los principios pedagógicos del translenguar (García, 2012; García & Leiva, 2014), se refleja en la existencia de programas bilingües que proponen una estricta separación de los idiomas en la enseñanza (Babino & Stewart, 2018; García & Leiva, 2014).

Como formadora de docentes bilingües me he enfocado en explorar la pedagogía del translenguar y el desarrollo de repertorios de prácticas translingüísticas que permitan interrumpir discursos y prácticas monolingües y aboguen por defender la diversidad lingüística (Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017; Musanti & Cavazos et al., 2018; Musanti et al., 2020; Musanti, 2023). Por consiguiente, en este estudio me propuse explorar como dos grupos de aspirantes a docentes bilingües (ADBs) en dos cursos que enseñen en español en el programa de formación docente para la educación bilingüe entienden el rol del lenguaje en la educación bilingüe, desarrollan el español pedagógico y construyen conciencia metalingüística en espacios de enseñanza y aprendizaje

anclados en una pedagogía del translenguar. Dos preguntas de investigación guían el estudio que documento en este artículo: 1. ¿Cómo entienden las aspirantes a docente bilingüe (ADBs) qué es enseñar en un aula bilingüe en términos de su percepción del alumno bilingüe y el uso del lenguaje? 2. ¿Cómo construyen las ADBs el español pedagógico y la conciencia metalingüística necesarios para enseñar en el aula bilingüe?

Contribuciones Teóricas y Empíricas a la Formación Docente Bilingüe

Este estudio se sitúa en el marco una pedagogía lingüística crítica para la formación del docente bilingüe (Alfaro, 2018; Bartolomé, 2004; García, 2015; Leeman, 2018), las conceptualizaciones acerca del translenguar como teoría y pedagogía (Flores, 2014; García, 2012; García & Leiva, 2014; García et al., 2017), y recientes investigaciones sobre la significación e implicaciones de una formación docente que aspira a promover pedagogías cultural y lingüísticamente inclusivas (Barros et al., 2020; Caldas et al., 2018; Collins et al., 2019; Solsona-Puig et al., 2018)

Una pedagogía lingüística crítica para la formación del docente bilingüe

Repensar la formación del docente bilingüe requiere de una pedagogía lingüística crítica centrada en desarrollar una postura ideológica definida (Bartolomé, 2004) enraizada en la concientización multilingüe y crítica (García, 2015) de nuestros futuros docentes bilingües. Esto significa formar docentes capaces de diseñar e implementar prácticas que capitalicen, valoren y expandan el repertorio bilingüe de sus estudiantes y aboguen por el estatus de los lenguajes minoritarios para contribuir a la equidad lingüística (Hernández, 2017). Según Leeman (2018), con el objetivo de promover el cambio social y la equidad, las pedagogías basadas en la conciencia crítica del lenguaje (CLA por sus siglas en inglés) alientan a los ADBs a cuestionar supuestos que se dan por sentado respecto al lenguaje y a analizar críticamente cómo estos supuestos se vinculan a la desigualdad y la injusticia social. Desde este enfoque, los formadores de docentes bilingües debemos asegurarnos que los futuros docentes profundicen su conciencia crítica del lenguaje y su claridad ideológica, es decir, que puedan examinar críticamente como la resistencia contra la hegemonía lingüística y cultural tiene un rol político al cuestionar y proponer transformar los valores antidemocráticos y creencias excluyentes en prácticas educativas (Alfaro, 2018; Bartolomé, 2004, García, 2015; Leeman, 2018; Panagiotopoulou et al., 2020).

Considerando la conceptualización de Paris (2012) sobre pedagogías culturalmente sostenibles, hoy más que nunca, es fundamental repensar las prácticas de formación de ADBs para promover la equidad y transformación social fomentando y dando continuidad a las prácticas culturales y lingüísticas de las comunidades de color a las que servirán como futuros docentes (Hernández, 2017). De este modo, se puede desafiar las ideologías monolingües y la hegemonía cultural y avanzar hacia el desarrollo de lo que García (2015) identifica como concientización multilingüe crítica en la formación docente. Es decir, para dar voz y educar a todos los estudiantes de manera equitativa, la formación de docentes bilingües en todos los contextos debe tener como objetivo el desarrollo de la tolerancia lingüística y la comprensión crítica de la supresión del lenguaje que se produce a través de la normalización de ideologías monolingües (García, 2015). Tanto las aulas de escuelas primarias y secundarias como las de preparación de docentes bilingües siguen siendo espacios donde coexisten discursos contradictorios, políticas lingüísticas

restrictivas, y donde ideologías y prácticas monolingües tienden a permear la tarea de educar (Arias & Wiley, 2013). Según Alfaro (2018), formar ADBs con conciencia crítica y claridad ideológica que puedan comprender y capitalizar el capital cultural y el repertorio lingüístico de sus estudiantes requiere de una comprensión crítica del bilingüismo, así como de la literacidad crítica global y binacional, y un compromiso para enseñar para el desarrollo de la biliteracidad, creando entornos de enseñanza y aprendizaje inclusivos de las diferentes prácticas lingüísticas de las familias y la comunidad. Estos elementos son determinantes en la agencia de los futuros docentes bilingües, impactando cómo luego implementarán las políticas lingüísticas en las prácticas escolares. Por ejemplo, Babino y Stewart (2018) exploran cómo los maestros bilingües en programas duales ejercen su agencia al abogar por sus alumnos y al promover prácticas y políticas de lenguaje en el aula que sean transformativas y equitativas. Como explica Mojica y otros (2023), esto es posible a partir de “oportunidades para crear una perspectiva crítica en los candidatos fundada en sus vivencias con el lenguaje, y que motive la defensa de su idioma de herencia” (p. 291) de modo que puedan navegar las tensiones y contradicciones de las políticas lingüísticas vigentes. Para esto, los formadores de maestros bilingües debemos poner énfasis en generar oportunidades para que los ADBs exploren, conceptualicen, diseñen e implementen prácticas que capitalicen el repertorio bilingüe de sus estudiantes y la comprensión del rol dinámico y usos fluidos del lenguaje en el proceso de enseñanza y aprendizaje (Caldas, 2021; Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017; Musanti & Cavazos, 2018).

Contribuciones de una pedagogía del translenguar a la formación docente

Otro enfoque teórico que enmarca este estudio es la conceptualización de una pedagogía del translenguar entendida como la integración de una postura pedagógica docente que ve el repertorio lingüístico bilingüe como un derecho y un recurso para aprender. Uso el verbo translenguar para identificar esta pedagogía, dado que captura el sentido del concepto de *translanguaging* y enfatiza el “lenguar” o *linguaging* en tanto “destaca las prácticas lingüísticas de las personas, y no las lenguas definidas, construidas, y hasta inventadas por naciones-estados y sus instituciones” (García, 2012, p. 354). La pedagogía del translenguar es praxis de la enseñanza en tanto se constituye en un acto político y de justicia social al desafiar los límites artificiales entre los idiomas y la visión monoglósica que aún prevalece en la formación de docentes bilingües (Flores, 2014; García & Leiva, 2014). Esta pedagogía interpela la ideología lingüística del docente bilingüe y lo convoca a alejarse de la visión tradicional y dicotómica del bilingüismo que da como resultado un enfoque pedagógico y didáctico que separa y contrapone los idiomas en el acto de enseñar (García, 2015). Según García et al., (2017) una pedagogía del translenguar requiere de una planificación estratégica y con propósitos específicos de espacios que capitalicen y valoricen el repertorio bilingüe de los estudiantes. Entonces, si nuestro compromiso es con la equidad y la justicia social, los formadores de docentes tenemos un rol clave en la construcción de un enfoque de preparación de docentes bilingües que los empodere dándoles herramientas ideológicas y pedagógicas para poder efectivamente preservar y promover el desarrollo de repertorios lingüístico de sus estudiantes bilingües y optimizar su rendimiento académico (Bartolomé, 2004; Fitts & Weisman, 2009; García & Leiva, 2014; García, 2015).

Hacia una formación docente para la inclusividad lingüística y cultural

Las investigaciones recientes sobre la preparación de docentes bilingües destacan la importancia de impulsar una visión dinámica del diseño de los programas y cursos incorporando marcos raciolingüísticos y pedagogías culturalmente sostenibles (Flores, 2014; Collins et al., 2019; Zúñiga, 2019; Mojica et al., 2023). Las áreas de investigación más exploradas sobre la formación de docentes bilingües incluyen la preparación de docentes con claridad ideológica y conciencia crítica (Alfaro, 2018; Bartolomé, 2004; Bustos Flores et al., 2011); la preparación de docentes bilingües con un énfasis en la revalorización del español pedagógico y sus competencias (Aquino-Sterling, 2016; Caldas, 2021; Díaz & Garza-Reyna, 2019; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017; Sutterby et al., 2005), la formación lingüística crítica de los futuros docentes bilingües (García, 2015; Leeman, 2018); la necesidad de programas centrados en pedagogías que integren estrategias culturalmente democráticas e inclusivas y el apoyo de la comunidad (Alfaro, 2018; Hernández, 2017) y propuestas de formación basadas en una ideología heteroglósica y una pedagogía del translenguar (Barros et al., 2020; Caldas et al., 2018; Collins et al., 2019; Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017; Musanti, 2023).

Las investigaciones postulan que las aulas de formación docente que creamos como académicos e investigadores deben modelar aquellos espacios de aprendizaje y enseñanza para la inclusividad lingüística y cultural que esperamos que nuestros estudiantes recreen como futuros maestros para sus alumnos (Woodley, 2016; Solsona-Puig et al., 2018). En este sentido, algunas investigaciones han identificado las oportunidades y los desafíos de integrar una pedagogía del translenguar en la formación docente. Barros et al., (2020) investigaron la influencia de la teoría del translenguar en las creencias lingüísticas de un grupo de ADBs en un curso para la certificación en TESOL. Si bien el monolingüismo persistió como ideología dominante, los autores argumentan que la pedagogía del translenguar abre oportunidades para mejorar su capacidad de involucrarse con la diferencia lingüística y la competencia comunicativa más allá de lo que predicen las ideologías estandarizadas sobre el uso apropiado y las formas correctas del lenguaje. La capacidad de los futuros maestros de reflexionar críticamente sobre el lenguaje, su uso y su enseñanza requiere el desarrollo de la conciencia metalingüística, habilidad metacognitiva que posibilita, por ejemplo, identificar las similitudes y diferencias entre lenguajes en términos gramaticales y pragmáticos (Caldas, 2021). Recientes investigaciones exploran el desarrollo de la conciencia metalingüística desde la pedagogía del translenguar (Caldas et al., 2018; 2021; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Henderson, 2018). Por ejemplo, Caldas et al., (2018) exploran como sus ADBs desarrollaron registros académicos y su conciencia metalingüística en un curso dedicado al desarrollo del español a partir de pedagogías del translenguar usando “*revoicing*”, apropiación directa de frases para expresar sus ideas, y “*translanguaging*” o recreación de frases conocidas en el registro académico en inglés a registros académicos en español. Como formadores debemos luchar por el desarrollo constante de la conciencia metalingüística y una mirada crítica del contexto socio educativo de modo que los futuros docentes construyan una comprensión ideológica del lenguaje en la práctica (Caldas et al., 2018; Mojica et al., 2023; Zúñiga, 2019). En conclusión, se necesitan más estudios sobre la postura translingüística, las prácticas de los formadores de docentes bilingües y el papel de la conciencia metalingüística crítica para crear espacios pedagógicos donde el translenguar fomente la

integración del bilingüismo como recurso y estrategia para aprender sobre el lenguaje y a través del lenguaje (Henderson, 2018).

Metodología

Este estudio cualitativo se inspira en metodologías de auto estudio que aspiran a componer y recomponer historias sobre la práctica en el contexto de las comunidades a las que pertenecemos (Craig, 2009). Lo que caracteriza este tipo de investigación cualitativa sobre la práctica es el hecho de que el rol de educador y el rol de investigador se asumen en forma simultánea, difuminando los límites entre la indagación y la práctica cuando el contexto profesional se constituye en el lugar para el estudio (Hamilton et al., 2020). Este tipo de indagación de la enseñanza requiere de un compromiso moral para comprender en profundidad tanto el impacto como la intersección de la práctica pedagógica de los formadores y el aprendizaje de los aspirantes a maestros. La integridad *–trustworthiness–* de este tipo de investigaciones deriva de la contextualización de las afirmaciones producidas por la misma indagación en la práctica situada del educador (Hamilton et al., 2020). Lo que tradicionalmente se ha definido como una limitación en las investigaciones centradas en la propia práctica es su misma fortaleza (Craig, 2009). Es decir, se desafían los enfoques tradicionales porque los investigadores se comprometen a desarrollar la comprensión de su práctica: su pensamiento, su acción, sus contextos y sus suposiciones sobre la enseñanza y la formación docente (Hamilton et al., 2020, p. 311). En este estudio cualitativo comparto y describo aspectos de mi práctica en dos cursos que enseñé para contextualizar el análisis de las percepciones y conceptualizaciones de las ADBs en torno a la educación bilingüe y derivar implicaciones para informar mi propia práctica y la posibilidad de repensar la formación docente bilingüe.

Sobre la investigadora

Llegué a esta universidad hace más de 10 años. Lo que teníamos en común esta región y yo, era y es el idioma, el bilingüismo, y mis raíces latinas. Mi país de origen es Argentina, el español es mi lengua identitaria, y mi forma de hablarlo sigue siendo un marcador de mi otredad en esta región. Mi camino hacia el bilingüismo secuencial y tardío también ha sido diferente del de la mayoría de mis alumnas. Como formadora de docentes apasionada por la indagación, al llegar a la universidad me desconcertó y deslumbró el escuchar a mis alumnas usando su repertorio de español e inglés de una manera tan fluida y compleja. Por esos años, mientras mis estudiantes compartían las experiencias sustractivas con el idioma que reflejaban lo que Sutterby et al., (2005) identificaron como el camino torcido al español, muchas se disculpaban por hablar ‘pocho’. Esta forma de referirse a su bilingüismo refleja la caracterización estereotipada de los mexicoamericanos bilingües como hablantes de inglés con falta de fluidez en español y una ideología de opresión y supresión del idioma que aún prevalece en esta región y en todo el país (Sutterby et al., 2005). Si bien mis estudiantes ya no se disculpan tan a menudo por su forma de expresarse y se embanderan con el poder, posibilidades y ventajas del bilingüismo, como formadora de docentes, sigo enfrentándome a los desafíos de una cultura institucional educativa que sigue legitimando la hegemonía del inglés como lenguaje de instrucción, de comunicación y de producción del conocimiento.

Contexto y participantes

Este estudio se desarrolla en una universidad de la comunidad transnacional y translingüe del Valle del Río Grande localizada a lo largo de la frontera entre Estados Unidos y México. La universidad prepara a la mayoría de los maestros de educación bilingüe de la región con un 90,5% del alumnado autoidentificado como hispano o latino. Además, el 65% de la población estudiantil se identifica como bilingüe y de primera generación en la universidad. La mayoría de las/os aspirantes a docentes bilingües (ADBs) en el programa recibieron su educación básica (K-12) en los Estados Unidos principalmente a través de programas substractivos de salida temprana que privilegian la transición rápida de los estudiantes a la enseñanza solo en inglés. También, muchas/os alumnas/os han experimentado parte de su educación básica en México (Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017).

Esta investigación se centró en dos cursos del programa de pregrado de formación de maestros de educación primaria con especialización en educación bilingüe cuyo lenguaje de instrucción es el español. Cinco de los cursos de este programa se enseñan en español, yo enseño regularmente dos de los cinco cursos, uno enfocado en el desarrollo de la lectoescritura emergente y el otro en la enseñanza del contenido y el desarrollo del lenguaje en el aula bilingüe.

Un total de 40 alumnas aceptaron participar en este estudio aprobado por la junta de revisión institucional (IRB), 23 participantes del curso sobre lectoescritura emergente en el aula bilingüe y 17 del curso sobre la enseñanza del contenido en el aula bilingüe. Todas las participantes son mujeres latinas con raíces mexicanas, bilingües, oriundas de esta región fronteriza con edades entre los 20 y 30 años aproximadamente. La mayoría ha completado toda o casi toda su trayectoria educativa en los Estados Unidos en programas de salida temprana o de inmersión en inglés. Además, todas describen un uso similar de su bilingüismo, donde el inglés es el lenguaje que predomina en espacios profesionales y de aprendizaje y el español en el contexto de la comunidad y la familia.

En ambos cursos uso el español como idioma de enseñanza y, salvo pocas excepciones, todos los materiales de lectura son en español. Mi planificación de los cursos sigue un enfoque pedagógico centrado en una pedagogía del translenguar, respetando e integrando intencionalmente todo el repertorio bilingüe de mis estudiantes para apoyar la comprensión del contenido, por ejemplo, abriendo espacios para que usen ambos lenguajes en discusiones, o estableciendo conexiones interlingüísticas entre términos en español e inglés (Musanti et al., 2020). Además, integro actividades que producen aproximaciones a la práctica docente (Grossman, 2018). Estas actividades les permiten a los ADBs acercarse progresivamente a la práctica real experimentando y probando sus propias estrategias diseñadas para modelar prácticas básicas en español –*core practices* (Grossman, 2018) como activar conocimientos previos, escribir objetivos de lenguaje, usar organizadores gráficos, integrar cognados y apoyar el proceso de escritura con marcos de oraciones, entre otras posibles estrategias (Musanti, 2023). Defino estas actividades como aproximaciones translingüísticas a la práctica en tanto son pensadas como oportunidades para que las ADBs practiquen el uso del lenguaje español en contexto de enseñanza mientras implementan estrategias apropiadas para las aulas bilingües ya sea interactuando con compañeros o utilizando escenarios de simulación virtual donde interactúan con avatares.

Recolección de datos

La recolección de datos en cada curso incluyó el uso de un pre y post cuestionario que elaboré con un interés exploratorio para implementar al comienzo y final de cada curso. Con este cuestionario de preguntas abiertas me propuse explorar como las ADBs en nuestro programa perciben y comprenden la educación bilingüe, el bilingüismo, el papel de la cultura y el idioma en la enseñanza y su autopercepción como futuras maestras bilingües. La elaboración del cuestionario fue informada por mi propia experiencia como formadora y el resultado de mis investigaciones anteriores (Ver Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017; Musanti & Cavazos, 2018; Musanti, 2023). Este cuestionario se completó al principio y al final de cada curso para facilitar la comparación en las percepciones y conceptualizaciones (Ver apéndice). Las preguntas se presentaron en español y en inglés entre paréntesis con la indicación de contestar de acuerdo con el lenguaje de preferencia.

Considerando la primera pregunta de investigación explorada en este artículo sobre alumnos bilingües y el uso del lenguaje en la enseñanza, integro como fuente de datos cuatro de las ocho preguntas de este pre-post cuestionario: (a) ¿Qué significa ser bilingüe para usted? (b) Como maestra bilingüe, ¿qué es lo que usted considera esencial conocer sobre sus alumnos para poder enseñarles en forma adecuada? (c) Al enseñar en un aula bilingüe, ¿qué es lo que tendrá en cuenta? (d) ¿Cómo se deben usar los lenguajes en un aula bilingüe para asegurarse que los niños aprendan lo que se espera para el grado?

Para responder a la segunda pregunta sobre el desarrollo del español pedagógico y la conciencia metalingüística utilizo además como fuente de información reflexiones escritas por las estudiantes en ambos cursos. En el curso sobre lectoescritura emergente, las estudiantes se aproximan a la práctica a partir de una actividad de lectura interactiva que modelo durante la clase usando el libro “Soñadores” de Yuyi Morales (2018). Esta actividad incluye momentos de reflexión personal y metalingüística sobre su experiencia con el texto y el lenguaje. Luego en grupos planifican una actividad de lectura interactiva sobre un texto culturalmente relevante que integra conexiones interlingüísticas para apoyar la construcción de significados de sus alumnos.

La reflexión seleccionada para el curso de enseñanza del contenido en el aula bilingüe fue en respuesta a una actividad de aproximación a la práctica a partir de la lectura del texto Cajas de Cartón de Francisco Jiménez (2000) para introducir el tema inmigración en Estados Unidos. En esta tarea, las ADBs diseñan una actividad para activar conocimiento previo como prelectura del texto, escriben el guion indicando que hace la maestra y los alumnos, y demuestran su actividad enseñando e interactuando con estudiantes avatares en un contexto de simulación virtual. Las simulaciones virtuales les permiten a las ADBs implementar estrategias, detener la práctica si necesitan retroalimentación o apoyo, y repetir si es necesario para considerar como distintos ajustes en la implementación impactan a los estudiantes avatares (Musanti, 2023).

Análisis de datos

El análisis de los datos incluyó dos etapas. La primera etapa se centró en leer y releer las respuestas a los cuestionarios y las reflexiones identificando códigos representados en las

propias palabras de ADBs (Saldaña, 2013). Algunos de los códigos identificados incluyen: no todos aprenden igual, de dónde vienen, “their background”, hay que tener respeto, sus intereses, saber de la cultura, no todos hablan inglés, más de un idioma, L1 apoyo de L2, conocer en que etapa están, conocimiento previo, lenguajes separados, hay que traducir, hacer conexiones, y los lenguajes se deben usar por igual. Una segunda etapa se centró en profundizar el análisis del pre y post cuestionario y permitió refinar los códigos e integrarlos en categorías descriptivas más amplias como: antecedentes culturales y familiares, rendimiento académico, bilingüismo como ventaja/visión aditiva, bilingüismo como déficit/visión sustractiva, andamiaje/estrategias de apoyo al lenguaje, entre otros. Además, se utilizaron categorías analíticas derivadas de la teoría (Saldaña, 2013) como translenguar, diversidad, transferencia lingüística, entre otros. La tabla 1 incluye una muestra de esta etapa del análisis indicando las frecuencias por código para el pre y post cuestionario contrastando ambos cursos. Una tercera etapa se centró en releer las reflexiones correspondientes a las diferentes aproximaciones a la práctica identificando ejemplos ilustrativos de estos patrones emergentes en los cuestionarios. Finalmente, identifiqué patrones emergentes de las categorías descriptivas y analíticas integrándolos en temas que respondieran a las preguntas de investigación. Para construir confiabilidad e integridad en este auto estudio (Hamilton et al., 2020), el análisis de los datos involucró varios ciclos de lecturas y re-lecturas, con un lapso de al menos 12 meses entre su recolección y el análisis de modo de tomar distancia de los datos y la situación de enseñanza. Además, es importante destacar que las investigaciones ancladas en la práctica son limitadas en tanto su integridad se asocia con la decisión de narrar en detalle y explorar críticamente la comprensión que desarrollamos de nuestra práctica y/o de nuestras alumnas y sus experiencias. Por lo cual el análisis de los datos que recogí se contextualiza en la descripción de mi práctica en cada curso. Como afirma la literatura, este tipo de estudios tiene el potencial de informar y transformar la propia práctica, la formación docente y la práctica de nuestras alumnas y futuras docentes (Craig, 2009; Hamilton et al., 2020).

Resultados

En respuesta a las preguntas de investigación, tres temas identifican desafíos en la preparación de maestros bilingües en términos de tensiones y/o contradicciones en los significados construidos por las ADBs en el marco de estos cursos. En relación con la primera pregunta, un primer tema examina el desafío de conceptualizar la diversidad lingüística de los alumnos bilingües y de repensar el uso del lenguaje en términos de la inclusividad lingüística. En respuesta a la segunda pregunta, los temas examinan como en el contexto de aproximaciones translengüísticas a la práctica, las ADBs desarrollan el español pedagógico y construyen conciencia metalingüística crítica. Las citas que ilustran los temas son textuales.

“No todos aprenden igual”. El desafío de conceptualizar la diversidad lingüística de los estudiantes bilingües

Los cursos que enseño integran un énfasis en comprender la complejidad y las múltiples dimensiones que es necesario considerar al planificar la enseñanza para el desarrollo de la lectoescritura y el aprendizaje del contenido de los estudiantes bilingües. En relación con esto, las respuestas al cuestionario reflejan como las ADBs enfatizan la importancia de conocer a los estudiantes a nivel individual, a nivel académico, a nivel cultural, su nivel de desarrollo del

Table 1. Códigos y frecuencias en pre y post cuestionario por curso.

Curso	Biliteracidad emergente		Enseñar contenido en el aula bilingüe	
	PRE (N=23)	POST (N=20)	PRE(N=17)	POST (N=15)
Alumnos/Rendimiento académico	9	13	7	5
Alumnos /Competencia lingüística de los estudiantes	21	22	12	18
Alumnos/Aspectos socioculturales /Familia y cultura	10	14	9	14
Bilingüismo como ventaja / visión aditiva	11	8	7	9
Bilingüismo como déficit / visión sustractiva	11	6	5	3
Andamiaje /estrategias de apoyo al lenguaje	2	10	0	8
Translenguar / Uso del repertorio lingüístico	11	8	7	9
Diversidad	8	6	3	2
Conexiones interlingüísticas / Transferencia	12	9	9	12

lenguaje inglés y en menor medida el desarrollo del español. En general, al referirse a los estudiantes bilingües, las ADBs en ambos cursos destacan que es importante saber que “no todos aprenden igual”. Una respuesta al pre-cuestionario lo ilustra: “Como maestra bilingüe algo que considero esencial conocer sobre mis alumnos para poderle enseñar formas adecuada es saber su cultura, en qué nivel va su inglés o español, y su nivel académico historial” (Maria). Conocer de dónde vienen los estudiantes en términos de su cultura, tradiciones y valores aparece claramente en las respuestas al cuestionario. Mónica explica: “... Estaría muy bien saber un poco de sus culturas y sus actividades favoritas así se podra integrar a una actividad en la cual ellos puedan hacer lo que mas les gusta...” (sic). Sin embargo, también en las respuestas al cuestionario como en las reflexiones de las ADBs es visible una ideología monolingüe que se refleja en énfasis en la carencia de los estudiantes bilingües en expresiones como “necesitan ayuda” porque “no saben inglés”. Es decir, afirmaciones como “...es importante conocer el nivel del lenguaje de nuestros estudiantes para saber en que necesitan ayuda” muestran una tensión entre reconocer y valorar las características y el bilingüismo de los alumnos y por el otro lado también posicionarlos como en situación de déficit. No obstante, esta tendencia coexiste con un movimiento discursivo hacia la valoración de los recursos lingüísticos y culturales de los estudiantes. En el curso sobre la enseñanza del contenido en el aula bilingüe al reflexionar sobre los principios de SIOP, Lucia escribe: “Si en el cercano futuro yo tuviese este grado, yo utilizaría materiales suplementarios de acuerdo a las necesidades de mis futuros alumnos para poder hacer conexiones con la vida real y

ayudar a incrementar el repertorio lingüístico de los estudiantes”. Algunas respuestas integran referencias a su cultura y los materiales apropiados como el uso de libros culturalmente relevantes.

En estos dos cursos, parte del contenido y conversaciones se enfocan en definir y diferenciar las trayectorias del bilingüismo de los alumnos en términos de un desarrollo secuencial o simultáneo. Mi objetivo es que las ADBs pongan en cuestionamiento las etiquetas de primera y segunda lengua que típicamente se les adscriben al español e inglés en referencia al alumno bilingüe. A pesar de esto, las respuestas que predominan incluyen afirmaciones como la de Celia que propone “reforsar la primera lengua y usarla como una herramienta en el aula para que puedan aprender el segundo idioma” (sic). Es decir, en la percepción de sus futuros estudiantes sigue predominando una mirada que separa los lenguajes en primera y segunda lengua y que posiciona a los estudiantes bilingües como aprendices de inglés como segunda lengua, cuando en realidad las mismas ADBs y muchos de los estudiantes bilingües en esta región son bilingües simultáneos en tanto desarrollan el bilingüismo desde que nacen. El desafío es trabajar con las ADBs más allá de las definiciones para que puedan repensar la importancia de las diferentes trayectorias del bilingüismo desde una perspectiva de continuo y no como categorías dicotómicas (García, 2012).

“Usar los dos lenguajes por igual”. El desafío de la inclusividad lingüística en la enseñanza de los alumnos bilingües

La inclusividad lingüística en la clase bilingüe refiere a la posibilidad, no solo de comprender, sino de poner en acción prácticas inclusivas que abran espacios para que las ADBs usen y desarrollen todo su repertorio lingüístico bilingüe al aprender afirmando su identidad lingüística y cultural y la de sus alumnos (García et al., 2017; Hernández, 2017; Solsona-Puig et al., 2018). Es decir, para lograr esto debemos partir de reconocer las vivencias e identidad bilingüe de nuestras/os estudiantes. Los resultados muestran que en estos cursos las ADBs se ven a sí mismas como personas bilingües. “Para mí, ser bilingüe significa todo! Me hace sentir como que valgo por [dos]...” (Erica). Esta claridad ideológica (Alfaro, 2018) sobre su identidad bilingüe no se refleja necesariamente en las percepciones de las ADBs sobre el uso del lenguaje en contextos bilingües. En ambos cursos las percepciones de las ADBs se sitúan en un continuo que va desde privilegiar una conceptualización monolingüe y estática del bilingüismo hacia una visión dinámica del bilingüismo donde el uso del idioma en el aula refleja la identidad cultural de los estudiantes y la propia (García, 2012; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017). Este continuo está caracterizado por la presencia de tensiones en las afirmaciones relativas a como enseñar y en las creencias sobre el rol del lenguaje y el bilingüismo en el proceso de enseñanza y aprendizaje. Es decir, la creencia de que ambos idiomas son necesarios en el aula y deben usarse “los dos lenguajes por igual”, coexiste con la creencia de que la enseñanza de los idiomas no debe “mezclarse”. Esto refleja ideologías monolingües (Barros et al., 2020) y el rechazo social a las prácticas lingüísticas propias de esta región como el cambio de código caracterizado como “maña” o mal hábito que “con el tiempo se me quito ... ya que mi papá me decía o hablas inglés o hablas español” (Sofía). El continuo también se refleja en la tensión entre integrar ambos lenguajes y la percepción reducida del español a ser un soporte del desarrollo del inglés: “En mi opinión ambos idiomas se deberían de usar entrelazados para que el estudiante aprenda ambos, pero primero se enfocaría en que su lenguaje de dominio se pueda usar como base” (Lucía). Las respuestas en el post-cuestionario no mostraron un cambio significativo en el

posicionamiento de los estudiantes en relación con el idioma, sino una capacidad más matizada para conceptualizar el uso del lenguaje y una conciencia más profunda de los factores que afectan a los estudiantes bilingües. Por ejemplo, Silvia negocia discursos contradictorios mientras demuestra una comprensión pedagógica de las prácticas básicas, explicando que es importante planificar

...diferentes actividades que les permitan usar ambos idiomas, agrupándolos estratégicamente, permitiendo cierto andamiaje con el idioma nativo, o usando marcos de oraciones para que los estudiantes practiquen con el lenguaje académico, pero sobre todo logrando el objetivo de ayudar a los estudiantes a aprender un segundo idioma rápidamente, mientras preservan el idioma nativo y el patrimonio cultural.

Como afirma Solsona-Puig et al., (2018) “el maestro que promueve la inclusión lingüística debe ser un maestro que entienda el español en su doble naturaleza: lengua como recurso y lengua como identidad sociopolítica” (p. 230). Como lo indica la reflexión de Silvia, esto requiere de docentes comprometidas y preparadas para preservar el idioma y la cultura de sus estudiantes bilingües.

El desafío de construir conciencia metalingüística crítica y el español pedagógico.

En estos cursos uso lo que identifiqué como aproximaciones translingüísticas a la práctica, es decir espacios para que las ADBs reflexionen sobre cómo usar y ampliar su propio repertorio bilingüe y el de sus estudiantes a través de conexiones interlingüísticas y el desarrollo de la conciencia metalingüística al enseñar en español (Rodríguez et al., 2021; Caldas, 2021). Siguiendo este enfoque, en el curso sobre lectoescritura emergente integro textos culturalmente relevantes en español como el libro *Soñadores* (2018) de Yuyi Morales, un texto poético que narra la travesía como inmigrantes de la autora y su hijo en su camino desde México a los Estados Unidos. Durante la primera parte de la actividad modelo una lectura interactiva del texto, usando nuestro repertorio bilingüe invito a las ADBs a establecer conexiones personales con el texto al conversar sobre el significado y el mensaje de la autora, analizar su uso del lenguaje, identificar conexiones con vocabulario conocido en inglés con los cognados ancestros/*ancestors*, e identificar diferencias gramaticales en oraciones como “Somos dos lenguas” donde en español el sujeto es omitido e inferido. Luego las ADBs planifican una actividad de lectura interactiva usando textos culturalmente relevantes e incluyendo ejemplos de cómo podrían establecer conexiones entre ambos lenguajes. Por ejemplo, un grupo diseñó una actividad con conexiones interlingüísticas identificando elementos morfológicos de cognados como “furiosa=furious, devora=devours” y también elementos sintácticos en el uso de “rojo/red” en la oración. En su reflexión escriben:

De esta actividad, aprendimos que es importante enseñarles a los estudiantes la morfología y la sintaxis en inglés y en español. Es importante saber las similitudes y diferencias entre los dos idiomas, porque de esta manera, lograrán usar ambos idiomas mejor.

La experiencia de leer el texto, pensar sobre el texto en términos de significado y uso del lenguaje, y luego diseñar una actividad que modele conexiones interlingüísticas, abre espacios para que las ADBs comiencen a reconocer la importancia de comprender y pensar sobre las conexiones entre ambos lenguajes y planificar una enseñanza que apoye el desarrollo del repertorio lingüístico.

El siguiente ejemplo es una aproximación translingüística a la práctica del curso sobre la enseñanza del contenido en el aula bilingüe diseñada para ampliar el repertorio del español pedagógico y pensar metalingüísticamente sobre el uso del español en las áreas de contenido. Esta actividad conecta artes de lenguaje y estudios sociales y requiere que las ADBs escriban un guion indicando lo que hace y dice la maestra y los alumnos durante una actividad sobre el texto “Cajas de Cartón” de Francisco Jiménez (2000). Este texto narra la vida del autor y su familia como trabajadores agrícolas migrantes en Estados Unidos. Esta actividad es precedida por un momento donde modelo a través de mi interacción con los estudiantes avatares en una simulación el uso intencional del lenguaje para activar conocimiento en relación con el texto. Luego de leer el texto, al crear el guion que usarán en su interacción con los alumnos avatares durante la simulación, amplían su repertorio lingüístico explorando el lenguaje y su uso en diferentes contextos (migración, cosecha) y por diferentes actores (los trabajadores migrantes) construyendo significados sobre términos como pizcar o braceros y estableciendo conexiones interlingüísticas con su repertorio en inglés a través de cognados o traducciones (Musanti & Rodríguez, 2017; Zúñiga, 2019). Un grupo imaginó una conversación entre la maestra y sus alumnos sobre la introducción de la palabra inmigración y el uso de mapas semánticos incluyendo un espacio para el translenguar al usar “*semantic maps*” integrando su repertorio lingüístico de forma fluida:

Maestra: ¿Cómo se relaciona la palabra inmigración con la historia ‘Cajas de cartón’?

Alumno: En la historia, toda la familia se mudó a California en busca de trabajo y creo que eso se considera como una inmigración.

Maestra: ¡Buena conexión! Ahora vamos a definir cada palabra en su hoja de semantic map y dar un ejemplo de cómo se usa en la historia. (sic)

Otro grupo construyó el guion en torno al concepto de “mudanza” y el concepto de “bracero” conectando el término con la palabra “brazo” y el tipo de trabajo que realizan los trabajadores migrantes. Es decir, reflexionaron sobre elementos del idioma español, las características de un texto narrativo y las conexiones entre el texto y la inmigración en Estados Unidos. En este proceso tomaron decisiones para representar esas ideas en una lección en español y negociaron diferentes significados ampliando su propio repertorio bilingüe con nuevos elementos del lenguaje pedagógico en español (García, 2012; García et al., 2017). Esto se ve reflejado en la reflexión metalingüística sobre la implementación de la actividad durante la simulación:

... tendría que prestar más atención a lo que responden los alumnos y saber como hacer conexiones entre lo que contestan y lo que quiero discutir. Esto fue corregido al decir “bien quien puede elaborar la conexión que Jayla (alumna) menciono entre el vocabulario e inmigración.” Esta pregunta apoya el pensamiento de orden superior porque la conexión no se encuentra dentro del texto y requiere que los

alumnos analicen que conexión puede existir entre el vocabulario cosecha, braceros e inmigración. (Viviana, sic)

En sus reflexiones, las ADBs comienzan a mostrar un análisis que articula ideas pedagógicas y metalingüísticas respecto del uso intencional del lenguaje. Por ejemplo, Susana explica su énfasis en el uso “correcto” del idioma: “Anime a los estudiantes que utilizaran el lenguaje académico al corregirlos cuando utilizaban una palabra incorrecta. No los regañe solo pacíficamente los corregía ...”(sic). Las palabras de Susana muestran la tensión entre integrar el repertorio bilingüe de los estudiantes y el uso de formas estándares del lenguaje. También Lucia al posicionarse como maestra reflexiona metalingüísticamente explica que es necesario “adoptar una perspectiva holística y multilingüe sobre la enseñanza, el aprendizaje y la evaluación que vea los dos o más idiomas que habla cada estudiante. la enseñanza de la alfabetización requiere el uso estratégico de ambos idiomas.” En esta reflexión Lucia se apropia del discurso pedagógico en español integrando eficazmente conceptos como “perspectiva holística” y “multilingüe” para describir un enfoque bilingüe y dinámico de la enseñanza (Caldas, 2021; Musanti, 2023).

Discusión

Este estudio cualitativo contextualizado en mi práctica identifica desafíos que corroboran una vez más, que necesitamos seguir repensando la formación docente bilingüe desde una propuesta cultural y lingüística sostenible que reconozca, abogue y enriquezca el capital cultural y lingüístico de nuestros aspirantes (Bustos Flores et al., 2011; Paris, 2012). Los resultados de este estudio identificaron tres desafíos importantes en la preparación de docentes bilingües en el contexto transnacional, bilingüe y bicultural del sur de Texas que en mi caso me invitan a seguir cuestionando como mi propia práctica promueve la claridad ideológica de mis estudiantes en relación a las implicaciones de la inclusividad lingüística (Alfaro, 2018; García, 2012). Un primer desafío refiere a la importancia de preparar maestros para que comprendan la diversidad lingüística de sus estudiantes bilingües. La identidad bicultural y bilingüe de las ADBs se expresa en la visión del alumno bilingüe y en la comprensión de sus propias trayectorias y la de sus alumnos hacia el bilingüismo en términos de secuencialidad o simultaneidad (García, 2012). A la vez, sigue predominando en sus respuestas una visión polarizante que separa los lenguajes en primera y segunda lengua (Collins et al., 2019). Esta separación aparece en un continuo que oscila entre una mirada aditiva del inglés y sustractiva del español hacia una mirada de un bilingüismo dinámico que integra ambos idiomas (García, 2012). Esta tensión me invita como formadora a continuar repensando las aproximaciones translingüísticas a la práctica y su efectividad para construir conciencia crítica sobre las ideologías de lenguaje y el significado de la diversidad lingüística en la enseñanza (Collins et al., 2019; Flores, 2014; Zúñiga 2019). Además, es un desafío que cuestiona la legitimidad de la postulación de un repertorio lingüístico único e integrado (García, 2012) para representar la percepción que las ADBs tienen de su bilingüismo y de sí mismas como personas bilingües (García et al., 2017).

El segundo desafío refiere a la comprensión de la inclusividad lingüística en el aula bilingüe en términos de reconocer, afirmar y expandir el repertorio y la identidad lingüística de las aspirantes y de sus estudiantes (Solsona-Puig, 2018). Los resultados muestran como el español

aparece fuertemente asociado a la identidad de las ADBs y valorado en términos de su bilingüismo, su familia y raíces culturales (Hernández, 2017). Sin embargo, sigue coexistiendo una visión que tiende a separar los lenguajes, a priorizar sus formas estandarizadas legitimadas por el currículo escolar, y a percibir el español como una herramienta al servicio del desarrollo del inglés (Solzona-Puig, 2018). Un avance hacia la inclusividad lingüística en la preparación de docentes bilingües requiere de más espacios donde los ADBs puedan sentirse confiadas y orgullosas de sus prácticas lingüísticas, y puedan explorar las diferentes formas en que ideologías monoglósicas se internalizan y se ponen en acción (Collins et al., 2019; García y Leiva, 2014; Hernández, 2017). Una mirada a mi práctica a través de estos resultados muestra que no es suficiente con los espacios translingüísticos que creo en mis cursos. Muchos candidatos a docentes generalmente ingresan a programas de formación de docentes bilingües sin haber tenido nunca que deconstruir sus ideologías inconscientes y liberar sus mentes de prácticas hegemónicas de enseñanza y aprendizaje (Alfaro, 2018; Mojica et al., 2023). Como todos los formadores de docentes bilingües, necesito desafiarme en la búsqueda constante de construcción de experiencias de aprendizaje cultural y lingüísticamente inclusivas que les permiten construir claridad ideológica (Bartolomé, 2004) y desarrollar la conciencia lingüística crítica (Leeman, 2018). Esto es esencial, para que nuestras/os futuras/os docentes desarrollen un repertorio de prácticas que les permitan negociar discursos contradictorios que legitiman ideologías monoglósicas (Barros et al., 2020; Mojica et al., 2023) y minorizan el español y las prácticas translingües de la comunidad (García, 2012).

El tercer desafío importante es preparar docente bilingües competentes en el uso del español pedagógico (Aquino-Sterling, 2016; Caldas et al., 2018; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017) a partir del desarrollo de la conciencia metalingüística crítica entendida como la capacidad para planificar situaciones de enseñanza y aprendizaje centradas en recuperar y desarrollar el repertorio lingüístico bilingüe de los estudiantes (Henderson, 2018). Lograr esto es especialmente importante para programas de preparación maestros bilingües en nuestro contexto bilingüe y bicultural donde coexisten discursos y políticas que siguen cuestionando o rechazando la educación bilingüe. Este estudio muestra la importancia y el desafío de contribuir a que las ADBs construyan claridad ideológica y amplifiquen su repertorio de prácticas para apoyar el desarrollo de la conciencia metalingüística en sus estudiantes. Los resultados muestran como las ADBs exploran la integración de conexiones interlingüísticas identificando elementos morfológicos a través del uso de cognados y, en menor medida, conexiones a nivel de la sintaxis, en la planificación de actividades del curso que indicaban específicamente integrar conexiones entre los idiomas. Las aproximaciones translingüísticas a la práctica en estos cursos tienen como meta promover que las ADBs avancen en la construcción de una conciencia metalingüística crítica que les permite identificar y valorar los recursos lingüísticos de sus estudiantes para definir su práctica pedagógica (Babino & Stewart, 2018; Caldas, et al., 2018) de modo que se posicione y legitime el español en tanto lengua minoritaria como idioma de enseñanza y de aprendizaje (Panagiotopoulou et al., 2020).

Es claro que los resultados de este estudio muestran el desafío de desentramar la mirada monolingüe de la enseñanza que sigue permeando las reflexiones de las ADBs y avanzar hacia una mirada crítica de la conciencia metalingüística que les permita cuestionar la presencia

hegemónica del inglés creando espacios para que sus estudiantes piensen sobre el uso de su repertorio bilingüe, lo amplíen agregando elementos de cada lenguaje y además valoren el español como lenguaje para aprender (Leeman, 2018; Henderson & Ingram, 2018). Uno de los motivos que me inspira a seguir explorando mi práctica y aprendiendo de mis estudiantes, es que entiendo que como formadores necesitamos navegar y exponer las tensiones y los prejuicios lingüísticos que enfatizan la carencia y que aún son parte del currículo de formación de maestros bilingües. En mi caso, este estudio es una oportunidad más para continuar analizando críticamente como una mirada de déficit del repertorio bilingüe de mis estudiantes puede sesgar mi percepción de los logros de mis alumnas. Este estudio es evidencia de que más allá de mi intencionalidad de integrar una pedagogía del translenguar en mi enseñanza, es importante que examine en forma constante mis propias percepciones sobre la significación de las prácticas lingüísticamente inclusivas. Esto es especialmente crítico si colectivamente esperamos avanzar en términos de construir programas socialmente justos y lingüísticamente equitativos (García, 2015; Leeman, 2018). Para avanzar hacia la equidad educativa se requiere de inclusividad lingüística, entonces como formadores debemos modelar para las/os futuros docentes bilingües la claridad ideológica necesaria para cuestionar los discursos monoglósicos y también el uso de nuestra conciencia crítica para diseñar e implementar prácticas sustentadas en una pedagogía del translenguar que reflejen una comprensión metalingüística crítica del rol del lenguaje en la enseñanza y el aprendizaje (Barros et al., 2020; Musanti et al., 2020; Rodríguez et al., 2021).

Conclusión e implicaciones

Es importante encuadrar las conclusiones en relación con las limitaciones de este estudio, cuyos resultados se circunscriben a dos cursos, con datos limitados a las respuestas y reflexiones de las estudiantes y, en referencia a un contexto bilingüe y bicultural fronterizo. Sin embargo, es posible derivar implicaciones para programas localizados en otros contextos socioculturales similares y que se propongan formar maestras/os bilingües preparadas/os para desafiar la ideología monolingüe aun prevalente.

Las investigaciones muestran que las/los aspirantes a la docencia bilingüe ingresan al programa con percepciones variadas de sus prácticas y habilidades lingüísticas y del rol del lenguaje en el aprendizaje y la enseñanza (Collins et al., 2019; Gauna et al., 2022). Los resultados de este estudio señalan implicaciones importantes para la preparación de maestras/os bilingües en tanto destaca los desafíos de deconstruir las percepciones de las/os aspirantes. Confrontar estos desafíos requiere que diseñemos programas y cursos integrando una pedagogía lingüística inclusiva con oportunidades estratégicas e intencionales (García et al., 2017) para construir una conciencia metalingüística crítica. Es decir, las/los ADBs deben desarrollar la claridad ideológica necesaria para comprender las implicaciones que sus decisiones pedagógicas tienen para la equidad educativa en términos del derecho de los estudiantes a desarrollar el bilingüismo a través de oportunidades para ampliar su repertorio lingüístico mientras abogan por la legitimidad del español como lenguaje para aprender y construir conocimiento. Esto significa que como formadores de docentes bilingües necesitamos un compromiso inquebrantable no solo con la promoción y desarrollo del español pedagógico necesario para modelar y enseñar en las diferentes

áreas de contenido en el aula bilingüe (Aquino-Sterling, 2016; Caldas et al., 2018; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2017; Musanti, 2023) sino con la formación de docentes críticamente conscientes capaces de comprender las ideologías, políticas y prácticas hegemónicas que impactan el acceso y oportunidades para el éxito académico de los estudiantes bilingües (Alfaro, 2018).

En conclusión, para desentramar el paradigma monolingüe que aún permea los programas y cursos de formación docente bilingüe (Barros et al., 2020; Caldas, 2021), los formadores de maestros bilingües necesitamos crear espacios de enseñanza y aprendizaje que permitan cuestionar la realidad socioeducativa en la que nuestros ADBs están inmersos para entender las peculiaridades de las experiencias así como el bagaje cultural y lingüístico de sus alumnos, crear espacios translingüísticos para construir conciencia metalingüística crítica, capitalizar y desarrollar su bilingüismo al modelar prácticas lingüísticas y culturalmente inclusivas y contribuir a afianzar un paradigma heteroglósico que cuestione la mirada de déficit y respalde la legitimidad del español en el contexto educativo.

Bibliografía

- Alfaro, C. (2018) The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past, present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 413-427.
- Aquino-Sterling, C. R. (2016). Responding to the call: Developing and assessing pedagogical Spanish competencies in bilingual teacher education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(1), 50-68.
- Arias, M. B., & Wiley, T. G. (2013). Language policy and teacher preparation: The implications of a restrictive language policy on teacher preparation. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 83-104.
- Babino, A., & Stewart, M. A. (2018). Remodeling dual language programs: Teachers enact agency as critically conscious language policy makers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(3), 272-297.
- Barros, S; Domke, L. M.; Symons, C. & Ponzio, C. (2020). Challenging monolingual ways of looking at multilingualism: Insights for curriculum development in teacher preparation, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1-16. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2020.1753196
- Bartolomé, L. I. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 97-122.
- Bustos Flores, B., Sheets, R. & Clark, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Teacher preparation for bilingual student populations: Educar para transformar*. Routledge.
- Caldas, B., Palmer, D., & Schwedhelm, M. (2018). Speaking *educación* in Spanish: Linguistic and professional development in a bilingual teacher education program in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(1), 49-63.
- Caldas, B. (2021). Spanish language development and support in a Bilingual Teacher Preparation Program. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 20(1), 18-29.
- Chang-Bacon, C. K. (2022). Monolingual language ideologies and the Massachusetts sheltered English immersion endorsement initiative: A critical policy analysis. *Educational Policy*, 36(3), 479-519.
- Collins, B. A, Sanchez, M. & Espana, C. (2019). Sustaining and developing teachers' dynamic bilingualism in a re-designed bilingual teacher preparation program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-17.
- Craig, C. (2009). Trustworthiness in self study research. In C. Lassonde; Gallman, S.; & Kosnik, C. (Eds) *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators. Professional Learning Series, Volume 7 (pp.21-34)*. Sense Publishers
- Díaz, Z., & Garza-Reyna, G. (2019). I Influence too: The role of professors in developing bilingual teachers' Spanish proficiency. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 99-119.
- Fitts, S. & Weisman, E. M. (2009). Exploring questions of social justice in bilingual/bicultural teacher education: Towards a parity of participation. *The Urban Review*, 42(5), 373-393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-009-0139-9>
- Flores, N. (2014, July 19). Let's not forget that translanguaging is a political act. *The Educational Linguist*. <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2014/07/19/lets-not-forget-that-translanguaging-is-a-political-act/>

- García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 245–255.
- García, O. (2012). El papel del translenguar en la enseñanza del español en los Estados Unidos. In D. Dumitrescu (Ed.), *Español en los Estados Unidos: E Pluribus Unum? Enfoques multidisciplinarios* (pp. 353-373). New York: Ediciones ANLE.
- García, O. (2015). Critical multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Language Awareness and Multilingualism* (pp. 1–17). Springer International Publishing.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In Adrian Blackledge, & Angela Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Springer International Publishing.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon, Inc.
- Gauna, L. M., Beaudry, C., & Cooper, J. (2022). The leaking Spanish bilingual education teacher pipeline: Stories of PK-20 challenges told by Latinx becoming bilingual teachers in the US. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1-15.
- Grossman, P. (Ed). 2018. *Teaching core practices in teacher education*. Harvard Education Press.
- Guerrero, M. D. & Guerrero, M. C. (2017). Competing discourses of academic Spanish in the Texas-Mexico borderlands. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), 5–19.
- Hamilton, M. L. Hutchinson, D. A., & Pinnegar, S. (2020). Quality, trustworthiness in S-STTEP research. In J. Kitchen et al. (eds.), *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices*, (pp. 300-333). Springer International Handbooks of Education.
- Henderson, K. I., & Ingram, M. (2018). “Mister, you’re writing in Spanglish”: Fostering spaces for meaning making and metalinguistic connections through teacher translanguaging shifts in the bilingual classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(3), 253-271.
- Hernández, A. (2017). Reflective and transformative practice in bilingual teacher preparation: Examining cross-cultural and linguistic equity. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 67–86.
- Jiménez, F. (2000). *Cajas de cartón*. Cenage Learning.
- Kennedy, B (2020) The bilingual teacher shortage in one Texas school district: Practitioner perspectives, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 19(4), 338-354.
- Leeman, J. (2018). Critical language awareness and Spanish as a heritage language: Challenging the linguistic subordination of U.S. Latinxs. In K. Potowski (Ed.), *Handbook of Spanish as a minority/heritage language* (pp. 345–358). Routledge.
- Mojica, Z., Stewart, M.A., & Grosso Richins, L. (2023) “Yo ya pasé por eso”: Estudiantes Latinas conectan teorías del lenguaje con sus vivencias en un entorno universitario bilingüe. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 45 (3-4), 276-294,
- Morales, Y. (2018). *Soñadores*. Neal Porter Books
- Musanti, S. I. (2023). “A veces encuentro más palabras en español”: Taking a stance towards translanguaging as a socially just pedagogy for bilingual teacher preparation. In N. King & Z. Tian (Ed.), *Developing Teachers’ Translanguaging Repertoires in Critical Teacher Education* (pp. 11-34). De Gruyter Mouton.

- Musanti, S. I., & Cavazos, A. G. (2018). "Siento que siempre tengo que regresar al inglés." Embracing a translanguaging stance in a Hispanic higher education institution. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, 5(2), 44-61.
- Musanti, S. I., & Rodríguez, A. D. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual teacher preparation: Exploring pre-service teachers' academic writing. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), 38-54.
- Musanti, S. I., Cavazos, A. G., & Rodríguez, A. D. (2020). Embracing a translanguaging stance and redefining teacher preparation practices in a Hispanic-Serving Institution. In J. M. Schall, P. A. McHatton, E. L. Sáenz (Ed.), *Teacher Education at Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Exploring Identity, Practice, and Culture* (pp. 69-87). Routledge.
- Panagiotopoulou, J., Rosen, L., & Strzykala, J. (Eds) (2020). *Inclusion, education and translanguaging: How to promote social justice in (Teacher) Education?* Springer
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.
- Rodríguez, A. D., Musanti, S. I., & Cavazos, A. (2021). Translanguaging in higher education in the US: Leveraging Latinx students' bilingualism. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1-22.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Solsona-Puig, Rodríguez-Valls, F., & Capdevila-Gutiérrez, M. (2018). La inclusividad lingüística en la educación multilingüe de California: coexistencia de las variedades y registros de lengua para enriquecer el aula de inmersión dual. *Educación y educadores*, 21(2), 219-236.
- Sutterby, J. A., Ayala, J., & Murillo, S. (2005). El sendero torcido al español [The twisted path to Spanish]: The development of bilingual teachers' Spanish- language proficiency. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 435-501.
- University of Houston (2021). Texas Teacher Workforce Report. <https://www.raiseyourhandtexas.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Texas-Teacher-Workforce-Report.pdf>
- Woodley, H. (2016). From pain to healing in language teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(2), 570-572.
- Zúñiga, C. E. (2019). Supporting "pedagogical" Spanish language competencies: Bilingual teacher education en la frontera. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 79-98.

Apéndice

Pre y post cuestionario

1. Al enseñar en un aula bilingüe, ¿qué es lo que tendrá en cuenta? (When teaching in a bilingual classroom, what is that you will consider?)
2. Explique cómo usa el idioma español e inglés en su vida diaria. (Explain how you use both languages in your daily life (home, school, work, etc.)
3. Por favor, explique por qué quiere ser un/a maestro/a bilingüe: (Please, explain why you want to become a bilingual teacher?)
4. Como maestra bilingüe, ¿qué es lo que usted considera esencial conocer sobre sus alumnos para poder enseñarles en forma adecuada? (As a bilingual teacher what do you consider essential to know about your students to be an effective teacher?)
5. ¿Cómo puede integrar la cultura de sus alumnos para tener en cuenta la diversidad en su clase? Explique y de un ejemplo. (How do you integrate culture to address the diversity in your classroom? Explain and provide an example.
6. ¿Cómo se deben usar los lenguajes en un aula bilingüe para asegurarse que los niños aprendan lo que se espera para el grado? (How should languages be used in a bilingual classroom to make sure students learn at grade level?)
7. ¿Por qué piensa que es importante tener en cuenta la diversidad cultural en el aula? (Why do you think is important to consider the cultural diversity in the classroom?)
8. ¿Qué significa ser bilingüe para usted? (What does it mean to be bilingual for you?)



**A MULTITIERED SYSTEM SUPPORT APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THE
CULTURAL AND BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS**

Drs. Robert P. Trussell
Associate Professor, Special Education
The University of Texas at El Paso

&

Dr. Beverly A. Calvo,
Associate Professor, Special Education
The University of Texas at El Paso

Abstract

The literature poses promising practices for increasing learning outcomes and reducing the rate of problem behaviors in school through Multitiered System Supports (MTSS) while creating school environments that support the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the student population. Although the literature provides many recommendations regarding the incorporation of linguistically and culturally responsive teaching, there is a lack of information regarding a systematic process for identifying linguistic and cultural similarities and differences necessary for making informed decisions for creating a culturally supportive environment. The purpose of this study was to implement a method of assessing cultural and behavioral characteristics of both student and teacher populations along a MTSS approach. The results of this study demonstrated that by using a MTSS approach, many social and cultural characteristics of the school population can be identified. Once identified, these features can be incorporated into the curriculum across universal, targeted group and individual themes.

Keywords: multitiered Support Systems, linguistic and ethnic diversity, culturally responsive teaching

Cultural Misunderstanding and Challenging Behavior

Teachers, students, families, and community members face significant contemporary challenges in schools, including acts of school violence, drug abuse, emotional and behavioral disorders, excessively high rates of rule- and code-violating behavior, expulsions, and dropping out (43rd Report to Congress, 202). One of the greater challenges facing educators is meeting the academic and socio-emotional-behavioral needs of students with increasingly diverse cultural, linguistic and socioeconomic backgrounds (Martinez-Alvarez, 2019; National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2020; Obiakor, 2004; Obiakor & Wilder, 2003). As a result, providing a positive classroom environment has become a national priority and a primary recommendation of the 2021 Surgeon General's report on youth mental health (2021). A proposed recommendation to help reduce disproportional exclusionary discipline practices strongly supports effective practices that focus on a Multitiered System of Support (MTSS; Schulz, Barrio, Hoover, Soltero-Gonzalez, Wang, & Herron, 2020).

The challenge of managing student behavior within diverse classrooms exists for a number of reasons. Crosby (1999) suggests that the wave of immigrant children from Hispanic, Middle Eastern and Asian countries have brought with them cultural and linguistic diversities that impact the traditional classroom structure. Misunderstanding of behaviors linked to a cultural learning history can place students in conflict with the social expectations between home and school (Brown, 2003; Figueroa, Klingner, & Baca, 2013). Teachers of diverse students face a significant challenge in understanding the influences that culture plays on student behavior. Understanding student cultural characteristics can help teachers better understand student behaviors in the context of the student's cultural learning history (Fabes et al., 2018). Cultural frameworks can be conceptualized as those learning histories common among a group of people. These frameworks influence people's perceptions of social contexts, thus influencing behaviors associated with learned outcomes. In order for teachers to fully support student social and academic development, there is a need to understand those cultural values that differ from the larger culture (Chan, Sharkey, Nylund-Gibson, & Dowdy, 2022; Monroe & Obidah, 2004). The problem is exacerbated when we address the issue of racial disproportionality in school disciplinary practices (Drakeford, 2004). For instance, minority students have a higher rate of being disciplined for minor offenses and receive more severe types of punishment (Fallon, L. M., DeFouw, E. R., Cathcart, Berkman, Robinson-Link, O'Keefe, & Sugai, G., 2021).

There are many contributing factors that impact teachers' instruction and interaction with students, but research has demonstrated that teacher perceptions and expectations of student behavior mediate teacher decisions regarding discipline (Barrio, Ferguson, Hovey, Boedeker, & Kluttz-Drye, 2023). Behavior expectations, practices and policies reflect the values of the larger culture. As a result, perceptions and judgments about student behavior are interpreted through the lens of cultural norms of the larger society (Monroe, 2006).

Teachers may not be aware of the relationship between their disciplinary actions towards student behaviors and the cultural learning history of those behaviors for the student (Cooper, 2002). Studies have shown that teachers do misinterpret cultural interaction styles as inappropriate behaviors, although students are not intending misbehavior (Irvine 1990). There is

some indication that systematic trends in disproportionality of discipline practices may exist due to an implicitly guided stereotypical perceptions (Fabes et al., 2018, Monroe, 2006; Skiba et al., 2005).

Research suggests that there is a need to incorporate culturally responsive disciplinary strategies in order to reduce the negative trends of disproportional discipline practices. A difficulty arises when attempting to provide evidence-based practices in cultural diversity that reduces the presentation of stereotypical views of cultural groups. Therefore, practices to reduce disproportionate discipline practices with diverse students must include a system that is flexible enough to explore and embrace the cultural characteristics of the community, ethnic groups within the school and classrooms, and diverse individuals (Monroe, 2006).

Multitiered Support Systems (MTSS)

Research in schools has demonstrated promising practices in the application of a MTSS approaches to address the needs of students with. MTSS offer a less biased approach to understanding characteristics and differences of students and has been applied to support behavioral, academic, linguistic and social/emotional needs of students across the school population (Weddle, Spencer, Kajian, & Petersen, 2016). The administration of MTSS considers student's experiences within and across multiple contexts, including community, family, district, school, classroom, and non-classroom. Efforts are policy driven to ensure accountability, maximum positive results, participation in and progress through the general curriculum, and effective and efficient communications. In addition, a proactive (positive and preventative) perspective is maintained along three levels: (1) universals: systems and practices that support most students, (2) targeted groups: systems and practices that support groups of students with specific needs, and (3) individuals: systems and practices that support individuals with specific needs (Horner, Albin, Sprague, & Todd, 1999). A team-based approach is applied to program assessment, development, and problem solving This approach enables input from multiple sources, broader expert knowledge base, and improved sustainability over time.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

In order for teachers to provide a safe and effective classroom for diverse students, the instructional practices and curricular materials must reflect and address students' cultural, ethnic, and social identities in order to ensure academic growth. Gay (2013) suggests that three features must be in place. First, classroom management involves creating classroom environments that are welcoming, racially and ethnically inclusive, and intellectually challenging. Second, as learning occurs the need for disciplinary action diminishes. Third, high levels of ethnic minorities being disciplined is a reflection of the misunderstanding of the cultural values, orientations, and experiences of minority youth.

Classroom management has evolved from simply controlling student misbehavior through the application of discipline, to creating environments that are racially and ethnically inclusive, comfortable and intellectually stimulating. Gay (2010) states that an essential role is for teachers to understand and use the cultural behaviors, experiences, and perspectives of students to teach them more effectively. CRT espouses the belief that when academic knowledge and skills are part of the educational context the educational experiences are more meaningful to the student. CRT

encourages teachers to understand the cultural values, behaviors, and contributions of different the students. Additionally, Gay (2004) suggests that by understanding and incorporating cultural values and experiences relevant to students, teachers can create classrooms that promote learning and build positive relationships with ethnically, racially, socially, and linguistically diverse students. Misunderstanding student's cultural values and experiences can lead to cultural conflicts, misunderstandings and inconsistencies between the behavioral expectations of schools and the cultural background of students.

Research has identified specific teacher instructional and interaction behaviors that promote a culturally responsive context. A culturally responsive context is created in classrooms when the teacher acknowledges students' differences and commonalities, validates students' cultural identity and learning styles in classroom activities, practices and instructional materials, educates students about the diversity of the world around them, promotes equity and mutual respect among students, and assesses students' ability and achievement validly (Banks & Banks, 2002; Gay, 2010, 2013).

The literature poses promising practices for both reducing the rate of problem behaviors in school through PBS and creating school environments that support the cultural characteristics of the students. Although the literature provides many recommendations regarding the incorporation of culturally responsive teaching, there is a lack of information regarding a systematic process for identifying cultural similarities and differences necessary for making informed decisions for creating a culturally supportive environment. Without such a process, teachers will struggle with making connections to diverse students due to inadequate knowledge (Brown, 2003). The purpose of this study was to implement a method of assessing cultural characteristics of both student and teacher populations along a 3-tiered approach. The information gained from this study will be used to better inform and connect CRT with PBS.

Method

Participants

The research took place in a small urban school district located in far west Texas along the U.S-Mexico border. The school district is in the process of implementing district-wide PBS. The school district has a total school population 6,239 students with a Hispanic population of 93%. 40% of students receive bilingual or ESL instruction and 64% of students are considered as economically disadvantaged. The school district houses 7 schools, including one high school, 2 middle schools, and 5 elementary schools.

Instrument Development

The research instrument was a series of interview questions designed along the MTSS framework. The first tier was based on the concept of universal factors. In the case of culturally responsive practices, universal factors are those cultural features that most students within a given community experience or are exposed to on a regular basis. The second tier was based on the concept of targeted group factors. In this study, targeted group factors were those groups of students that have life experiences or cultural ties that are unique to that particular group and

differ from the universal. The third tier was based on the concept of individual factors. With regard to culturally responsive practices, individual factors were those cultural experiences limited to specific individuals within a community.

Upon review of the literature and based on the three-tiered approach, researchers with expertise in MTSS and culturally responsive practices created an open-ended series of questions designed to address universal, targeted group, and individual cultural and linguistic factors (see Figure 1). The process for identifying questions included the following steps. First, based on the three-tiers each researcher created a series of questions addressing each tier. Second, the questions were compiled and each researcher rated questions independently. Third, the researchers met to reduce and consolidate the number of questions for each tier. Fourth, an outside reader with expertise in both MTSS and culturally responsive practices independently reviewed the questions and provided feedback.

Interviewing Process

Each interview occurred within the school setting across a two month period. The participating schools in this study included two middle schools and four elementary schools. Within these schools, a total of 35 teachers and administrators agreed to be interviewed about the cultural characteristics of both the students and the staff. The teachers and administrators were selected based on availability and knowledge of the school and community population. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and the interview process occurred over a two month period. The interviews were then transcribed verbatim. During the interview the informants were asked clarifying questions and to provide examples in order to deepen the researchers' understanding. This also included asking probing and follow-up questions related to the descriptions of context, conditions, and instructional strategies. First year teachers and staff were not included in the interviews, as well as those who were not familiar with the student population.

Data Analysis

Data collection and data analysis occurred simultaneously. The analysis process included coding in order to define emerging themes as they related to universal, targeted groups and individuals. The coding process began as the interviews were transcribed and consisted of a line-by-line analysis. Comparisons were made between schools, grade levels and experiences in order to explore similarities and differences in the data. The data were analyzed independently by three researchers and two research assistants. The codes were then categorized according to common themes.

Results

The results of each of the interviews were coded and organized around the themes of community, family structure, values and mannerisms, and then presented according to the three tiers of universals, targeted groups and individuals.

Universal Characteristics

Community: Due to the proximity of the community to the U.S.-Mexico border, the influence of Mexican culture and language was predominant. Most of the students and families in this area were of Hispanic decent with many being first generation in the U.S. As a result, most students still had close relatives living across the river in Mexico and traveled frequently between the two countries. For example, on the weekends many students would spend several days in Mexico and then return on Monday morning in time for school. Further, the primary language in this community was Spanish. Spanish was the language spoken in the stores and on the streets. Most of the business signs were in Spanish and usually the first words spoken to customers was Spanish. The community itself was relatively undeveloped. The town is spread out along the valley of the Rio Grande River and is primarily an agricultural community where cotton and chili peppers are the main crops. The town did not have city water or a modernized drainage system. Further, many of the areas around the main town evolved in a rather haphazard way where basic services were sporadically available. For example, in many areas electricity was illegally spliced from one house or trailer to the next. Due to the lack of infrastructure there was the continuous threat of flooding. The community was located at the foot of a mountain range. Therefore, when it rained, flash floods developed quickly and intensely exposing the community to rivers of rushing water that poured through streets, houses and buildings causing destruction, injury and occasionally death. These floods occur numerous times a year during the monsoon season. Further, the area was lacking health and mental health services. There was one medical clinic for an area that is 40 square miles and the nearest affordable hospital was 30 miles away. As a result, many students did not receive yearly check-ups or visited a medical professional on a regular basis. The community was also lacking in cultural institutions. There was no library or theatre. On the outskirts of town there was a small art community, but the art was directed towards a more affluent clientele who came down to the community to buy and see art. Although there were some nationally known stores in the community, most of the shops were family owned and operated with names that reflected the community, such as “Sierras Quick Stop” and “the Burrito Lady”.

Family Structure: During the interview process, issues relating to changes in family structure were frequently addressed. Many of the interviewees agreed that the traditional extended family common in this part of the country has changed over the past few decades. In the past, it was common for families to include a complete nuclear family and extended family members living in the same home. Today, many students lived in families that were mixed. A common situation was for a student to live in a family with his mother, a grandparent and maybe an uncle or some cousins. Another family situation that was common in the community was for students to be living exclusively with extended family members. This situation occurred when the student’s parents were living in Mexico, but sent the child to live with extended family members in the U.S. These students lived within two family systems that spanned two countries. As a result, there were cultural conflicts that emerged. Children in the U.S. community were raised in a less formal manner than is common in Mexico. For example, it is common in the U.S. to engage an adult in a conversation or ask questions regarding a particular topic. In Mexico, the distinction between the adult and the child is more defined. Therefore, children visiting family members from the U.S. can be seen as disrespectful in the manner in which they interact with adults. Despite

these differences, many Mexican families preferred to send their children across the border to live with extended family members and attend school in the U.S.

Another theme that emerged with regard to family structure, and related to the idea of less formality, was the prevalence of students living in households with a lack of supervision. Many interviewees believed that due to the breakdown of the nuclear family, and the mixed nature of the extended family, traditional roles of authority have been somewhat obfuscated. Further, it was perceived that many students have had little formal discipline and, as a result, were inclined to do as they pleased. This was especially true of boys who tended to be perceived as “coddled.”

Due to the economic condition of the community, many family members had to work two jobs just to make ends meet. Teachers stated that it was difficult to communicate with parents or guardians because many of them worked during the day, and then go to a second job in the evening. These circumstances also contributed to the lack of supervision purported by the interviewees. The economic demands on the family had a direct impact on the responsibilities of children. Many children had responsibility for their younger siblings after school. They had to arrive in time to pick them up after school, provide an after school snack, supervise homework, and take care of any incidental need that occurs between the end of school and the arrival of an adult. As a result, many students have never been able to participate in after school programs, clubs, or events.

Values: During the interviews several themes focusing on values were repeated with a clear distinction between those interviewees from the community and those from outside of the community. Interviewees from outside of the community tended to perceive most students as having difficulty focusing on the future and seeing a world for themselves outside of the confines of the community. This perception came from teachers who found that many students lacked setting bigger goals for themselves than those around them. This lack of focus or goal setting resulted in students being labeled “unmotivated” by teachers from outside of the community. Conversely, teachers from within the community; those who grew up in the area had a different interpretation of the behaviors perceived as “unmotivated.” These interviewees believed that the students certainly have dreams and ambitions but do not make a public display of these future goals. An explanation for this can be understood through respect of family. Many of these students come from homes with low levels of educational attainment and work in unskilled or semi-skilled professions. As such, these students do not publically put themselves “above” their families, but show respect for their families through embracing the community and lifestyle.

Further, these students come from families that value being together. These students are expected to graduate from high school and even to attend some college, but they are also expected to stay in community. There is a pragmatic reason for this. Since most adults work unskilled or semi-skilled jobs, and many of these jobs are seasonal and/or part-time, and since many of the adults are not legal residents of the U.S., there will be no pension plan or Social Security to support them in their latter years. Therefore, they rely of their children and grandchildren to support them as they age.

Education is valued by families within the community. As much as possible, parents are involved in the schools and participate in school related functions and events. One of the most

valued instructional practices is the teaching of English. Although most of the schools provide bilingual or dual language education in Spanish and English, most of the interviewees believe that parents would prefer that the schools only teach in English. There is the perception that English is the key to success and that there is no need to teach Spanish because Spanish is spoken at home and everywhere else in the community. Spanish is valued, but many parents believe that English should be the primary focus of schools.

Mannerisms: Most of the interviewees believed that the students were generally polite and had manners. Conversely, many of these students were perceived to lack self-discipline and have a difficult time following classroom and school expectations. It was noted that students were not openly defiant of expectations, but tended to disobey rules in subtle ways. There was also the perception that many of these students were in need of praise and attention. Also, interviewees from outside of the community tended to interpret behaviors associated with being humble to lower self-esteem, while interviewees from the community interpreted these behaviors as demonstrations of respect and politeness to adults.

Targeted groups

During the analysis of targeted group data, two main groups emerged. One group identified by interviewees was middle class students not from the community and the other group was migrant/immigrants with no family ties to the community. The middle class group had settled into the community but was not from the community. Many of these families were military families or were families brought to the area to work in business. The migrant/immigrants tended to be those involved in agriculture and construction. These families traveled extensively and arrive in the area during the cotton and chili planting and harvest seasons or to work in large scale construction projects. Interestingly, during the interview process it was noted that several teachers were not able to make a distinction between universal characteristics and groups of students who came from unique experiences and cultural backgrounds. Comments regarding perceived uniformity of students included “no groups are different” and “all students are unique” and “those from the outside adjust to become like the rest of the students.”

Community: Middle Class: Although living within the community, this group tended to remain somewhat removed considering that they lived in a subdivision located in a remote part of the community. The subdivision was made up of relatively new houses with modern architecture compared to older areas of the community. Due to the relative remoteness, students living in the subdivision tended to associate with others living in the same neighborhood. Further, because of the higher socio-economic status of the subdivision, the area stands out in contrast to the rest of the community. The ethnic make-up of the Middle Class is mixed, including African American, White, Hispanic and Asian families.

Family Structure: Middle Class: Most of the families were nuclear families with one mother and one father. Generally speaking, these were homes where basic needs were met. The families were comfortable and had available resources to provide their children with enriching experiences. Further, these families tended to have high expectations for their children. Most of these families have lived in other places and some have lived overseas for extended periods of time. As a result, these families were very resilient to change and adaptation to new communities. They tended to have a global perspective and were able to align themselves with the community

and with the broader society as well. As a part of the lifestyle of the Middle Class, these children grew up with many options and they were accustomed to having choices in their lives.

Values: Middle Class: Many of these students brought with them a sense of competition. They valued competition and being winners. Also, many of the families had a strong Christian faith and attended churches that were more contemporary than the traditional Catholic Church, which was once the predominant faith of the area. Education was also highly valued. These families had high expectations of their children to advance into professional careers.

Mannerisms: Middle Class: Regarding the mannerisms of these students, there was a division in perception between interviewees from the community and those from outside of the community. Interviewees from the community described these students as being “very demanding and selectively cooperative.” They attributed these behaviors to having too many choices in life. These mannerisms were viewed as creating disruptions in the classroom. These behaviors were also referred to as disrespectful by some of the interviewees from the community. Conversely, interviewees from outside of the community described these students as highly motivated with clear goals and ambitions for the future. They perceived their classroom behavior as inquisitive, as opposed to disruptive, and saw them as leaders.

Community: Migrants: As the name implies, the migrant community was one that traveled around the country following work opportunities in both agriculture and construction. This community was made up of a number of families that tended to stay together as they traveled to different areas of the country. For the most part, they lived in the poorer areas of the community in low rent homes or apartments. These low rent areas were often in the path of potential flood waters placing these families at risk for harm and/or homelessness. Further, these were areas where there was a high level of gang activity and crime, further placing these families at-risk. The ethnic make-up of the migrant population in this region was exclusively Hispanic with many of them being from Mexico. The interviewees’ perception of the migrant student’s community was particularly dour. Their living circumstances were described as being the “worse off” and living very “rough lives.” Further, there was a level of protection afforded to this group that was not evident with other students. Interviewees stated that they purposely did not highlight their lifestyle in order to protect them from others.

Family Structure: Migrants: Admittedly, the interviewees did not know a lot about the family structure or culture of these students. Several observed that the families could be a mix of nuclear and/or extended. Additionally, these families tended to embrace a more traditional Mexican culture, which included using what was considered an “older way of speaking Spanish” and celebrating exclusively Mexican holidays. It was noted that the traditional roles between parents was more evident in these families, including wives yielding decision making to husbands. Interactions between families and school personnel usually consisted of ceding unquestioning authority to teacher suggestions, recommendations and assumptions. These families had limited resources. Interviewees believed that few received any type of real health care and, as a result developmental issues were noted in these students. Several interviewees observed a lack of thriving when compared to other students.

Values: Migrants: A strong work ethic was prevalent in the migrant community. Due to the rigors of the lifestyle, students were exposed to periods of extensive work and travel. Further, the value of having work was presupposed by the extent to which these families went to obtain employment opportunities. Another value identified by the interviewees was the importance of their peer group. These students tended to stay together and not interact with other students. Further, the migrant students seemed to have a level of respect for adults that was not as apparent when compared to other students.

Mannerisms: Migrants: The migrant students were described as “low key.” They tended to be quiet in class and not volunteer to participate or answer questions. Many of these students struggled with learning English probably due to the fact that aside from school, they have had limited exposure to the English language. Further, many of these students were significantly academically behind. Within the classroom structure, these students did not complain and followed teacher expectations without question. As with their parents, they held a certain level of reverence for the school personnel.

Individual

During the analysis of individual data, several unique students emerged. There was one student from Japan and another student who had two mothers. During the interview, many teachers had difficulty providing specific details about these two students. With regard to *Family Structure*, teachers reported that the Japanese student lived with his Japanese born mother and father. The student with two mothers lived with both women. Details regarding family structure were not known by the teachers. When asked about *Values*, it was assumed that the Japanese family had more traditional values, but no details were provided. There was an indication that both families held value systems that were different from both universal and targeted groups. When addressing *Mannerisms*, both teachers reported that the two students were shy and had difficulty fitting into the main group. Further, these students did not really belong to a specific targeted group.

Discussion

In order for teachers to fully support student social and academic growth, there is a need to understand those cultural values that differ from the larger culture (Delgado Rivera & Atkinson, 1997). This suggests that the larger culture, as well as unique groups and individuals must be understood in order to create supportive environments. Although there is substantial research on the need for creating culturally supportive environments to enhance positive student participation in the educational process, there is a lack of information regarding specific processes that can be implemented to help identify cultural characteristics of all students. Without such a process, teachers will struggle to make connections to diverse students due to inadequate knowledge (Brown, 2003). The purpose of this study was to implement a method of assessing cultural characteristics of both student and teacher populations using a 3-tiered approach similar to that used in PBS. The results of this study demonstrated that by using a 3-tiered approach, many social and cultural characteristics of the school population can be identified. Once identified, these features can be incorporated into the curriculum across universal, targeted group and individual themes.

Universals

The results of the Universal features of the community and student experiences provided information that could be used to develop both curriculum and instructional practices. The vast majority of students are Hispanic with direct ties to Mexico. This information could be reflected across the school setting and across subject areas and during instruction. The environment should reflect the community and appear as a natural extension. Across the school settings there could be an abundance of visual and physical representations of Hispanic artifacts, heroes and celebrations both past and present. An example was observed in one elementary school. There were murals depicting features of the community (chili and cotton fields) and social aspects. One mural showed an elderly man holding hands with a young, school-aged child. Considering that many of the students in the area live in homes with grandparents or are being raised by grandparents, this mural was particularly accurate and sensitive to the specific population of students at the school. From an instructional perspective, many of the students were polite and had manners, but tended to disobey rules in subtle ways. This information is important to help guide teacher behavior. Teachers need to maintain a level of politeness and manners with all students. By doing so, they are establishing a balanced relationship that is culturally responsive to the vast majority of students. Students come to the school setting expecting a more formal, respectful relationship between teachers and students.

From a classroom perspective, teachers should be incorporating examples, stories, and anecdotes into all lessons that reflect features of the community. Teachers who include common community features will be tying in new learning to old learning. This simple premise is often overlooked due to time constraints, as well as a vast array of readily available materials generated from outside of the community. For example, a lesson on the oceans of the world could start with how the Rio Grande will feed the Gulf of Mexico. Also, considering that this region was once part of a vast ocean, there is plenty of local evidence of ocean features.

Teachers who include specific family structures, economic circumstances, value systems, and cultural experiences related to student's day-to-day life will further engage students in the learning process. Based on the results of this study, teachers can extend lessons by linking learning to family structures with multiple generations, to include families with single or both parents working numerous jobs to make ends meet, to present family value systems that value education but discourage self-promotion that puts children above the patriarch of the family, and to incorporate those experiences common to life in on an international border where crossing cultural boundaries is a day-to-day affair.

Targeted Groups

In this study, two unique targeted groups were identified by teachers and administrators, including students from middle class backgrounds and students from migrant family backgrounds. According to this study, students from middle class and migrant families brought to the school a set of experiences, values and mannerisms that set them apart from the majority of students. In order to be culturally responsive teachers must have an understanding of their experiences, value systems and mannerism. With this information teachers can adopt and adapt materials that are relevant to the prior learning of these students. Middle class students tended to come from families with very high expectations for them to achieve academically in order to prepare them for success

in the broader society. Therefore, their education must include information that they can link to the world outside of the immediate community. One can argue that much of the material available within contemporary public school already represents the broader society. Further, many of the middle class students have lived in other parts of the country or overseas. Teachers should take the time to find out about the different places students have lived and then link those places and experiences back to the community. In this way, all students can benefit from these experiences. Children from middle class backgrounds also tended to have a series of unique mannerisms. These students can be perceived as being disrespectful and demanding. This may be a perception of contrast when compared to the larger group. Many students from middle class backgrounds have an inquisitive nature to the point where they may question rules and expectations. These mannerisms can create disruptions in the classrooms if misunderstood by the teacher.

Students from migrant families have a lifestyle and experiences that are vastly different from the majority of students. Teachers and administrators need to make a more defined effort to understand the experiences of these students. These students tended to exhibit low levels of classroom participation. Many of the interviewees stated that they did not want to embarrass these students by asking them to share about their lives in front of the class. As a result, many students from migrant families were not connected to the curriculum and therefore the many contributions migrants have made to the society were not included. Having a “probrecito” (poor little boy/girl) attitude does nothing to elevate and support these students. Teachers need to find a way to normalize the life experiences of students from migrant families into the day-to-day lesson plans. By understanding those important and positive experiences in these student’s lives, teachers can incorporate them into the day-to-day lessons. By doing so, these students will be able to link new knowledge to old knowledge, as well as feel a part of the classroom community. Further, they tended to socialize exclusively with other students from migrant families. Teachers and administrators need to make an effort to help these students build a peer network beyond just those within the migrant community. This is critical for students to develop a sense of belongingness to a community that is not transient.

Individuals

In this study, several individuals with unique backgrounds were identified by teachers and administrators. As the results indicated, there was very little information about these students. This lack of information suggests a disconnect between those students in unique circumstances and the efforts of the school personnel to understand those circumstances. Although viewed as unique, if there is not a systematic way of both understanding these student’s background and experiences, as well as incorporating their experiences in the educational process, then these students will be inadvertently marginalized. As the research has stated, misunderstanding of behaviors linked to a cultural learning history can place students in conflict with the social expectations between home and school (Brown, 2003). Therefore, the time and effort school personnel invest in continually understanding their student population will yield the on-going benefit of creating culturally responsive environments and instruction that will include and represent all students.

Teacher Perceptions

A result of this study demonstrated a distinction between the perceptions of teachers from the community and those from outside of the community. Teachers from the community viewed students as humble and being very respectful to the family. They stated that these students do have dreams but do not make a public display of the ambitions in order not to put themselves above their family. Teachers from outside of the community tended to view these students as unmotivated and not having dreams beyond the options available within the local community. Teachers from the community perceived students from middle class backgrounds as being disrespectful and used to having too many choices in life. Teachers from outside of the community, those from more middle class backgrounds, viewed the middle class students as inquisitive, motivated and having leadership skills. As these results indicate, teachers from the community and teachers from outside of the community can learn from each other regarding student characteristics. Both groups of teachers had biases that the other group could help to reduce through open and honest discussion.

Limitations

This research was conducted in a small urban school district located in far west Texas along the U.S-Mexico border. It is well-established that cultural characteristics will differ from school to school. As a result, the conclusions of this study are limited to the region in which the study was conducted. Further, this research was descriptive in nature and did not attempt to establish a relationship between cultural characteristics of the student population, culturally responsive practices of school personnel, and the occurrence or non-occurrence of problem behaviors. The fact that this research identified areas in which there were disconnects between the perceptions of school personnel and unique cultural characteristics of students does not imply that a relationship to potential problem behaviors. This research only attempted to demonstrate that using a three-tiered approach to gather information on the cultural experiences of students could potentially provide information that can be used to develop culturally responsive practices and instruction.

Implications for Future Research

The current research provides a method for understanding cultural characteristics of students. Future research needs to focus on developing culturally responsive instructional materials and practices based on the three tiers (universal, targeted group, and individual). Further, the impact of these practices needs to be assessed in relation to academic growth, social development and the impact on problem behavior.

References

- Adelman, H., and Taylor, L. (1997). Addressing barriers to learning: Beyond school-linked services and full service schools. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 67,408-421.
- Banks, A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.)(2002). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barrio, B. L., Ferguson, S. L., Hovey, K. A., Boedeker, P., & Klutz-Drye, B. (2023). Voices beyond the numbers; a systematic review of qualitative studies of disproportionality in special education. *Preventing School Failure*, 67(1), 39-47.
- Brown, D. F. (2003). Urban teachers' use of culturally responsive management strategies. *Theory to Practice*, 42 (4).
- Chan, M, Sharkey, J. D., Nylund-Gibson, K., & Dowdy, E. (2022). Associations of school diversity with students' race-based victimization and school connectedness: a combined influence of student and teacher racial/ethnic diversity and socioeconomic diversity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 52, 44-60.
- Cooper, P. (2002). Does race matter? A comparison of effective black and white teachers of African American students. In *In search of wholeness: African American teachers and their culturally specific classroom practices*, ed. J. J. Irvine, 47-63. New York: Palgrave.
- Crosby, E. (1999). Urban schools: Forced to fail. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(4), 298-303.
- Drakeford, W. & Staples, J. M. (2006). Minority confinement in the juvenile justice system: Legal, social, and racial factors. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39(1), 52-58
- Fabes, R. A., Martin, C. L., & Hanish, L. D. (2018). Children and youth in a diverse world: Applied developmental perspectives on diversity and inclusion. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 59, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2018.11.003>.
- Fallon, L. M., DeFouw, E. R., Cathcart, S. C., Berkman, T. S., Robinson-Link, P., O'Keefe, B. V. O., & Sugai, G., (2021). School-based supports and interventions to improve social and behavioral outcomes with racially and ethnically minoritized youth: a review of recent quantitative research. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 31, 123-156.
- Figueroa, R., Klingner, J., & Baca, L. (2013). The present and future of bilingual/ESL special education. *Impact: Feature issue on educating K-12 English language learners with disabilities*, 16(1). Retrieved from <http://ici.umn.edu/products/impact/261/3.html>
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 48–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/curi>.
- Horner, R.H., Albin, R.W., Sprague, J.R., and Todd, A.W. (1999). Positive behavior support. In M.E. Snell, and F. Brown, (Eds.), *Instruction of students with severe disabilities (5th ed., pp. 207-243)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice-Hall.
- Taylor-Greene, S., Brown, D., Nelson, L., Longton, J., Gassman, T., and Cohen, J. Irvine, J. J. (1990). *Black students and school failure: Policies, practices, and prescriptions*. New York: Praeger.

- Lawson, H.A., and Briar-Lawson, K. (1997). *Connecting the dots: Progress toward the integration of school reform, school-linked services, parent involvement and community schools*. Oxford, OH: Institutes for Educational Renewal.
- Lewis, T.J., Sugai, G., and Colvin, G. (1998). Reducing problem behavior through a school-wide system of effective behavioral support: Investigation of a school-wide social skills training program and contextual interventions. *School Psychology Review*, 27, 446-459.
- Martinez-Alvarez, P. (2019). Dis/ability labels and emergent bilingual children: current research and new possibilities to grow as bilingual and biliterate learners. *Ethnicity & Education*, 22(2), 174-194.
- Monroe, C. R. (2006). Why are “bad boys” always black? Causes of disproportionality in school discipline and recommendations for change. *The Clearing House*, 79(1), 45-50.
- Monroe, C. R. & Obidah, I. E. (2004). The influence of cultural synchronization on a teacher's perceptions of disruption: A case study of an African American middle-school classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55 (3): 256-68.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2020). English language learners in public schools. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
- Obiakor, F., Enwefa, S., Utley, C., Obi, S., Gwalla- Ogisi, N., & Enwefa, R. (2004). Serving culturally and linguistically diverse students with emotional and behavioral disorders. In L. M. Bullock, R. A. Gable, & K. Melloy (Series Eds.), *Fifth CCBBD mini-library series on meeting the diverse needs of children and youth with EIBD: Evidence-based programs and practices*. Arlington, VA: Council for Children With Behavioral Disorders.
- Obiakor, F., & Wilder, L. (2003). Disproportionate representation in special education: What principals can do. *Principal Leadership*, 4, 17-21.
- Rivera, B. D. & Rogers-Adkinson, D. (1997). Culturally sensitive interventions: Social skills training with children and parents from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 33, 75-80.
- Schulz, S. M., Barrio, B. L., Hoover, J. J., Soltero-Gonzalez, L., Wang, C., & Herron, S. (2020). Sustaining a multitiered system of supports for English learners in rural community elementary schools. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 4-16.
- Skiba, R. J., Poloni-Staudinger, L., Simmons, A. B., Feggins-Azziz, R., and Choong-Geun, C. (2005). Unproven links: Can poverty explain ethnic disproportionality in special education? *The Journal of Special Education*, 39 (3), 130-144
- U.S. Department of Education. (2021). *Forty third annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2021). *Protecting youth mental health: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Mental Health Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health.

Figure 1: Questions designed to address universal, targeted group, and individual cultural and linguistic factors

Three-tiers of CRT Interview

Universals:

1. What are the cultural characteristics that most students in your classroom have in common? What are the living, family, and community experiences of most students?
2. Describe specific cultural norms, behaviors or attitudes students seem to share?
3. How do you adjust your instruction so that student experiences are incorporated into your curriculum and instruction?
4. How does the make-up of the faculty match the cultural composition of the student body? What are the similarities and differences?
5. How do you see yourself in relation to the overall cultural make up of your class? What are the similarities and differences?

Targeted Groups:

1. Describe unique groups of students within you classroom?
2. Describe specific cultural norms, behaviors or attitudes all students seem to share?
3. How do you adjust your instruction so that these unique group experiences are incorporated in your curriculum and instruction?

Individual:

1. Are there particular students that have distinct cultural, linguistic or ethnic backgrounds in your class?
 2. Describe specific norms, behaviors or attitudes unique to this student?
 3. How do you modify your instruction so that these experiences are incorporated in your curriculum and instruction?
-



**THE SPANISH PROFICIENCY OF HERITAGE LANGUAGE SPEAKERS SEEKING
BILINGUAL EDUCATION TEACHER CERTIFICATION: IMPLICATIONS
FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

Dr. Luis A. Rosado, Professor, University of Texas at Arlington

Carla Amaro-Jiménez and Amanda A. Olsen

Abstract

Since the inception of the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency test of Spanish in 2008, the test has become a significant hurdle for Spanish heritage language speaker (SHLS) and candidates in general seeking EC-6 bilingual education certification in Texas. There is a lack of research that identifies what challenges these teacher candidates face when taking this test, and what changes, if any, Teacher Preparation Programs (TPPs) need to incorporate to improve the performance of teacher candidates (Aquino-Sterling, 2016). Thus, this research study attempts to identify possible reasons for the low student performance at the State level on this test and identify possible changes needed to improve their outcomes. This study analyzed the performance of 90 Latinx teacher candidates, most of which were SHLS, on the BTLPT—Spanish in Texas. Findings revealed that, in addition to language being a challenge for students, completion of one of the writing tasks required knowledge of the state curriculum and lesson planning, further complicating candidates' performance on the test, and raising questions about the validity of the writing section of the instrument. Results from this study suggest that TPPs should reconsider program admission standards to be sure that candidates have the basic Spanish proficiency necessary to be successful in the program. Results also suggest that TPPs should develop individualized programs of study to ensure candidates have (or can) develop the Spanish skills and the field-specific academic vocabulary needed to be successful on this key academic Spanish test for emerging bilingual teacher candidates. Additional suggestions are provided.

Keywords: Heritage language speakers, Bilingual teachers, Spanish proficiency, certification exams, BTLPT, bilingual teacher preparation, academic Spanish, Spanish writing

The Spanish Proficiency of Heritage Language Speakers Seeking Bilingual Education Teacher Certification: Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs

“We must increase the numbers and diversity of teachers in ESL, dual language, and bilingual education. Let’s remind our bilingual students today that they will be the best teachers tomorrow.”
Source: Dr. Miguel Cardona, U.S. Secretary of Education, NABE Conference, February 8, 2022.

Cardona’s (2022) urgent call for more diverse and bilingual teachers echoes the increase in English learners (ELs) across the U.S. over the last ten years. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that in 2019, 10% of the U.S. population were English learners (2022, May). Spanish-speaking ELs accounted for 74.8% of the ELs population (NCES, 2022, May), with the majority living in Texas (19.60%), California (18.6%), and New Mexico (16.5%).

Currently, Texas has the largest number of ELs in the United States. In the 2021-22 academic year, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) reported that 21.7% of the 5,427,370 students attending public school in Texas were Emergent Bilinguals (EB)/English Learners (ELs) and qualified for bilingual or special language services (TEA, 2022). Further, 82.3% of EB/ELs in Texas received some form of bilingual/ESL language instruction, while 13.5% or approximately 73,269 students participated in alternative bilingual or ESL language programs (TEA, 2022). Although these students (13.5%) qualified for English/Spanish bilingual education, there are often not enough bilingual teachers to serve the population (Ryan, 2021).

To address the need for more bilingual teachers, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) approved legislation to allow alternative certification programs (ACP) to expedite the certification of teachers (TEC Chapter 21.049, 2016) and motivate in-service teachers to seek additional certification in bilingual education (TEC §230.105, 2001). However, these options have not been able to solve the teacher shortage in the State. For example, in the academic year 2021-2022, Texas lost 42,839 teachers due to attrition (Landa, 2022). To replace these teachers, the State hired 42,973 new teachers (Landa, 2022). Of the total number of new hires in 2021-2022 academic year, 21% or 9,139 teachers were working with emergency permits or without teacher certification (Landa, 2022). These numbers suggest that the crisis of teachers in Texas is far from over, and many of these uncertified teachers are teaching our special populations, like ELs.

To further exacerbate the teacher preparation process in Texas, the State continues making changes to the teacher certification process. Currently bilingual education elementary teacher candidates take five certification exams—the EC-6 Core Subjects, the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR), the Bilingual Supplemental, the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT) — Spanish, and the new Science of Teaching Reading (STR), added in 2021.

On April 29, 2022, the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) approved additional changes to the certification of EC-12 teachers. They approved a three-year implementation for a performance-based assessment—EdTPA—to replace the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility test (Texas Teacher Classroom Association, 2022). This performance-based subject specific exam appears to be challenging enough to bring new uncertainties to the

certification of teacher candidates in Texas. However, at the time of this writing and perhaps due to the severe shortage of bilingual teachers, the implementation of this new test is on hold.

Among these exams, the Spanish proficiency exam (BTLPT) was shown to be a key hurdle for bilingual education teacher candidates (Arroyo-Romano, 2016; Guerrero, 2003; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2009; Guzmán-Johannessen & Bustamante-López, 2002; Rodríguez & Musanti, 2017). Since its inception in 2008 and through 2014, the passing rate of the BTLPT has hovered between 50% to 60% (Arroyo-Romano, 2016). In the 2017-2018 academic year, 3,510 candidates took the test with a 56% passing rate (Pearson Education, 2020), suggesting that a low passing rate may be typical for the BTLPT—Spanish, thus highlighting the challenge that this test presents to teacher candidates.

Due to the documented challenges of the BTLPT and the importance of understanding Spanish Heritage Language Speakers' (SHLS) performance in the test, the present study sought to investigate elements that may predict the performance of bilingual teacher candidates on the test. We sought to identify which of the four language components of the test—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—teacher candidates struggled the most to pass, with the hope this information can yield reliable data to identify the challenges these candidates face when taking the test. The current study examined the following research questions:

1. Are there statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the listening comprehension, reading comprehension, oral communication, and written communication subscales of the BTLPT—Spanish?
2. Is there a relationship between student demographic characteristics on the listening comprehension, reading comprehension, oral communication, written communication, and the composite score from the BTLPT—Spanish?

In summary, the goal of this study was to identify the challenges that teacher candidates face when taking the test, and based on test results, identify possible programmatic and policy changes to improve the ability of TPPs to prepare bilingual teacher candidates to pass the Spanish certification exam, and increase the pool of bilingual teachers in U.S. public schools.

Background

Preparing and hiring bilingual education teachers is a priority (Ayala, 2016; National Center for Education Statistics, 2022; Ryan, 2021), especially for states like Texas and California, which have the largest percentages of ELs in the Nation. In addition to the continued increase in student enrollment, teacher attrition also played a key role in keeping up with the number of teachers required to serve this student population. For example, between 2013 to 2022, the state of Texas had a teacher attrition rate of over 10%, including 11.55% in 2022 (Landa, 2022), showing how every year the State must replace many teachers, including teachers in high need areas such as bilingual education. In 2021, Texas lost 42,839 teachers due to attrition. The number of teachers required to serve ELs in Texas is more notable when we consider the number of teachers who retire every year as well as the additional teachers needed to serve the natural growth of the EL population. Every year TPPs must recruit Spanish-speaking teacher candidates from the

nation and often from abroad. However, in the last few years the state of Texas has shifted recruitment efforts from abroad to include programs to recruit and prepare local high school students to become teachers in high needs areas like bilingual education (Texas Education Agency, 2021-2023).

Grow Your Own Programs

In a keynote presentation at the NABE conference in New York City, the Secretary of Education, Dr. Miguel Cardona, challenged school districts and TPPs to increase the numbers and diversity of teachers, creating a pipeline from high school to college of former English learners (Els) to prepare them to become the teachers of tomorrow (Cardona, 2022). In Texas, this pipeline has already become a reality. Programs labeled Grow Your Own have emerged in large school districts like Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, and Houston. Shifting recruitment efforts to the local community has been productive in the sense that these teachers have a better understanding of the students they serve. Community-based recruitment efforts may yield positive results given candidates' familiarity with (and understanding of) the community in which they serve. These opportunities may also prove pivotal to recruitment efforts by TPPs as they work to not only diversify the pool of teacher candidates, but also to tap into the communities' funds of knowledge and expertise to prepare more effective bilingual teachers (Texas Education Agency, 2021-2023; Bustos Flores, et al., 2002).

Children who were brought up in Spanish-speaking communities in the United States have unique language and cultural characteristics that make them ideal candidates to serve as bilingual education teachers and professionals. An asset-based perspective places emphasis on the linguistic and cultural resources that they bring, which shapes not only their personal journeys and experiences, but their lives (Tung, 2013). As was briefly discussed earlier, these students may have been born in the U.S., while others may have come the U.S. prior to developing a solid foundation in their native language (Beaudrie et al., 2014). Valdés (2001) labeled these students as Heritage Language Speakers (HLS) and has written about the challenges they may face as they enter fields in which these skills are tested (Valdés, 1989). Specifically, these children were raised in communities where Spanish was used as a means of intragroup communication; thus, they generally have developed a functional proficiency in the language and have developed a special connection to the culture, the community, and their families (Valdés, 2001). Some of these children are "Natural Bilinguals" who have acquired the language spontaneously and inductively through interaction with native speakers in bilingual communities (Valdés, 1989, p. 210). Others have been brought up in monolingual Spanish-speaking communities and were introduced to English in school, eventually developing a level of bilingualism (García, 2011). However, because in school they are often required to embrace and assimilate to the English language and culture (Arroyo-Romano, 2016), many of these students have limited opportunities to develop their first language to satisfy basic cultural and linguistic needs (Carreira, 2009).

Spanish HLS generally develop functional communication skills in the community. These local varieties may be different, however, from those used in school and in textbooks. As a result, when they begin taking formal instruction in Spanish, some may struggle with the language, and

develop the idea that their version is deficient or incorrect (Potowski & Shin, 2018). Rather than continuing to see their already acquired linguistic repertoire as an asset, some HLSs rebel against formal language instruction, and may fail to fully capitalize on the connections between both versions. At the same time, the public school system assesses the performance of students using formal language instruction (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2013; Solano-Flores, 2008), potentially shifting students away from using their local language variety in favor of a more “prestigious” version of the language. However, as has been argued elsewhere (Hopewell & Escamilla, 2013; Solano-Flores, 2008), using only the standard variety of the Spanish language suggests that school systems and testing agencies are not developing an accurate view of our students’ language proficiency, and the assets that their language practices and experiences bring into the educational arena (Gándara & Escamilla, 2017).

In teacher education, a comparable situation exists with the development of Spanish proficiency exams for teacher certification. Many states assess the Spanish proficiency of bilingual teacher candidates based on the principles of the prestigious dialect at the expense of other local linguistic varieties.

It has been documented that HLS face unique challenges, different from students in traditional foreign language instruction and even those in bilingual education programs (Carreira, 2009; Wiley, 2001). Because of the pressure to assimilate to English, HLSs often do not have time to develop an academic version of Spanish in school, resulting in an incomplete acquisition of the language (Monstrul, 2012). Therefore, when they join TPPs, they often rely on English to produce the academic vocabulary needed to function in the formal school environment and to take Spanish exams. Although language transferring is an effective copying strategy (Cummins, 2005), it can result in negative language transfer and the development of an anglicized version of the Spanish language. This anglicized version of Spanish is more noticeable when students attempt to produce the educational and academic language required in teacher education and particularly in Spanish testing. Furthermore, when they try to recall the social Spanish learned as children to communicate in formal settings, this often result in the use non-standard Spanish in their oral and written communications (Rosado, 2005).

Spanish HLSs possess unique linguistic characteristics; some might speak the language fluently, while others simply understand it (Carreira, 2009) and prefer to respond in English. Others may understand and communicate orally, but they have difficulties with reading and writing or may view themselves as bilingual (Arroyo-Romano, 2016), thus, not seeing the importance of taking formal Spanish courses. Despite this lack of formal Spanish instruction, many take the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) (College Board, n.d.) and receive Spanish credits. As a result, they enter TPPs with Spanish credits, but with gaps in the formal components of the Spanish language.

These gaps, as well as the development of testing instruments, have shown to be a challenge for testing agencies. To improve testing practices, the three-leading research associations in the U.S.—American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education—published the Standards for

Educational and Psychological Testing (1999). Standards 7 and 9 specifically emphasize the concept of fairness in testing and best testing practices for special populations, including students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In these standards, these national associations question the value and fairness of testing students in their second language. They argued that these testing conditions can bring “testing irrelevant” components to the process, affecting its ability to assess the intended construct—the Spanish proficiency of the examinees (1999, p. 91). Regarding the testing of HLS, who have been brought up with two languages, Standard 9 questions the implications of using monolingual assessment frameworks to evaluate the separate language development of bilingual learners. Thus, these agencies are fully aware of the challenges of assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students. While the testing standards brought attention to two prominent issues—fairness in testing and testing individuals from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds—the document, unfortunately, presents more questions than concrete solutions. After almost twenty years of the enactment of these testing standards, we are still questioning how to best assess the language proficiency of bilingual students and especially how to assess the Spanish proficiency of HLS seeking certification in bilingual education.

Using monolingual frameworks to assess bilingual HLSs presents serious fairness concerns because researchers have noted that when bilingual teacher candidates take Spanish exams, like the BTLPT, they do not necessarily switch from English to Spanish; instead, they engage their “...full linguistic repertoire...” of languages and experiences to address challenges (García & Kleyn, 2016, p. 14). This strategy can be highly effective for Spanish-English bilinguals due to the cross-linguistic similarities between the two languages. For that reason, bilingual candidates can easily transfer linguistic content and strategies across languages (Elola & Mikulski, 2016). Some of these strategies and even lexical similarities will transfer without problem across languages, but there is always the possibility of negative transfer, including the use of false cognates.

Spanish also has unique features that can result in no transfer or negative transfer. For example, while English requires subject-verb agreement only, Spanish requires a more sophisticated system of agreement in number and gender. Spanish number agreement goes beyond the subject-verb agreement required in English. It requires number agreement among multiple components—the article, noun, adjective, and the verb. Similarly, gender agreement involves the article, noun, and the adjective. These issues pose challenges to teacher candidates when taking the test because they must check not only with the delivery of the intended message but the appropriate agreement of number and gender. Additionally, Spanish requires the use of special orthographic markings not present in English. These unique features are accent marks, the use of the tilde over the n (eñe), dots over the ü (dieresis), and the use of the admiration and interrogation symbols at the beginning and end of utterances (Morris & Rosado, 2013). Because of the complexity of the morphology, the syntactic structure of Spanish, and the gender agreement requirements, HLS struggle with grammar and punctuation challenges in the Spanish language.

Despite the challenges that some Spanish-speaking HLS face in TPPs, they have socio-linguistic experiences and characteristics that place them in a unique position to become bilingual education teachers. First, they are the product of our education system, and some of them were

former English learners (ELs). These experiences can support leveraging their own efforts as they share these experiences, not only with the students they serve, but their families as well. Second, they have gone through an education system where monolingualism and assimilation are still the norm, and despite these challenges, they have managed to maintain their language and culture. As such, they bring myriad cultural and sociolinguistic features that make them ideal bilingual education teacher candidates. TPPs must recognize these funds of knowledge (González et al., 2005; Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992) that HLSs bring to teacher education and use them as the foundation for the development of policy and plans to address the needs of future bilingual education teachers.

Methodology

Setting

This study took place in Texas at a Research I Hispanic-Serving Institution located in a large metropolitan area of 6.3 million people. The university has a student population of approximately 58,000 students, of which 51% identify as undergraduates. The TPP is predominantly a face-to-face program with a small number of courses offered online. In the 2019-2020 year, there were 2,273 students enrolled in the TPP, of whom 909 (40%) were pursuing a bachelor's degree in teacher education, including 90 seeking bilingual education certification. Further, the teacher candidates in this program were diverse, with 1,023 (45%) identifying as students of color, specifically 750 (33%) identified as Hispanic, and 273 (12%) identified as African American.

Participants

The current study involved 90 Hispanic bilingual education teacher candidates who took the BTLPT—Spanish—during their junior or senior year in the program, from 2016 to 2020. Most participants were born in the United States (52%), and 65% identified English as their current primary language. The majority of the participants were first generation college students (91%), single (73%), and transferred from local community colleges (69%). If we take into account the number of US born students (52%) and those who identified English as their primary language (65%), we can estimate that from 52% to 65% of the students were HLS. Other descriptive statistics are provided in Table 1.

Instruments and Data Collection

Two instruments were used to gather data on the participants. The first was a Qualtrics-based questionnaire. This survey had 37 questions and asked participants to provide demographic information (e.g., native language, academic status, age, etc.) as well as information related to their progress towards certification. The second instrument was the BTLPT, a Spanish proficiency exam developed in Texas to assess the Spanish language proficiency of candidates, within the context of education, for the bilingual education teacher certification. The BTLPT follows the integrative-pragmatic principles of language testing (See Valdés, 1989), where examinees complete functional tasks associated with the responsibilities of first-year bilingual education teachers. The test requires examinees to perform job-related tasks using the four basic skills of the language—listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
Composite Score		252.59	19.20	198-287
Listening Comprehension		81.89	9.16	56-97
Reading Comprehension		75.72	12.48	40-100
Oral Comprehension		77.93	13.20	44-98
Written Comprehension		69.93	14.77	28-100
Transfer Status (1=Yes)	69.32			
Marital Status (1=Married)	26.51			
American Born (1=Yes)	51.81			
English Proficiency (1=Proficient)	65.06			
First-Generation College Student (1=Yes)	90.90			
Passed the BTPT (1=Yes)	78.89			
Age Group				
18-24 Years Old	60.71			
25-30 Years Old	25.00			
31 and Older	14.29			

The BTLPT is a certification exam that teacher candidates generally take during their senior year. It includes 84 multiple-choice questions used to assess the first two standards—listening comprehension and reading comprehension. To assess oral communication, the test requires the completion of four tasks—simulated conversation, questions and answers, an oral presentation, and an oral presentation to support an opinion. The written expression task requires the completion of three writing samples—a response to a letter, an essay, and a lesson plan (Pearson Education, 2020). The tests supply prompts to complete the oral and written components of the test. For the lesson plan, the test prompt supplies the topic of the lesson and an aim from the K-6 State curriculum. Based on this information, teacher candidates select the grade level to develop the plan. Teacher candidates have a maximum of 3.5 hours to complete the actual test (Pearson Education, 2020). However, each test subscale has a time limit, and any unused time cannot be used in other sections.

Except for the multiple-choice questions from the listening and reading components, the test assesses the performance of candidates using holistic assessment practices (TEA, 2010). From the global components, the test assessors continue to examine the more specific linguistic components of the responses—pronunciation, vocabulary usage, and grammar. Combining the global and discrete components of the tasks, the examiners produce a comprehensive analysis of the examinees’ performance. The four subscales of the test are scored separately and later they are combined to obtain a composite scale score ranging from 0 to 300, where a score of 240 is required to pass.

Design

To answer research question one, a one-way fixed effect analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. To test the assumptions of an ANOVA, skewness and visual inspections of histograms were used to test for normality and Levene's test was conducted to measure homogeneity of variance, $p < .05$. To account for variance differences, the Games-Howell post-hoc test was applied to investigate group differences (Field, 2013). The effect sizes were measured with partial eta squared (η^2) and interpreted using Cohen's (1988) guidelines where an effect size of 0.2 is small, 0.5 is medium, and 0.8 is large. The independent variable was the exam subscales, specifically listening comprehension, reading comprehension, oral communication, and written communication, while the dependent variable was the exam scores.

To investigate the second research question, five different multiple linear regression models were run. The dependent variables were each of the individual subscales from the BTLPT exam (i.e., listening comprehension, reading comprehension, oral communication, and written communication) and the composite score. The independent variables were student transfer status (transferred or had not transferred), age group (18 – 24 years old, 25 – 30 years old, or 31 years or older), marital status (married or not married), birthplace (U.S. born or not), native language (Spanish, English, or both Spanish and English), employment status (working or not working), first-generation college status (first-generation or not), number of credits earned from taking the CLEP exam (0 credits, 3-6 credits, or 9-12 credits), and whether they passed the BTLPT or not. Both analyses were conducted using R Studio 3.6.3 and the results were considered significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Results

A total of 90 Latinx bilingual teacher candidates took the BTLPT from 2016 to 2020. Seventy-five students passed on the first attempt and 15 failed. Of the 15 who failed, four passed on the second attempt, one passed on the third attempt, and three failed their third attempt. No data were available for the remaining seven students as of the writing of this manuscript. An analysis of the passing rate of students in their first attempt showed that the mean composite scale score of the whole group was 251.59 ($SD = 19.20$) out of a possible 300 points. A detailed analysis of the individual subscales is presented under each of the research questions.

Research Question One: Mean Differences between Subscales

The results from the ANOVA (see Table 2) revealed statistically significant differences between the four subscales—listening comprehension, reading comprehension, oral communication, and written communication—of the BTLPT, $F(3, 360) = 14.19$, $p < .001$, where 11% of the variance in the exam scores were attributed to the BTLPT subscale ($\eta^2 = .11$). Furthermore, results from a Games-Howell post-hoc test revealed students scored statistically significantly higher on the listening comprehension ($M = 81.89$, $SD = 9.16$), oral communication ($M = 77.93$, $SD = 13.20$), and reading comprehension ($M = 75.72$, $SD = 12.48$) exams, compared to the written ($M = 69.93$, $SD = 14.77$) exam, $p < .05$. Students also scored statistically significantly higher on the listening comprehension exam compared to the reading comprehension exam, $p < .05$.

Table 2: ANOVA Games-Howell Posthoc Results

Group	Comparison Group	Mean Difference (Group - Comparison)
Listening	Reading	7.85 (2.17)**
	Oral	3.39 (2.24)
	Written	11.17 (2.50)***
Reading	Listening	-7.85 (2.17)**
	Oral	-4.46 (2.47)
	Written	3.31 (2.71)
Oral	Listening	-3.39 (2.24)
	Reading	4.46 (2.47)
	Written	7.78 (2.76)**
Written	Listening	-11.17 (2.50)**
	Reading	-3.31 (2.71)
	Oral	-7.78 (2.76)**

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Standard deviations are in parentheses.

Research Question 2: Relationship between BTLPT Scales and Student Demographics

When students passed the BTLPT, they were statistically significantly more likely to score higher on their composite score and the four exam individual subscales (listening comprehension, reading comprehension, oral communication, and written communication) compared to students who did not pass the BTLPT, $p < .001$. Further, students who were ages 31 or older scored statistically significantly lower than students between the ages of 18 – 24 for listening comprehension, $p < .05$, although students aged 31 or older scored significantly higher than students aged 18 – 24 on oral communication, $p < .05$. Further, when reading comprehension was the outcome variable, first-generation students scored statistically significantly lower than students who were not first-generation, $p < .01$ and individuals who indicated that English was their native language scored statistically significantly lower than those who reported that Spanish was their first language, $p < .05$. Results also show a statistically significant differences between students born in the United States ($M=248.88$) and student born abroad ($M=257.40$) on their composite score, $p < .05$. These data could possibly suggest that some of the participant who were born in Spanish-speaking countries might have developed stronger Spanish skills and managed to maintain the proficiency needed to pass the Spanish test. However, the age of arrival does not seem to affect the performance of students on the test. Results from an independent sample t-test found no statistically significant results between students who arrived between the ages of 1-5 ($M=247.77$) and those who arrive age 6 and older ($M=261.65$) on the composite score, $p < .05$. For more information, see Table 3.

Table 3: Multiple Regression Results

	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Listening Comprehensio n	Reading Comprehensio n	Oral Comprehensio n	Written Comprehensio n
	Composite Score (Adj R ² = .55)	(Adj R ² = .26)	(Adj R ² = .39)	(Adj R ² = .58)	(Adj R ² = .31)
Intercept	229.26 (6.57)***	78.69 (4.13)***	74.16 (5.30)***	58.11 (4.58)***	50.44 (6.64)***
Transferred 1	-3.60 (3.39)	-1.21 (2.13)	-4.15 (2.74)	2.24 (2.36)	-3.37 (3.43)
Age 25-30 ²	-3.11 (3.61)	-3.14 (2.27)	-1.97 (2.92)	2.66 (2.52)	-3.95 (3.65)
Age 31 or Older ²	-2.85 (4.90)	-7.41 (3.09)*	-1.09 (3.96)	7.25 (3.42)*	-5.08 (4.96)
Married ³	3.66 (3.78)	2.84 (2.38)	4.75 (3.06)	-2.98 (2.64)	3.36 (3.83)
American Born ⁴	0.06 (3.55)	-1.04 (2.23)	-0.31 (2.87)	-0.15 (2.48)	1.77 (3.59)
English Proficient ⁵	4.18 (3.73)	1.93 (2.35)	-1.53 (3.01)	2.57 (2.60)	6.06 (3.77)
First- Generation 6	-3.44 (4.92)	-1.82 (3.10)	-8.67 (3.97)*	-1.87 (3.43)	5.11 (4.98)
Passed BTLPT ⁷	33.59 (3.70)***	8.21 (2.33)***	16.16 (2.99)***	21.65 (2.58)***	17.10 (3.74)***

Notes: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. ¹Did not transfer is the reference group. ²Ages 18-24 is the reference group. ³Not married is the reference group. ⁴Not born in America is the reference group. ⁵Not proficient in English is the reference group. ⁶Not a first-generation student is the reference group. ⁷Did not pass the BTLPT is the reference group. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Discussion

The data presented in Table 3 shows the means of the composite score and each of the subscales. The composite score of the group was 251.59, well above the minimum passing rate—240. This score suggests that students who passed the test had higher than average Spanish language proficiency. The highest mean of the individual subscales of the BTLPT were obtained in areas of listening comprehension (81.59) and oral communication (77.93). These findings were not surprising as most HLSs generally have extensive practice developing these language skills as part of their interactions at home and in the community.

Participants scored the lowest on language skills that require formal school instruction, specifically reading and writing. The mean score from the reading comprehension subscale was 75.72, while the mean score for the written communication subscale was 69.93. These findings support work from Guerrero (1997), specifically that teacher candidates in TPPs were admitted

with limited proficiency in formal language skills or the academic Spanish needed to be successful in the program.

The subscales of written communication and oral communication had the highest standard deviation of the four subscales, while the lowest was for listening comprehension. These data suggest that there were significant differences in the proficiency levels of test-takers in the written and oral communication performances. Conversely, the standard deviation for listening comprehension was 9.16, suggesting that participants scored more homogeneously than in the written and oral components of the test.

Students scored the lowest on the written communication component of the test. This was expected as Spanish requires various levels of agreement in terms of number and gender, including special orthographic markings that can be challenging even for native speakers of the language (Bowles, 2011; Elola & Mikulski, 2016; Montrul et al., 2008). Using orthographic accents are often challenging for students because they need to apply Spanish syllabication rules to identify the main stress of the word. Finding the main stress in Spanish words can be difficult since teacher candidates often use English intonation patterns and syllabication rules to identify the primary stress in Spanish words, often can result in faulty identification. Moreover, mastering rules for applying Spanish accent markings requires a lot of practice to develop the automaticity required to apply them in a test format.

It is still intriguing that participants scored significantly higher on essay writing task than in lesson planning and letter writing. This was an unexpected finding since the length of the essays and criteria for development are traditionally more complex and demanding than the criteria for letter writing and lesson planning. A possible explanation for this finding is that letter writing has become a lost art for this generation, and it has been replaced by email communications. By nature, emails are shorter and generally informal communications. Thus, when teacher candidates are required to prepare a formal letter, they might experience difficulties performing the task.

When developing lesson plans in Spanish, students may experience similar challenges. Currently, most school districts do not require teachers to develop formal lesson plans in Spanish; instead, they require shorter lesson plans written in English. As a result, even teacher candidates with experience as instructional aides in bilingual programs do not have experience developing lesson plans in Spanish, a skill required in the written portion of the BTLPT-Spanish. Therefore, since there is not a standard format for lesson planning, students may more easily get overwhelmed with this task.

In contrast, teacher candidates have extensive experience writing essays. Essay writing is required in multiple courses in traditional TPPs, where candidates can practice with various models used for essay writing. Even though most of the writing is done in English, teacher candidates probably manage to transfer those skills to Spanish writing. This type of experience with essay writing might explain teacher candidates' performance on this section of the exam.

Beyond the obvious challenges of written communication, this subscale may lack validity—the ability to test what it was designed to test. That is, the test was designed to assess the Spanish proficiency of teacher candidates, however, writing a lesson plan in Spanish about a prescribed topic requires knowledge of the K-6 State curriculum—previously assessed in the Core Subject exam. It also requires knowledge in lesson planning, also previously assessed in the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility exam. The candidates may have the Spanish proficiency to write a lesson plan, but if they might be unable to recall PK-6 curriculum content knowledge and/or the steps to develop a lesson plan, and as result, their score may be negatively affected. Using these nonlinguistic elements to assess the linguistic performance of teacher candidates poses a serious challenge to the instrument. This double jeopardy suggests that this written task of the test may have low validity and should be eliminated or redesigned to address validity concerns.

However, while we wait for the state education agency (SEA) and the testing company to acknowledge these validity and fairness concerns, TPPs must adopt measures to examine these fairness concerns and take steps to address them. These steps should include the design or modification of teacher preparation courses where HLSs are exposed to academic Spanish, including pedagogical and content area vocabulary. Further, we recommend that the SEA and testing agencies carefully examine the implications of using monolingual frameworks to assess prospective bilingual teachers and instead develop instruments where bilingual and multilingual populations have a better opportunity to show their true linguistic competence. That is, the Spanish proficiency that bilingual education teachers bring to the classroom goes beyond separate proficiency levels in Spanish and English. They bring different proficiency levels in L1 and L2, but the bulk of their linguistic knowledge is expressed when using both languages to process information and to solve problems. This type of language skills is stored in what Cummins labelled the Common Underlying Proficiency (Cummins, 2005). Further, the communication skills and problem-solving strategies that bilingual people commonly use to communicate (García & Kleyn, 2016), go beyond the demonstrated separate levels of proficiency in L1 and L2. Now, the issue is, how do we measure the total language proficiency that teacher candidates bring to the TPP, using only separate monolingual assessment frameworks?

Recommendations and Implications

The development of academic and pedagogical Spanish language is needed to be successful on the BTLPT—Spanish. Nonetheless, when candidates are admitted to TPPs, most are not ready to meet the “traditionally accepted” level of Spanish proficiency necessary to be successful on this test. Thus, programs often have fewer than two years to ensure that candidates develop the proficiency needed to master specific standards on the test. Consequently, TPPs need to assess their candidates' language proficiency and design a plan of study to counter any language gaps they may face when taking this test. This implies that TPPs must regulate the number of Spanish credits allowed via exam, and potentially require candidates to take additional courses in Spanish to meet needs identified. Additionally, the preparation should emphasize the development of nomenclature and jargon of the profession and the academic language in general (Guerrero, 1997; Guerrero & Guerrero, 2009; Rodríguez & Musanti, 2017). This type of jargon

will help candidates on the whole test, but specifically it will help their performance in the oral communication and the lesson planning component of the written communication, where they are required to use that type of vocabulary. It is also important to provide strategies and practice using discourse patterns expected in oral and written tasks, and the grammar and orthography support needed to improve oral and written communication.

However, language is best mastered when it is used as a medium for instruction, as opposed to teaching the language in isolation. Therefore, TPPs should restructure their plan of study to provide teacher candidates with exposure to authentic academic speech and the academic language used in pedagogy in content-based courses (Arroyo-Romano, 2016; Guerrero, 1997, Guerrero & Guerrero, 2009; Rodríguez & Musanti, 2017). Teacher candidates would also benefit from having direct experience with lesson planning in Spanish to ensure they are prepared for this task, which is a key component of the BTLPT-Spanish. Additionally, securing the use of quality resources, including books and articles, written in academic Spanish, will allow students to increase their exposure to academic writing and vocabulary.

However, even if TPPs manage to implement all suggested changes, there is no guarantee that they will address everyone's needs; thus, successful restructuring of TPPs might require some degree of differentiation to target individual groups gaps (Rodríguez & Musanti, 2017). That is, TPPs should assess the current level of Spanish proficiency of their teacher candidates and design a plan of study to address identified needs of HLS, people who have learned Spanish as a second language, and even native speakers of the language. This plan of study should include taking more courses with the Spanish department to address specific needs, and activities to address language proficiency to proof that they have developed the minimum requirements to pass the test. The implementation of these added program requirements implies that faculty members must go beyond the traditional course requirements to guide teacher candidates to develop the Spanish proficiency to pass the certification exam. Although it is easy to preach about the value of instructional differentiation in public schools, in higher education and in TPPs, these practices are far from becoming a widespread practice.

Finally, it is important to consider expanding this study to include various universities from the State to obtain a more accurate view of the performance of students at the state level. It is also important to consider the possibility of expanding the study to gather data about the K-12 schooling of bilingual teacher candidates and to identify those students that graduated from bilingual, dual or ESL programs to derive implications about the readiness to become candidates for the bilingual education teachers. We recommend comparing the Spanish requirements from TPPs across the state and the performance of their candidates on the Spanish test. These data would supply tangible information about the number and types of Spanish courses and prerequisites to ensure the success of teacher candidates in the Spanish certification exam.

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association
- Arroyo-Romano, J. E. (2016). Bilingual education candidates' challenges meeting the Spanish language/bilingual certification exam and the impact on teacher shortages in the state of Texas, USA. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 15*, 275– 286.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2015.1134539>
- Aquino-Sterling, C. R. (2016). Responding to the call: Developing and assessing pedagogical Spanish competencies in bilingual teacher education. *Bilingual Research Journal, 39*(1), 50-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1139519>
- Ayala, E. M. (2016, September 28). *Texas is desperate for bilingual teachers, so why aren't more answering the call?* Dallas Morning News. <https://bit.ly/2USwsaC>
- Beaudrie, S., Ducar, C., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage language teaching: Research and practice*. McGraw Hill Education.
- Bowles, M. (2011). Exploring the role of modality: L2 heritage learner interactions in Spanish language classroom. *Heritage Language Journal 8*(1), 30-54.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43649899>
- Bustos Flores, B., Keehn, S., & Pérez, B. (2002). Critical need for bilingual education teachers: The potentiality of *normalistas* and paraprofessionals. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(3), 501-524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2002.10162575>
- Cardona, M. (2022, February 8). NABE General Session. [Conference presentation] NABE Conference in New York City, February 8-10, 2022. <http://www.nabe-conference.com/index.html>
- Carreira, M. (2009). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term heritage language learner. African Studies Center. UCLA
<https://international.ucla.edu/africa/article/14647>
- College Board (n.d.) College Level Examination Program (CLEP).
<https://clep.collegeboard.org/>
- Cummins, J. (2005). *Teaching for cross-language transfer in dual language education: Possibilities and pitfalls*. TESOL Symposium on Dual Language Education, Bogazici University, Turkey, September 23. Retrieved from <https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/new-resource-library/symposium-on-dual-language-education-3.pdf>
- Elola, I. & Mikulski, A. M. (2016). Similar and/or different writing processes? A study of Spanish foreign language and heritage language learners. *Hispania 99*(1), 87-102.
www.jstor.org/stable/44112827
- Gándara, P., & Escamilla, K. (2017) Bilingual Education in the United States. In O. García, A. Lin, & May, S. (Eds.) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed., pp. 439-452). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_33
- García, O. (2011) Emergent bilingual and TESOL: What's in the name? *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 322-324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00172.x>

- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.) *Translanguaging with multiple students. Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9-32). Routledge.
- González, N., Moll, L.C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guerrero, M. (1997). Spanish academic language proficiency: The case of bilingual education teachers in the U.S. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(1), 65-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1997.10815602>
- Guerrero, M. (2003). "We have correct English teachers. Why can't we have correct Spanish teachers? It's not acceptable." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(5), 647-668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000142931>
- Guerrero, M., & Guerrero, M. C. (2009). El (sub)desarrollo del español académico entre los maestros bilingües: ¿Una cuestión de poder? [The (sub) development of academic language proficiency: The case of bilingual education teachers: Is this a question of power?]. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 8(1), 55-66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802466795>
- Guzmán Johannessen, B. G., & Bustamante-López, I. (2002) Bilingual academic Spanish proficiency tests: Assessment of bilingual cross-cultural and language and academic development teacher candidates. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(3), 563-574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2002.10162578>
- Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2013). Struggling reader or emerging biliterate student? Reevaluating the criteria for labeling emerging bilingual students as low achieving. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 46(1) 68-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X13504869>
- Landa, J. B. (2022). Employed teacher attrition and new hires 2007-08 through 2021-22. Texas Education Agency PEIMS and SBEC ECOS. <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/employed-teacher-attrition-and-new-hires-jbl220825.pdf>
- Montrul, S. (2012). The grammatical competence of Spanish heritage speakers. In S. M. Beutrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.). *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States* (pp. 101-120). Georgetown University Press.
- Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñan, S. (2008). Gender agreement in second language learners and Spanish heritage speakers: The effects of age and context of acquisition. *Language Learning*, 58(3), 503-553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00449.x>
- Morris, L., & Rosado, L. (2013). Desarrollo del Español para maestros en programas de educación bilingüe. LM Educational Consultant.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2022, May) *English language learners in pschools. The Condition of Education*. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf/english-learners>
- Pearson Education (2020). Texas Educator Examination Program. The BTLPT (TExES 190) https://www.tx.nesinc.com/TestView.aspx?f=HTML_FRAG/TX190_TestPage.html
- Potowski, K., & Shin, N. L. (2018). *Gramática Española: Variación social*. Taylor & Francis.
- Pearson Education Inc. (2019). Texas Educator Certification Examination Program Technical Manual Supplement 2017-2018 Program Year Data. Retrieved from https://www.tx.nesinc.com/content/Docs/2017_18_Technical_Manual_Supplement.pdf

- Rodríguez, A. D., & Musanti, S. (2017) Pre-service bilingual teachers and their Spanish academic language proficiency as measured by the BTLPT: Perceptions and performance. *Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction* 19(1) 2017. <https://bit.ly/35YP3rX>
- Rosado, L. (2005). The language of Cervantes: Alive and well in Texas. *Hispania*, 88(4), 456-469. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20063213>
- Ryan, F. (2021). *2020-2021 Teacher shortage areas and loan forgiveness programs*. Texas Education Agency. <https://bit.ly/3nKGI Dy>
- Solano-Flores, G. (2008). Who is given what tests in what language by whom, when, and where? The need for probabilistic language in the testing of English language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 189-199. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X08319569>
- Texas Teacher Classroom Association (2022), SBEC approved controversial performance assessment certification exam. <https://www.tcta.org/latest-education-news/sbec-poised-to-take-final-action-on-controversial-certification-exam-proposal>
- Texas Education Agency. (2010). Preparation Manual for the 190 Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT). Texas Educators Certification, Austin, Texas. https://ecofp.ate.utsa.edu/pluginfile.php/10592/mod_resource/content/1/190_btlpt_spanih.pdf
- Texas Education Agency. (2017). *Summary Statistics for Total Scores 2016-17*. Texas Educator Certification. <https://bit.ly/2IV3Iet>
- Texas Education Agency. (July 19, 2022). Enrollment in Texas Public Schools 2021-22. Division of Research and Analysis. Office of Governance and Accountability. Austin, Texas. <chromeextension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/enroll-2021-22.pdf>
- Texas Education Agency (July 19, 2022). Texas PK-16 Public Schools Information Resources (TPEIR) Teacher certification statewide by certification program. <https://www.texaseducationinfo.org/ViewReport.aspx>
- Texas Education Agency (2021-2023). Program guidelines 2021-2023 Grow your own grants, cycle 4. Educators Initiatives. <https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/grants/grants-administration/grants-awarded/2021-2023-grow-your-own-grant-program-cycle-4>
- Texas Educator Certification §230.105 Chapter 230 (December 27, 2016, Update). Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter B General Certification Requirements. Issuance of Additional Certificates Based on Examination. chromeextension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2016_12_ch230-two.pdf
- Texas Educator Certification Chapter 21.049 Alternative Certification (April 14, 1, 2001). Subtitle D Educators and School District Employees and Volunteers. <https://codes.findlaw.com/tx/education-code/educ-sect-21-049.html>
- Tung, R. (2013). *Innovations in educational equity for English language learners*. Voices in Urban Education. https://www.ilctr.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/ELL_Shifting-to-an-Asset-Based-Paradigm.pdf
- Valdés, G. (1989). Testing bilingual proficiency for specialized occupations: Issues and implications. In B. R. Gifford (Ed.), *Test policy and test performance: Education, language, and culture. Evaluation in education and human services* (Vol. 23),

- Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-2500-7_10
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, A. Donald, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37-80). The Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems. <https://bit.ly/35UlBwM>
- Vélez-Ibáñez, C., & Greenberg, J. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S.-Mexican households. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 23(4), 313-335. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3195869>
- Wiley, T. G. (2001). On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In J. Peyton, J. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 29-36). The Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems. <https://bit.ly/35UlBwM>



**UNDERSTANDING THE INFLUENCE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ON EDUCATORS**

Jesus J. Villa
Doctoral Candidate
University of Texas at El Paso

Abstract

This qualitative study focuses on the voice of five dual language educators in a school located in the U.S./Mexico border region that has recently expanded the two-way dual language program to the middle school level. This article illustrates the transformation of these educators after taking professional development sessions that helped teachers to better serve the needs of emergent bilingual students in dual language programs by fully understanding the goals of dual language. The professional development sessions were based on the C6 Biliteracy Framework that focuses on Create, Connect, Collaborate, Communicate, Consider, and Commit in order for students to become bilingual and reach grade-level academic achievement. Data collection included classroom observations and individual semi-structured and informal interviews with the cohort of dual language educators. Furthermore, the incorporation of the dual language program in secondary education resulted in counter-hegemonic ideologies from educators that promote bilingualism and empower students' multilingual voice.

Keywords: Dual Language Education, Middle School, Translanguaging, Professional Development

Understanding the Influence of Professional Development on Dual Language Educators

There is a significant increase of emergent bilingual students in the United States school districts. It could represent a challenge for some educators to provide high-quality education for those students with limited English proficiency, especially in an education system designed to promote a monocultural and monolingual perspective of teaching and learning (García et al., 2008; García, Johnson et al., 2017). Historically, in the United States, legal and political actions have favored and promoted remedial and subtractive models of bilingual education. These subtractive models support English-only policies and enhanced English monolingualism (Flores, 2016).

As an alternative to best educate emergent bilingual students in the 21st century and provide equity in education, dual language programs have exponentially grown in numbers across the U.S. in the last decade (Morren López, 2012; Palmer & Martínez, 2013; Ramírez & Faltis, 2020). This research supports dual language programs that show when a student's first language is used, it can result in higher level of academic development (Thomas & Collier, 2019). For that reason, there has been an increase in dual language programs promoting the use of translanguaging pedagogies that allow emergent bilingual students to use their native languages in conjunction, rather than keeping them separate (Ramirez & Ross, 2019). According to Garcia (2009), translanguaging refers to the language practices of bilingual people and the flexible use of their linguistic resources.

Fairclough (2001) illustrated that language use is not neutral because there are social, political, and ideological aspects of language. These ideologies or orientations may surround how an individual talks about language, its issues, and how one language is prioritized over another. For most emergent bilingual students, school represents a place where they must go to acquire the English language, creating a separation between the students' home language and the official school's language of instruction. (Cummins, 2008). By separating students' home language from the official school's language of instruction, the wrong idea is generated that only English is important, and the language of their family and community is unwelcome in school (Valenzuela, 2010). In response to these dominant language ideologies, Ruiz (1984) presents three basic orientations toward language and its role in society; language may be alternatively viewed as a problem, a right, or a resource. Therefore, by viewing language as a resource rather than as a problem, educators can generate a counter-narrative to the dominant deficit perspective present in schools.

In order to successfully incorporate dual language programs and translanguaging pedagogies to the benefit of emergent bilinguals, appropriate teacher preparation and certification in bilingual education is crucial (Boyle et al., 2015; Ramos et al., 2013). In their study, Menken and Solorza (2015) show that principals who did not receive formal preparation in bilingual education demonstrated misconceptions and limited understanding of bilingualism. On the other hand, principals who received proper bilingual education preparation were well prepared to serve emergent bilingual students and prioritize the students' academic needs, demonstrating the importance of specialized preparation to successfully educate emergent bilingual students. Due

to the importance of specialized preparation in bilingual education, this study discusses the C6 Biliteracy Framework. The C6 framework focuses on lesson planning through an equity lens. It challenges the status quo and ideologies from a school system centered on whiteness, heteronormative ideologies, and monolingualism to a school system that values linguistic diversity inclusivity and promotes a culture of educational equity.

The purpose of this research is to illustrate how middle school dual language teachers view dual language and the use of translanguaging pedagogies after taking professional development sessions on the C6 Biliteracy Framework. The C6 Biliteracy Framework was conceptualized to ensure that dual language teachers can lesson plan via an equity and social justice lens, helping school districts in their effort to generate a more equitable education (Medina & Izquierdo, 2021). For that reason, each educator in this study received the corresponding training on each of the C6 framework components: create, connect, collaborate, communicate, consider, and commit. The C6 framework is a tool for lesson planning through a critical consciousness lens. Critical consciousness was developed by Paulo Freire and refers to the awareness of inequalities and systems of oppression and the commitment of the oppressed against these systems (Freire, 2021).

There were two main findings in this study. First, the C6 professional development impacted the participants' teaching ideologies and practices. The results show that teachers with proper preparation to educate emergent bilinguals have fewer misconceptions regarding bilingual education and are more likely to use translanguaging practices. Second, the study also showed the positive academic effects of using translanguaging in the classroom. Even if the body of empirical studies that explored teachers' language practices and ideologies in the field of dual language has grown over time, more work still needs to be done to understand how teachers' ideologies regarding translanguaging can generate equity and social justice in education (Briceño, 2018; Henderson & Palmer, 2015; Martínez et al., 2015).

The study identified how to generate equity in our classrooms from a social justice lens. Especially to the vulnerable group composed of emergent bilinguals that are most vulnerable or at risk of disparities and often encounter challenges in receiving quality and equitable education. The study contributes to the body of research on bilingual education by examining how middle school dual language teachers view dual language and the use of translanguaging pedagogies after taking professional development sessions on the C6 Biliteracy Framework. The results of this study are intended to inform policymakers, educational institutions, and teacher education programs by capturing the challenges, barriers, and successes of dual language and translanguaging pedagogies at the middle school level.

Theoretical framework

The study uses a social justice theoretical framework. In general, social justice refers to a commitment to challenging social, cultural, and economic inequalities imposed on individuals from different distributions of power, resources, and privilege. For that reason, social justice in education enables students' voices to read the word and the world (Freire & Macedo, 2005). The

use of translanguaging in education is itself a socially just act (García et al., 2017). The reason is that it shifts the discourse from a deficit model to an additive model, releasing students' voices and generating a space for their language practices and experiences, not only the ones of the dominant group in the school (García & Wei 2014). Translanguaging theories challenge and critique dominant language ideologies that portray those practices as deficient, as illustrated in the study of Hamm (2018). Incorporating dual language programs and translanguaging pedagogies in secondary education is essential as an alternative to the traditional English-only structural models that systematically undermine and oppress the use of language of emergent bilingual students.

Methods

Context

This qualitative research study took place in a Title 1 middle school located in the U.S./Mexico border region. The middle school has a large concentration of low-income students, of which 51% of the population is eligible for free lunch, and 14% is eligible for reduced lunch. The minority enrollment of the school is 94% of the student body, with 92% Hispanic and 2% Black or African American. Dual language programs have been implemented for several years at the elementary level in the school district with positive academic outcomes. According to the district Title III lead teacher, at the elementary level, students in the dual language program have been making academic gains on state exams, Reading increased from 59 to 62, Math from 65 to 78, and Science from 61 to 65 in approaching grade levels. However, at the middle school level, the dual language program is in the initial stage, and academic outcomes are still not visible. One reason is that the 2021-2022 school year was the second year the dual language program was implemented in the middle school where the study was conducted. The school implements a 50/50 model by offering four classes in English and four classes in Spanish; for example, Science, History, and a Technology elective can be provided in Spanish; meanwhile, Mathematics, English Language Arts, and other electives can be provided in English.

Participants

Participants were recruited via a purposive or purposeful sampling method which is widely utilized in qualitative studies. As illustrated by Merriam and Tisdell (2015), purposive sampling is a nonprobability sampling technique in which the researcher has an establish criteria to choose members of a specific population to participate in the study. The criteria used to select participants in this study was that the participants should be middle school teachers involved in the dual language program, and have received training by the school district to appropriately serve students who participate in the dual language program.

The recruitment process was via email after receiving Institutional Review Board approval. Additionally, five middle school educators involved in the dual language program in this Title 1 middle school who received appropriate professional development sessions for dual-language education were invited to participate. Some of the professional development sessions offered by the school district were the following: Content, Language and Culture, Cross-Linguistic Work, Differentiated Instruction, and Assessments and Socio-Cultural Competence.

These sessions were based on the C6 Biliteracy Framework, which is an equity-driven framework conceptualized to serve both the academic and emotional needs of students in dual language classrooms.

The group was composed of five educators, three were women, and two were men with different backgrounds, years of experience, and education levels. Each participant teaches a different content area and has different roles in the school and within the district. However, even if none of them had previous experience teaching dual language at the middle school level, they all understand the impact of dual language on students. They all believe that students will benefit from the continuity of the program that was established at the elementary level. For that reason, they all helped to form the dual language program implemented at the time this study took place.

Data Collection and Analysis

This study used qualitative approaches because a qualitative approach seeks to discover and interpret how people construct meaning out of specific situations in their lives (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Therefore, this is the best approach for this study because it aims to better understand middle school teachers' current attitudes and perceptions toward implementing dual language programs and the use of translanguaging to empower students. The end of this study pursues the following research questions: 1) How do middle school teachers perceive dual language after professional development sessions on asset-based views of students' language and culture? 2) What understanding do middle school teachers have of translanguaging after professional development? 3) How do middle school dual language educators perceive that dual language programs and/or translanguaging empower students' multicultural identities and generate equity in education?

In order to answer the research questions, this study involved five classroom observations and five formal individual interviews as the primary data collection method. Between the months of August and October of 2021, the researcher observed five dual language teachers during instructional time for one class period that lasted approximately 45 minutes, and field notes were taken during each class observation. Data was also collected during conversations at three dual language Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings with middle school dual language teachers, the middle school Language Proficiency Assessment Committee aide, the school assistant principal, and the district Title III lead teacher. The dual language PLC meetings created a space for informal interviews and conversations with the different members of the dual language program and provided insight regarding instruction and curriculum decisions, and served to clarify misconceptions.

Formal individual interviews were then scheduled with the teachers. These interviews were semi-structured in nature and were specifically designed for this study, allowing them to provide feedback about their expressed attitudes and perceptions regarding the dual language program implemented in their middle school. Meanwhile, classroom observations allowed the researcher to see and record how aligned the data from the interview was to actual practice. It allowed the researcher to observe how these teachers interacted with students in a dual language classroom, and how the teachers created a more inclusive classroom environment by

implementing translanguaging and allowing students to make use of their full linguistic repertoire. Data sources in this study included field notes and transcripts of video-recorded interviews. Data analysis used open coding to break down the data to identify initial codes, and finally, focused coding was used to create a finalized set of codes and categories.

Findings

The purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of a group of middle school educators who recently started implementing a dual language program in their middle school. In addition, the study aims to understand how these educators see the use of translanguaging pedagogies to empower students both academically and culturally and generate more equitable educational practices. Different themes emerged in analyzing participants' answers from formal and informal interviews, allowing the researcher to organize data by research question and theme.

Research Question 1

1) How do middle school teachers perceive dual language after different professional development sessions on asset-based views of students' language and culture? Research question one focused on how the C6 professional development impacted teachers' perceptions of dual language and its recent implementation in their middle school. The following themes emerged: knowledge about dual language after professional development, perception of dual language, changes in teaching practices, and expectations and challenges implementing the dual language program. The five educators mentioned that they all benefited from the C6 professional development sessions provided by the school district. The professional development reinforced their knowledge of bilingual education, and after the sessions, they had a clear understanding of the dual language program and felt more prepared to serve emergent bilingual students. All of them have a similar concept of dual language, but at the same time, it varies depending on their personal experiences and background. Regarding the impact and changes in their teaching practices, most educators reported that they modified their teaching practices, increasing their confidence in teaching dual language. Their teaching moved away from a monocultural lens that privileges the dominant language to a lens more culturally responsive to students' culture and language.

In the last theme, regarding expectations and challenges, the participants acknowledge similar challenges that need to be addressed for the program to be successful in middle school. The first challenge shared by the participants during the interviews is the need for more teachers. The reason is that as the dual language program continues to develop and increase, the need for more capacitated teachers is clearly evident. According to the research participants, there is also a need for resources designed specifically for the dual language program, especially educational videos. Not just the translation of the English version of the content material, but resources and even a curriculum designed with the needs of dual language students and emergent bilinguals in mind. Finally, the last challenge expressed during the interviews with the participants is related to the program structure and organization that best cover the needs of students in middle school.

Some of the research participants believe that it would be easier and less confusing for the students in the dual language program who are transitioning from elementary to middle school to follow the same structure and organization they were accustomed to during the previous school years. Therefore, if the dual language program successfully grows and expands to the high school level, it should follow the same structure and organization that students have already known since elementary. However, other participants disagree, arguing that middle school is different from elementary school. For example, in elementary school, students have a single teacher for the most part of the day, but at the middle school level, students have a different teacher for each content area, and students have to move from classroom to classroom. Therefore, since students must get used to a new school setting, this transition from 5th to 6th grade is perfect for changing the dual language program's implementation and organization.

Despite the challenges the research participants are facing, all the research participants agree that the dual language program will be successful at the middle school level, and in the future, the program will expand for the students at the high school level. The study found that after taking the C6 professional development, the research participants learned more about dual language education, and the research participants felt more prepared to serve emergent bilingual students. The study also found that the research participants expressed perspectives that privileged bilingualism. All the research participants see the dual language program's potential and the academic implications for emergent bilingual students. Table 1 below presents quotes from the research participants that complements the findings in this study.

Research Question 2

2) What understanding do middle school teachers have of translanguaging after professional development? Research question two focused on how educators understand translanguaging and how they think it can be implemented in different classrooms at the middle school level to support emergent bilingual students. The following themes emerged: knowledge about translanguaging after professional development, perception of translanguaging, and use of translanguaging. The first theme illustrated that most of the research participants admitted that they learned more about translanguaging practices and how to implement them in their classrooms to move from a subtractive model of education to a more additive one. The research participants agreed that after the professional development, they understand the potential of translanguaging to help students generate a deeper understanding.

Concerning the second theme, perception of translanguaging, most of the research participants perceive the use of translanguaging in their classroom as something positive that can benefit and prepare students academically. However, some of the research participants also showed concerns and doubts because some of the students must take the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) in English. Also, depending on the grade level and content area, students need to take the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) test in English. For that reason, some of the research participants are unsure if the use of translanguaging would benefit students in the long term, especially if students are required to take standardized state assessments in English.

The research participants' perception was reflected in the last theme, "use of translanguaging." The last theme reveals that even if all research participants agreed that translanguaging is an effective tool, not everyone would use it outside of the dual language class. Two of the research participants mentioned that they would not use translanguaging for any of their other monolingual classes. One of the research participants commented that he would use translanguaging only if he saw it necessary to teach the content in a way that the students could understand. The other two research participants mentioned that they already use translanguaging in their monolingual classes. Table 2 below presents quotes from the research participants that complements the findings in this study.

Research Question 3

3) How do middle school dual language educators perceive that dual language programs and/or translanguaging empower students' multicultural identities and generate equity in education? Research question three focused on dual language educators' ideologies and perceptions regarding the impact of two-way dual language programs and translanguaging on emergent bilingual students. The following themes emerged from the coding process: translanguaging as an empowerment tool on the classroom level, middle school level, and community level. The findings in this study show that all five research participants believed that translanguaging could empower students on multiple levels, not just on the classroom level but also on the family and community levels. Out of the five research participants, four of them expressed their belief that dual language and translanguaging can improve students' confidence and improve peer relationships in their classrooms.

During the interviews, only two research participants shared the impact of language practices on the middle school level. The research participants shared how dual language education and translanguaging practices open the opportunity to interact with students from different languages, backgrounds, and cultures. As a result, both groups of students, emergent bilingual and native speaker students who participate in the dual language program can create relationships and increase their social circle. According to the research participants, interactions of emergent bilingual students with English native speakers produced by translanguaging can boost their confidence and improve their academic performance. However, the benefits of the dual language program go beyond academics and can impact the field of sports. According to one of the research participants, translanguaging practices can improve students' athletic performance, generating a sense of unity in the team.

Concerning the community level, all five educators agreed that dual language and translanguaging generate a positive impact in their community. According to the research participants, the act of expanding the dual language program to the middle school benefits the community by increasing parental involvement and participation, generating a sense of unity among students, parents, and the community. Also, the research participants shared their belief that the dual language program can prepare students professionally by providing them with the skills they need to find success both academically and in life. According to the research participants, dual language education helps students to find the appropriate mindset in order for them to open the door for future good job opportunities and not conform to the stereotypical

Latino minimum wage jobs. Table 3 below presents quotes from the research participants that complements the findings in this study.

In this study, all research participants shared the importance of implementing a dual language program at the middle school level to promote bilingualism and challenge colonial and monolingual norms in the classroom. Those types of practices, in a way, force the emergent bilingual students to forget their cultures, traditions, and language and adapt to the hegemonic culture and language. The C6 professional development helped the research participants clearly understand the goals of dual language education and improve their teaching practices to serve the academic needs of emergent bilingual students. The research participants shared their experiences and the challenges of teaching dual language and using translanguaging at the middle school level. The research participants also shared ideas of how they think the dual language program can be improved. Upon closer examination, all research participants have high expectations of the dual language program and agree that it will be successful at the middle school level over time. Also, the research participants see potential in the dual language program and believe that one day it will expand to the high school level.

Translanguaging can help educators meet the academic needs of the culturally and linguistically diverse students they serve. Translanguaging moves additive bilingualism to a deeper understanding of how emergent bilingual students use one unitary meaning-making system to produce language (García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging is tied to social justice practices because it interrupts monolingual pedagogies, ideologies, and education policies that systematically repress marginalized groups of students (Canagarajah, 2009; Garcia, 2009; García et al., 2008). Based on the research findings, the research participants understood that translanguaging can be used as an instrument to empower emergent bilingual students both academically and culturally and generate more equitable educational practices. Translanguaging and bilingual education can help students boost their self-esteem and confidence by allowing them to communicate in two or more languages. Also, it can help improve the students' relationships by enabling them to expand their social group, opening the opportunity to be able to socialize with dual language and monolingual students.

Conclusion

This qualitative study found that educators who receive formal dual language training are better prepared to serve students in the dual language program and are more willing to use translanguaging in their classroom. The findings mentioned above resonate with the information shared by Menken and Solorza (2015), who explained how crucial appropriate bilingual education preparation is to the continuity and success of bilingual programs such as dual language programs. All research participants in this study shared how the C6 professional development impacted their teaching ideologies and practices. Even if the research participants face challenges in their dual language program, they also believe that it would be successful at middle school. Some of the difficulties mentioned by the research participants include the lack of resources for dual language and the lack of time to prepare the lesson plans that promote bilingualism. The research participants also see the need for more dual language teachers as the program continues growing

and the need to develop a specific curriculum for dual language at the middle school level since elementary and middle school are very different from each other. The study also confirmed that the research participants believe that the use of translanguaging can empower students both academically and culturally and shared how translanguaging can be implemented outside of the dual language classroom in order to challenge monolingual ideologies.

The primary suggestion based on the research findings to support the continuity of the programs would be the need for a curriculum exclusively designed for dual language at the middle school level. Also, the research participants expressed the need for educational videos, textbooks, novels, and digital learning resources based on the academic needs of students who participate in the dual language program, not just a translation of English resources. Finally, dual language teachers need to be better prepared to serve emergent bilingual students and to create lessons that dismantle systems of oppression; therefore, this study recommends professional development in bilingual education. Professional development such as the C6 training mentioned in this study should be available for all teachers and not just for those in the dual language program. Opening bilingual education professional development to all teachers could inform teachers within the same campus where the dual language program is being implemented. Dual language education demands intentional and systematic planning to achieve its primary goal of equally preparing students to succeed in school and in their life. When educators understand the principles and pillars of bilingual education, dual language programs are more likely to endure and succeed.

Limitations

The limitation section addresses how the study methodology and the sample group selected could vary in another study, even when appropriate measures were used to increase the validity and reliability of the research (Creswell & Poth, 2016). The results of this study are limited to understanding the perception of relatively new dual language teachers in one middle school located in the U.S./Mexico border region. Also, a small number of dual language teachers participated in this study and shared their beliefs and experiences related to dual language and translanguaging, and how these practices can empower students academically and culturally.

References

- Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. Office of English Language Acquisition, US Department of Education. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED601041>
- Briceño, A. (2018). “En español esa palabra no tiene ningún sentido”: A cross-case analysis of three mexican american dual language teachers’ language ideologies and instructional differences. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 12(4), 288-301. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2018.1470436>
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). The plurilingual tradition and the English language in South Asia. *AILA Review*, 22(1), 5-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.22.02can>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. United States: SAGE Publications.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol.10, pp. 1528–1538). Boston, MA: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_116
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods* (pp. 25–38). United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 13-38. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616482>
- Freire, P. (2005). *Education for Critical Consciousness*. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203986103>
- García, O. (2009). Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty & M. Panda (Ed.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education* (pp. 140-158). Bristol, UK; Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., Seltzer, K., & Valdés, G. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J. A., & Falchi, L. (2008). From English Language Learners to Emergent Bilinguals. *Equity Matters*. (Research Review No. 1). Columbia University. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED524002>
- García O., & Wei L. (2014) Language, Bilingualism and Education. In C. Espinosa et al. (Eds.), *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education* (pp. 46-62). London: Palgrave Pivot. doi: 10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Hamm, J. (2018). Translanguaged paideia seminars: Empowering emergent bilingual learners' voices. *Dialogues: An Interdisciplinary Journal of English Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 28-69. doi: 10.30617/dialogues.2.1.4

- Henderson, K. I., & Palmer, D. K. (2015). Teacher and student language practices and ideologies in a third-grade two-Way Dual Language Program Implementation. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(2), 75–92. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2015.1016827>
- Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 26-42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.977712>
- Medina, J., & Izquierdo, E. (2021). Equity commitment in large scale dual language bilingual education. *Multilingual Educator*, 12, 6-10. Retrieved from https://www.gocabe.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/ME_2021-FINAL.pdf
- Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2015). Principals as linchpins in bilingual education: The need for prepared school leaders. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(6), 676-697. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.937390>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). United States: John Wiley & Sons.
- Morren López, M. (2012). Children’s language ideologies in a first-grade dual-language class. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 12(2), 176–201. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798411417077>
- Palmer, D., & Martínez, R. A. (2013). Teacher Agency in Bilingual Spaces: A Fresh Look at Preparing Teachers to Educate Latina/o Bilingual Children. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 269–297. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12463556>
- Ramírez, P. C., & Faltis, C. J. (2020). *Dual Language Education in the US: Rethinking Pedagogy, Curricula, and Teacher Education to Support Dual Language Learning for All*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.
- Ramirez, P., & Ross, L. (2019). Secondary dual-language learners and emerging pedagogies: The intersectionality of language, culture, and community. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 176-184. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569399>
- Ramos, F., Dwyer, E., Pérez-Prado, A. (2013). Improving the preparation of teachers wishing to work in two-way bilingual education programs: Listening to the practitioners. In Proceedings of the BilngLatAm 2004 First International Symposium about Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in Latin America (pp. 257–267). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1045&context=sferc>
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning, *NABE Journal*, 8:2, 15-34, doi: 10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464
- Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (2019). Dual language education for all. In D. DeMatthews & E. Izquierdo (Eds.). *Dual language education: Teaching and leading in two languages* (pp. 91-105). New York: Springer.
- Valenzuela, A. (2010). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S. - Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. United States: State University of New York Press.



**A DUOETHNOGRAPHY: PREPARING PRESERVICE TEACHERS TO USE
CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY SUSTAINING PEDAGOGIES**

Dr. Gina L. Garza-Reyna
Associate Professor, Teacher and Bilingual Education
Texas A&M University - Kingsville

Dr. Zulmaris Diaz
Professor and Director of Field Experiences, College of Education and P-16 Integration
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Abstract

This duoethnography explored a two-part research question: What impact, if any, does our teaching have on our students' development of socio-cultural competence? To what extent, if any, can our students design instruction that includes culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies (CLSP)? Data sources for this study were us, two university professors, and artifacts created by our students in our undergraduate bilingual education classes. Using an adapted rubric focused on CLSP, the professors explored the preservice teachers' competence in: (1) addressing academic success, (2) maintaining cultural and linguistic competence, and (3) challenging institutional barriers/status quo. While the preservice teachers displayed some difficulty in the first two areas, they did poorly on the third. Based on results, ideas on how to redesign instruction focused on CLSP for preservice bilingual teachers in educator preparation programs are presented.

Keywords: preservice teachers, duoethnography, culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies, bilingual education

A DUOETHNOGRAPHY: PREPARING PRESERVICE TEACHERS TO USE CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY SUSTAINING PEDAGOGIES

Introduction

The number of English Learners (ELs) continues to increase at exponential numbers. In 2017, an estimated 5 million children across the nation were identified as ELs and enrolled in the PK-12 system (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022). There is no argument that ELs have unique linguistic, academic, and affective needs that must be met through their daily instruction. While emphasis has traditionally been placed in these areas, an additional emphasis has begun to be placed on the socio-cultural development of ELs as well. By developing socio-cultural competence in EL students, each is given the opportunity to learn about their individual identity/culture and how they intersect with others (National Association for the Education of Young Children, 2021).

For children to develop this area, teachers need to be ready to design effective instruction. In the state of Texas, a restructuring of the bilingual teacher standards recently took place to ensure that teachers are effectively prepared to teach the ELs in their charge. The new standards now emphasize that teachers should not only possess socio-cultural competence but be able to design activities that specifically promote the English Learners' bilingual and bicultural identity through culturally and linguistically responsive activities (Texas Administrative Code, 2020).

As university professors preparing bilingual teacher candidates, we found that the implementation of the new standards presented us the chance to reflect and critically analyze how our current practices in the university classroom were preparing our preservice teachers to measure up to the demands of the state. In particular, we were presented with the opportunity to look at how we prepared the preservice teachers to deliver culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy (CLRP) through their lessons. CLRP has been part of our curricula for some time. We cover the topics through formal readings and lecture with classroom discussions integrated into them. However, even with including it as part of our coursework, we couldn't help but wonder if what we were doing was enough to make sure our preservice teachers would measure up to the new state standards. Thus, our two-part research question was created: What impact, if any, does our teaching have on our students' development of socio-cultural competence? To what extent, if any, can our students design instruction that includes culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies (CLSP)? Using a duoethnography approach we attempted to answer these two questions.

From Culturally Responsive Teaching to Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Pedagogies

According to Irvine & Armento (2000), most of the curricula used in U.S. public schools favor White histories, culture, and knowledge, resulting in an alleged "achievement gap" between White middle-class students and their minoritized peers. When the history, culture, and knowledge of minoritized groups are ignored so are their funds of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). Moll and González (1994) define funds of knowledge as historically

accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge that are embedded in the daily practices and routines of families. In essence, funds of knowledge are the students' capital and should be tapped into during content area lessons, not overlooked.

Ladson-Billings (1995), like Moll and Gonzalez (1994), focuses on the cultural capital of minoritized students and coined culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP). CRP serves as a reminder to advocate for the recognition of students' funds of knowledge because of the critical role they play in acquiring academic content (Howard & Rodriguez-Minkoff, 2017). CRP grounds itself with pillars that focus on making sure students: (1) experience academic success, (2) develop and maintain cultural competence, and (3) also develop a critical consciousness that challenges the current status quo of the social order (Ladson-Billings, 1995a).

It is imperative that schools engage in culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) because it encourages minoritized students to maintain their cultural integrity while succeeding academically (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). Through CRP, educators are urged to recognize that all students come to school with a wealth of knowledge and experiences that, when affirmed and supported, promote students' success. Moreover, Paris & Alim's (2017) have proposed Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies (CSP) and have pushed educators to not only recognize minoritized students' cultural wealth, but to legitimize the rich and varied knowledge and linguistic practices they possess. More specifically, CSP "seeks to sustain linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of schooling for positive social transformation" (Paris & Alim, 2017, p. 1). Even though CSP takes into consideration the linguistic wealth of minoritized students, for the purpose of this article, we will refer to CSP as Culturally and Linguistic Sustaining Pedagogies (CLSP). We are adding the term linguistic to highlight the importance of taking into consideration students' linguistic assets, especially students whose first language is not English.

CLSP goes beyond what CRP requires; it calls for the de-centering of Whiteness and encourages a permanent presence of the communities who have been and continue to be damaged and erased through schooling (Paris & Alim, 2017). In order for this to happen though, it is necessary to change the way preservice teachers are being prepared and commit to creating CLSP educators that can do the following: (1) center their pedagogical practices on multiculturalism and multilingualism; (2) emphasize racial, cultural and social justice; (3) focus on the heritage and community practices of minoritized students instead of White middle-class expectations; and (4) empower young people to critique institutional racial barriers that have discouraged and continue to prevent the academic success of minoritized students (Kinloch, 2017). However, to prepare this type of teacher candidate, teacher educators working in educator preparation programs must examine their own realities and acknowledge how power and privilege have extended advantages to certain groups and disadvantages to others.

Preparing Teachers for Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Pedagogies

Others have begun to examine and reflect on the preparation of pre-service teachers for today's diverse classrooms and the results of their studies bring to light the strengths and weaknesses in how we prepare our future teachers. For example, according to Allen, Hancock, Starker-Glass and Lewis (2017), too often pre-service teachers are not prepared because they

never learn to disrupt deficit positionalities nor examine the sociohistorical and sociocontemporary contexts in which they teach. Which is why the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (Chu and Garcia, 2014; Fitchett, Starker, and Salyers, 2012; Siwatu, 2007) has been used in many studies related to this topic. The scale measures participants' knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy on the topic of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). The above aforementioned studies found that participants felt prepared in making students feel valued, but less confident about engaging students in culturally diverse content.

In addition, Cruz, Manchanda, Firestone, and Rodl (2020) conducted a survey among 245 pre-service and practicing teachers to measure their self-efficacy in delivering culturally responsive teaching. They found that the participants felt more confident on items related to curriculum and instruction, but less confident in topics such as: (1) cultural knowledge, (2) validating students' culture and (3) using cultural contributions for curricular purposes.

While most of the literature on the preparation of pre-service teachers regarding the conceptualization and enactment of CLSP has focused on White pre-service teachers (Flynn, 2015; Sleeter, 2001, 2017; Whiting & Cutri, 2015), the past decade has seen an increase in studies that specifically investigate the preparation of minority teachers. For example, Jackson (2015) investigated how candidates of color enrolled in a teacher education program in a predominantly White institution felt about their preparation to implement CLSP. Results demonstrated that the candidates felt insufficiently prepared due to the colorblind approach used by the program. In contrast, Gist (2017) reported that incorporating CLSP oriented content in conjunction with in-class activities were effective in preparing minority teachers to understand and plan lessons with CLSP. These studies demonstrate the importance of a continuous and systemic inclusion of CLSP content along with strategically planned experiences in order to prepare pre-service teachers that feel confident implementing CLSP. Moreso, it is important to continue to grow studies in this area so that they can serve as resources to better prepare pre-service teachers from majority and minority backgrounds.

Method

As researchers and practitioners in the field of Bilingual Education, we not only seek information to better our practices, but also acknowledge that we have a story to tell. It is for this reason that we opted to conduct a duoethnography study (Chang, Hernandez, & Ngunjiri, 2012; Ellis & Bochner, 2011). Duoethnographies involve the sharing of personal narratives by more than one person who share experiences on a common happening (Pinner, 2018; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018). As researchers, a duoethnography allowed us versatility in research design and access to larger amounts of data sources to analyze, thus resulting in a richer understanding on the research topic (Chang, Hernandez, & Ngunjiri, 2012; Docherty-Skippen & Beattle, 2018).

To conduct this research, we assumed the role of researcher and participant to analyze the effectiveness of our classroom practices, particularly those geared toward teaching our preservice teachers about CLSP. While we reflect on the effectiveness of our work as Bilingual Education

practitioners through this research, we also hope to extend the conversation among those that also prepare preservice Bilingual teachers to enter classrooms armed with highly effective practices that respect and sustain the language and culture each child brings into the classroom.

Background

The Professors

Critical pieces of duoethnography research are the researchers themselves. It is for this reason that we share our backgrounds with you, the reader. We are two Latina university professors, each with more than 10 years of experience preparing Bilingual teacher candidates at different universities in South Texas. Researcher 1 is a native Spanish speaker, formally educated in the language through 12th grade. Researcher 2 a heritage language learner of Spanish formally educated in English through 12th grade, with formal study in the Spanish language once enrolled in undergraduate and graduate level courses at the university. Although our linguistic and educational backgrounds differ vastly, the scope of our work as professors of Bilingual Education is the same--to prepare our preservice teachers so that they can master theory and best practices on teaching English learners (ELs), including the use of CLSP.

The Students

Texas is in high need of teaching candidates that have working knowledge on CLSP and other effective methods and strategies for engaging the 1.1 million ELs in the state (Texas Education Agency, 2021). The population of students we serve at our universities work toward filling the classrooms needed to serve this population. Most of the preservice teachers we prepare are heritage language learners. By definition, a heritage language learner is a student who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English (Valdés, 2000). The students in our classes are all seniors. Between the two classes, we examined the work of 38 students (34 females and 4 males). All the students were Latinos. Of the 38 students, 29 were between the ages of 20-30, and 9 were between the ages of 30-40.

All students in our classes were pursuing Bilingual certification in the state of Texas. In order to become certified, the students must pass a series of five state exams. One exam is administered in Spanish to verify fluency in all language domains. To help the preservice teachers prepare not just for the state exams, but also for the classroom, we teach part of our coursework in Spanish. This is done so that our students can practice the Spanish language at an “academic” level. In addition, the Spanish coursework also serves as a model of the CLSP that should be used with their future students.

Data Sources

The data for this study came from various sources (Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018; Wall, 2008) and was completed by the students while they were enrolled in one of our courses. They were: (1) children’s books authored by the preservice students and (2) content area lesson plans written by the students for various content areas. Data sources that came from us, the researchers,

were recorded conversations of ourselves reviewing the data and having discussions over our reflections of teaching the preservice teachers. Data for this study was concurrently gathered (Chang, Hernandez, & Ngunjiri, 2012) and grouped into two broad categories: (1) Data from Students and (2) Data from Professors (see Table 1). It was important for us to not just use self-data, but also incorporate data sources from our students to add variety and strengthen data analysis and reflection (Chang, 2008).

Table 1: Description of Data Sources

Data Source from Students	Description
Children's Book	This assignment gave the preservice teachers the opportunity to create an authentic children's book. The preservice teachers picked a topic that they believed was culturally relevant, based on their background knowledge. They were asked to write an original manuscript on the topic. Students are responsible not just for the script, but also for the illustrations that accompany the text. This assignment was completed in groups.
Lesson Plans	Students were given the opportunity to create a series of lesson plans that integrated CLSP. Lesson plans were written for the following content areas: (1) language arts, (2) mathematics, (3) social studies, and (4) science.
<hr/> Data Sources from the Researchers <hr/>	
Recorded Conversations	The researchers recorded meetings where they discussed and shared their data and experiences. This was done to allow for further discussion on recurrent patterns that were observed from the data in addition to common experiences/themes encounter with the preservice teachers as content was delivered in the classes.

Instrument

The instrument used to analyze the data collected from students is an adaptation of Aguirre and del Rosario Zavala's (2013) Culturally Responsive Mathematics Teaching (CRMT) tool. The tool was created to help mathematics teachers intentionally reflect and plan among multiple dimensions that include children's mathematical thinking, language, culture, and social justice to enhance lesson design and delivery (Aguirre & del Rosario Zavala, 2013). The major dimensions

were adapted from this instrument and aligned to the elements of CLSPs (Paris & Alim, 2017) and Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) (Landson-Billings, 1995b), which are: (1) ensuring academic success; (2) maintaining cultural and linguistic competence focusing on heritage and community practices; and (3) challenging institutional barriers and the status quo. Even though the CRMT tool was designed for teachers to reflect on a lesson or a unit, we thought it was an excellent tool to use when assessing our students' work. Its dimensions are strongly aligned to the CLSP and CRT categories. Adapting an existing rubric is a common practice because it allows for tailoring to the specific scope of the current work (University of Hawaii Manoa, 2017). A comparison of the original and adapted rubric is provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Comparison of Rubrics

Original Rubric Dimensions	Adapted Rubric Dimensions	CLSP Category
Depth of knowledge and student understanding	Content knowledge and understanding	Academic Success
Mathematical Analysis	Content Knowledge/Understanding	Academic Success
Mathematical discourse and communication	Content discourse	Academic Success
Intellectual support	Cognitive demand	Academic Success
Student Engagement	Cognitive Demand	Academic Success
Academic Language Support for English Learners	Language Support for ELs	Maintain cultural and linguistic competence
Use of ESL scaffolding strategies	Language Support for ELs	Maintain cultural and linguistic competence
Funds of knowledge/culture/ community support	Funds of Knowledge and Linguistic Resources	Maintain cultural and linguistic competence
Use of critical knowledge/social justice	Power and Participation	Challenge institutional barriers and the status quo.

Data Analyses

As with any duoethnography research, our data went through several analyses (Chang, Hernandez, & Ngunjiri, 2012). Each data source received an initial review from the researchers individually. At the individual review, analysis and scoring of each data source took place using the adapted rubric (Chang, Hernandez, & Ngunjiri, 2012). At the second analysis, the researchers met to review the data and share with each other their scoring for each artifact. The second analysis served as calibration between the two researchers because they discussed and addressed any differences in scoring. Calibration is an important part of the process as it assures accuracy and consistency between the reviewers when using rubrics (University of Hawaii Manoa, 2017).

In addition, we opted to audio record our team data review sessions. According to Cann & DeMeulenaere (2010), recording dialogue during data analyses results in a unique and supplemental data source—one that helps take note of conversational points that, once stated, can help guide later data review. Our open discussions provided us the opportunity to question and make comments and negotiate how we interpreted the work, thus providing us the opportunity to “engage ourselves” with the data at a deeper level (Bahr, Monroe, & Mantilla, 2018; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011).

During the second analysis and subsequent discussion, we calculated how many artifacts received a *directly*, *indirectly*, or *not at all* rating from the rubric in each of the areas. Noticing a scoring pattern in certain categories, the results prompted a conversation over those categories of culturally linguistic sustaining instruction we observed receiving the highest and lowest scores. Conversations were recorded and revisited. They were also correlated with the notes we took after each of our class sessions. In doing so we were able to identify the elements of the culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies the artifacts did/did not address and will be presented in the findings section.

Findings and Discussion

Through this study we explored our effectiveness in preparing preservice bilingual teachers to understand the concept of CLSP by analyzing the coursework they produced related to this topic. Our research questions were: (1) What impact, if any, does our teaching have on our students’ development of socio-cultural competence? (2) To what extent, if any, can our students design instruction that includes culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies (CLSP)? We analyzed the preservice teachers’ understanding of the concept by analyzing specific assignments they completed through one of our undergraduate courses. The first assignment was a children’s book. The purpose of the assignment was to have the preservice teachers create an authentic children’s book by writing an original storyline and creating illustrations based on a topic that they believed the ELs in the region could relate to. The second was a lesson plan. Through this assignment the students created content area lessons that not just addressed the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), but also integrated best practices, including CLSP. Each artifact was analyzed in each category of the rubric and scored as *directly*, *indirectly*, or *not at all* addressing the CLSP categories. The findings of our analyses will be presented by CLSP

categories and their respective subcategories/dimensions. By doing this we were able to answer our first and second research question. Our summary is below:

Academic Success

Content Knowledge and Understanding

The areas of: (1) content knowledge and understanding, (2) content discourse, and (3) cognitive demand were examined in both artifacts to discover how they addressed the CLSP overarching category of Academic Success (see Table 2). In studying the scoring for these areas the researchers noticed a trend. The majority of the artifacts addressed this area either *indirectly* or *not at all*. It became evident that students understood the foundation of designing culturally relevant texts and lesson plans that support ELs language development from our lectures. However, their work did not directly include in-depth coverage of the topic or multiple opportunities for students to discuss the content. In the children's books we noted mostly a superficial understanding of the topics presented. Overall, one artifact (7.7%) of all books *directly* addressed content knowledge at the highest level, implying that students designed books that focused on comprehension at low levels. The other eight (61.5%) fell under *indirectly*, with an additional *four* (30.8%) falling into the *not at all* dimension. In reviewing the lesson plans, 11 of the artifacts (91.7 %) *indirectly* addressed the dimension of content knowledge and understanding, with only one other addressing it *directly* (8.3%).

In the texts topics such as (1) family, (2) traditions, (3) hobbies, (3) pets, and (4) school were presented. While all texts were grade level appropriate, the topics selected for presentation to the students were written in a way that superficially presented them. For example, Book 5 presented a visit to the zoo. The text reads: “*¡Mira el hipopótamo! La hipopótamo Rita quiere que saltes con una patita. ¡Mira el mono! El mono Armando que trae sombrero quiere bailar huapango.*” This text, while well written, failed to address the area of content knowledge and put it in the *not at all* category. Book 10 focused on the topic of *Día de los Muertos*. In this story a student, John, gets to learn about the holiday by having his teachers and classmates explain it to him. The section of the text that introduces the topic reads:

Mrs. Garcia overheard Maria and John's conversation and joined by saying, “For those of you that do not know what *Día de los Muertos* is I will explain it after lunch. Now let's line up for the cafeteria.” During lunch John needed an answer so he asked Maria, “Do you know where *Dias de los Muertos* is?” Maria replied, “it's a big party that starts on October 31st to remember our family members and dress up in costumes.”

Upon reviewing our recorded conversations, we found that we spoke at length about the four books that fell into the *not at all* category. Four may not seem like a high number but considering that prior to assigning this work the preservice teachers had read chapters on the importance of content knowledge and had participated in classroom lectures and activities related to developing challenging lessons, the number indeed was high. While the preservice teachers were able to

initially write about cultural and community practices, over all their work failed to expand on the historical and content background of the topics they selected. It was evident that the preservice teachers understood the purpose of the children's text-- to relate to the lived cultural and linguistic experiences. However, as they developed the books, they did so at a superficial level, missing opportunities for their future students to gain knowledge about experiences that many times are absent in today's schools. For us, the researchers, it alerted us to the fact that our work did not have the impact we thought it had.

For the lesson plans, a similar trend was seen. The dimension of content knowledge and understanding was addressed mostly *indirectly*. For example, the objective for Lesson Plan 2 was to observe and list the physical properties of given objects. All activities throughout the lesson required students to keep a list of the characteristics of various objects; but never in the lesson was it explained that observable physical properties can be characterized by shape, color, texture, and material. Therefore, superficially addressing the state standard which requires students to identify and record observable physical properties of objects, including shape, color, texture, and material, and generate ways to classify objects as stated in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

Another missed opportunity to directly promote content knowledge was evident in Lesson Plan 4; the selected state standard required that students explain the purposes of the U.S. Constitution as identified in the Preamble. As explained in the lesson plan, the teacher presented a video read aloud of the book *We the kids*. As the video played, students were required to answer the following questions: (1) How does the preamble affect your current life? (2) Why does the preamble call for a more organized union? The lesson indirectly covers the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution but it never helped the students learn the purpose of the U.S. Constitution, nor question its sociopolitical role. While preservice teachers need to have a strong understanding of content, we acknowledged through our discussion that perhaps their limited experience in teaching and limited understanding of some of these concepts could have been the reason for superficially presenting the content knowledge, thus suggesting that in addition to not just teaching CLSP in our classes, building of content knowledge beyond what is covered in their core prior to entering their teacher preparation classes may be needed and was discussed. This concept is not foreign to us. After all, at both our institutions discussions on ways to bridge the gap between what is covered in the preservice teachers' basic coursework prior to entering our programs have occurred repeatedly. Researcher 2 shared in the conversation that the institution was in the process of working with content area teachers to inform them of the state standards but had been unsuccessful in creating a smooth transition for the students. Researcher 1 had written in her notes that the area of Social Studies has been a concern for some time.

Content Discourse

The area of content discourse presented very similar results with only one children's book (7.7%) *directly* addressing the dimension, thus presenting limited opportunities for content to be introduced. The remaining 12 artifacts (92.3%) *not at all* or *indirectly* addressed the content discourse dimension. For the lesson plans, a slightly different trend was noted with six artifacts (50%) *directly* addressing this dimension and an additional five artifacts (41.7%) addressing it

indirectly. The examples shared in the Content Knowledge and Understanding section can serve as examples to show lack of content discourse in the preservice teachers' work. In reviewing the other 12 children's texts, we noted that the preservice teachers wanted to impose their understanding of the topic on the readers, in addition to not helping them understand content and how they also did not allow for negotiation of meaning. This was the direct opposite of the CLSP recommendation and inconsistent with our teachings. As seen in Book 10, in the previous section where the topic of *Día de los Muertos* would literally be "explained after lunch," as described in the text. Content discourse was among the most poorly performed.

The topic of content discourse was one the researchers reflected on during their meeting, especially because this topic in particular was covered in their lectures. Not only did students read one chapter on the topic, they also analyzed sample children's text for content discourse with both professors. Researcher 1 shared during one meeting that she wrote in her notes at the end of each session where this topic was covered that the lessons had gone particularly well and that students were engaged in the topic. However, the execution was amiss in the children's texts for both groups of preservice teachers.

The lesson plans, however, showed a balanced performance, meaning that preservice teachers were able to plan for situations where students would use the academic language multiple times and in different forms; six lesson plans (50%) *directly* addressed content discourse, while only one (8.3%) did *not at all* address content discourse. For example, in Lesson Plan 8, students were expected to participate in a scavenger hunt finding different types of angles throughout their classroom. Not only does the described activity allow students to use the vocabulary learned for the different types of angles, but they also had to negotiate and explain to each other how they classified the angles. To conclude the lesson students were required to write a reflection of their learning while using key vocabulary. It is evident that this lesson provided plenty of opportunities to use the academic language throughout the lesson with many varied opportunities that required students to use both oral and written language.

Other lessons called for the use of different vocabulary development strategies to help students learn content vocabulary and then practice it in various activities. For example, in Lesson Plan 1, the preservice teachers reported the use of Total Physical Response (TPR) to teach the concept and vocabulary by using physical movement to make linguistic connections between the characteristics of living and non-living things. Students made connections between the vocabulary and gestures, learning in a non-threatening environment. As Lesson Plan 1 developed, it called for a transition between gestures and oral language to writing. At the end of the lesson students were required to create a book of living and nonliving things, highlighting the learned vocabulary. Our recorded conversations noted our surprise that only six of the lessons directly addressed content discourse; since both of us spent a great amount of time in our lectures discussing and modeling this CLSP area, prompting us to talk about how we needed to restructure the class to cover this topic in more detail with our students.

Cognitive Demand

In reviewing the artifacts, 11 (92.3%) children's books addressed this dimension *indirectly* or *not at all*, thus providing limited to no opportunity to develop a deep understanding of concepts being presented through the stories. In the lesson plans a similar trend was observed; ten artifacts (83.3%) addressed the dimension *indirectly* and only two (16.7%) addressed it *directly*. It appears that the preservice teachers had a general understanding of this area and addressed it to a certain extent but missed opportunities to drive discussion and learning further. For example, in analyzing the children's texts it was found that all but one presented the information at a superficial level. A trend seen in the previous section of Content Discourse. Book 8 was written on *Día de Los Muertos*; while the topic is culturally relevant, the book did not lend itself to provide detailed information. In the text the students wrote:

This is my first *Día de Los Muertos*. I have to stay close with my family. They know the way to our living family's home, which is where our *ofrenda* will be. As we travel to the *ofrenda* there will be much to see.

While the concept of an *ofrenda* was presented in the text. There was no elaboration to further explain the concept. Furthermore, the illustrations presented in the text (a child and grandmother as skeletons), while adhering to the theme of *Día de los Muertos*, did not coincide specifically with the concept of an *ofrenda* being presented in the written paragraph.

Book 9 noted a similar happening. The topic of *Charro Days*, a local festival, is presented in it. The text read, "*¡la ropa tiene muchos colores y patrones! Las chicas y los chicos usan trajes regionales mexicanos.*" Again, we see the presentation of information on what can be seen at the festival, but nothing discussing history or reason behind it. Like in the first area of content knowledge, the focus was on entertaining the reader by giving fun facts or tidbits of information, but not really presenting the opportunities to use the book as a venue for instruction. Sadly, the majority of these artifacts casually mentioned their selected topics but lacked detail and completely missed opportunities to elaborate. In summary, the students fell short in this area of CLSP teaching.

Similar scores were noted in the lesson plans. Many of the activities described in the lesson plans failed to challenge students to use critical thinking. For example, the state standards for Lesson Plan 9, expected that the students classify and sort two and three dimensional figures. The lesson calls for students to read a book, draw the figures shown in the book and then label the characteristics of each figure. A similar approach is seen in Lesson Plan 1, in which the state standard expects the students to classify living and nonliving things based upon whether they have basic needs and produce young. The activity planned for Lesson Plan 1 requires students to create a book of living and nonliving things and write down the characteristics of each. None of these two lessons engage students in cognitively demanding activities. Furthermore, the lessons planned never gave students the opportunity to compare and contrast or to use what has been learned.

Overall, the section of cognitive demand was poorly performed. As researchers, we found this odd. Concepts like Bloom's Taxonomy and the state standards are covered in nearly all teacher preparation courses. Coursework focuses on creating lessons that are at the application level or higher of Bloom's Taxonomy. We approached this area with the assumption that the pre-service teachers had a well-formed understanding of cognitive demand because of the repeated exposure they received in their coursework. However, it seems that they struggled with this tremendously. Prompting us to discuss ways in which we needed to approach this topic in future classes and focus on building the pre-service teachers' foundation rather than assuming they already had it.

Academic Success Discussion

In reviewing the recorded conversation that contained the analysis for the three dimensions under Academic Success, it became evident that the opportunity to present the information at a much deeper level, involving critical reflection, should have been presented in both assignments yet was not. The trend leaned toward scraping at the surface rather than diving deep into the history, meaning, or content. In our lectures we discussed adapting curriculum that is challenging and meets the linguistic, cultural, and affective needs of the students. However, it didn't transition effectively into the lessons prepared by the preservice teachers. It seemed as if the preservice teachers had zoned-in on the linguistic needs of the students and ignored providing opportunities for depth of knowledge and student understanding. Furthermore, in both artifacts students were not given opportunities to question. For the children's books, the purpose was to entertain rather than educate, inform, or question. The lesson plans presented content superficially and educated students on topics without providing an in-depth coverage of the topic(s). Overall, the area of presenting content knowledge and promoting understanding was an area the preservice teachers struggled with and one that will need to be revisited as we move forward with teaching our classes in the future if we want to ensure ELs experience academic success, one of the elements of CLSP (Paris & Alim, 2017) and Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) (Landson-Billings, 1995b).

Maintaining Cultural and Linguistic Competence

Funds of Knowledge and Linguistic Resources

The first dimension we analyzed under the CLSP category of cultural and linguistic competence was funds of knowledge. Upon reviewing the analyses, funds of knowledge performed the highest in the children's books; a total of 10 artifacts (80.8%) *directly* addressed funds of knowledge. The topics selected for texts varied, but all in some form drew from the background of the students. The topics presented in the children's text were: (1) schooling experiences, (2) language learning, (3) holidays/celebrations, (4) traditions, (5) friendships, and (6) family. There was direct evidence of students being able to present topics that students could connect to. However, missed opportunities to provide language scaffolding, especially for emergent bilinguals, was not present.

Only three (25%) of the 12 lesson plans *directly* demonstrate the use of funds of knowledge and linguistic resources. Eight (66.7%) of the lesson plans *indirectly* tapped into students' funds of knowledge and one (8.3%) *not at all*. Even though it was evident during our classes that the teacher candidates understood the linguistic and cultural resources children bring to school, these elements were not taken into consideration when planning the lessons. Most lessons relied on books and YouTube videos produced in English that represent mainstream. For those that did *directly* address the area, they did so effectively. For example, in Lesson Plan 1 students made a T-chart of the living and non-living things found at home. The lesson also integrated scaffolding for the academic vocabulary presented in the lesson. Lesson Plan 9 too had direct examples; in this lesson the teacher helped the students make the connection between the word “*puntas*” (corners) to the word “*vertices*” (vertex). Overall, the preservice teachers were able to incorporate funds of knowledge in the children’s texts superficially, but not necessarily interweave it throughout the lesson plans.

In reviewing our recorded meetings, we noted contentment with the preservice teachers’ ability to recognize students’ funds of knowledge at the *directly* or *indirectly* levels. The topic of funds of knowledge is one that is repeatedly covered in the coursework (our classes and others within their course sequence). It is evident that the preservice teachers were able to use their preexisting understanding to create texts and lesson plans relevant for students. We did discuss, however, helping students further develop their skill so that a higher percentage could earn a *directly* rating. Some of our discussions prompted us to find ways to help students move past lecturing on the concept and possibly dissecting lessons together to see how they can be adapted to better integrate funds of knowledge.

Language Support for English Learners

The second dimension under this linguistic and cultural maintenance CLSP category focused on providing opportunities for students to build language and conceptual understanding. In reviewing the children’s books, only three (23.1%) were *directly* able to provide language scaffolding for the readers. The other 10 artifacts (76.9%) did not find ways to build vocabulary or assist students, putting them in the *indirect* or *not at all* categories. There were instances where illustrations did not match text and did not support each other. For example, in Book 3 the text read: “*En la escuela Fernando le cuenta a todos los niños que tiene un perrito llamado Bingo. Les dice que no solo es su perro que también es su mejor amigo.*” However, the illustration shows students standing, not interacting. We noticed issues like this in several artifacts. In short they provided missed opportunities to linguistically support students learning a language who might use illustrations to gather or verify their understanding of the texts. A similar trend was found in Book 11, where students described a student performing at a cultural event by writing, “we are here and it is almost time to go on STAGE [stage capitalized for emphasis].” However, even though the word focused on in the story is stage, the illustration shows a wristwatch keeping track of time, which focuses on the part of the sentence not in capital letters. This was a common trend in the artifacts reviewed, and a huge miss for CLSP. It seems that while in our classes we discussed the importance of language building/scaffolding for students at varying stages of acquiring English, the students did not find ways of creating those supporting features for students. During our meeting we discussed ways that we could refine the presentation of this

concept to help with the preservice teachers' mastery of this topic. While several suggestions were discussed, the one that we agreed upon in our meeting was providing more examples/scenarios and having students create sample linguistic scaffolds to present to each other to help with their understanding of this concept.

The lesson plans proved to have slightly more linguistic support built into them for students. A total of six lesson plans (50%) *directly* addressed this category, while four (33%) *indirectly* addressed it with an additional two (16.7%) that did *not directly* address it at all. The half of the lessons that made use of various strategies to support language support opted to include visuals, sentence stems, vocabulary lists, and activities like Total Physical Response (TPR). For example, as previously mentioned, Lesson Plan 1, used TPR to teach the concept and the vocabulary of living and non-living. In addition, Lesson Plan 2 called for the use of a vocabulary list in both languages that displayed pictures of different descriptive properties, such as rough, soft, and shiny. Another lesson that directly provided language support for ELs is Lesson Plan 6. The objective of the lesson was to decode words with /h/ and it purposefully highlighted the connection between both languages, Spanish and English. This lesson stresses the importance of bridging both languages by illustrating words that start with /h/ in English and Spanish and have similar meaning, for example, hotel-*hotel* and hour-*hora*, allowing for linguistic connection(s). It is evident that in the lesson plans our students provided more targeted linguistic support. During our recorded conversations we discussed how it could have been because as part of the lesson plan requirements the preservice teachers needed to list language objectives and describe linguistic connections, honing them in the specific requirements of this category.

Maintaining Cultural and Linguistic Competence Discussion

Like in the previous dimension of content discourse the majority did not address the category of language support for English learners, thus showing a need to further provide instruction and support on addressing linguistic needs and development in students. We account for the good performance on funds of knowledge in the children's books because the assignment directly asked them to select topics related to the community and students. However, once asked to create lessons where they had to address the students' funds of knowledge in lessons, they could not. Overall, the category of maintaining linguistic and cultural competence was addressed partially. This led us to acknowledge that we need to find ways to more explicitly teach these dimensions and explicitly require them in our assignments. Not being able to address these dimensions was a concern for us, the researchers, and was something we discussed at great length. After all, language and culture are at the heart of CLSP. In our discussion there was almost a moment of "where did we go wrong?" However, upon reflecting we acknowledged that grasping these concepts and applying them beyond the textbook takes time. A reminder to revisit the structure of our coursework and supplemental activities to include more support for the students.

Challenge Institutional Barriers and Challenge the Status Quo

Power and Participation

The last area has the overall lowest performance in both the big books and the lesson plans. A total of zero artifacts (0.0%) addressed power and participation *directly*. A total of three

(23.1%) artifacts addressed it *indirectly*. The remaining 10 artifacts (76.9%) addressed it *not at all*. The books, while touching on topics students could identify with culturally, did not present any evidence of opportunities to critique issues of equity/language or discuss how these issues pertain to their lives. Rather the books took on an enrichment approach by looking to entertain the students by providing tidbits of information on holidays and cultural traditions. Like in the previous section, this was also a miss for the preservice teachers when discussing CLSP.

The lesson plans provided similar results with zero artifacts (0.0%) addressing this category *directly*. One artifact addressed it *indirectly*. An additional 11 artifacts (91.7%) addressed the category *not at all*. Lesson 4 was the only lesson that somewhat engaged students in questioning power and participation. The objective of the lesson was to understand the purpose of the U.S. Constitution as identified in the preamble. Throughout the lesson, the teacher probed students to think reflectively and critically with questions like, “What is liberty for you? Do you think all people and all countries have liberty? How does the U.S Constitution preamble affect our current lives?” Through these questions it is evident that students were challenged to explore how, in their current situation, the Constitution affected their lives, liberty, and the well-being of others. While it became evident that this was the poorest performed category, we admit it wasn’t a jaw dropping conclusion.

We each suspected that this area would present difficulty for the preservice teachers. Our students, because of their Hispanic background, were raised to respect power and authority. We discussed issues like the status quo, social justice, and being instruments of change with them in our classes. We even discussed how making a wrong decision could affect the overall academic success and personal growth of their future students. However, the smallest trace of our teachings was not evident in the artifacts we reviewed. This brought us to discuss how we could go about changing our approach for our future students and then discussed how long it would take before our efforts would have an impact. Especially since we were working against years of conditioning.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, the preservice teachers were able to *directly* or *indirectly* address areas focused on content and language. However, they struggled with areas that targeted challenging institutional barriers and the status quo. Many of our students have been educated with a curriculum that for many years has ignored their histories and cultural knowledge, making it difficult for them to be aware of how institutional barriers and the status quo dismisses their power and participation. As mentioned before, many have been raised not to question because of the Hispanic culture they grew up in. They have countless times heard the saying “*calladito te ves más bonito*,” which implies that by not questioning you can avoid problems. Even now, we acknowledge that as professors we are in positions of power over our students. And that perhaps they may have not performed well on some domains because they did not want to question our teachings. While we both consider ourselves to be open and approachable, in the eyes of our students perhaps because we are “professors,” they didn’t see us that way. This serves as a reminder to us to have discussions with the preservice teachers about questioning and speaking

up for themselves and the future students that they will soon teach. We can't change educational outcomes for the better unless the teachers in these critical positions are willing to speak to make the change happen.

In addition, this research has helped us realize that our work goes beyond judging how good we are as professors by our state exam scores. We need to focus more on the instruction we give our students in the classrooms and how they perform in class. While we celebrate each student who graduates, becomes certified, and begins working with ELs in the state, we need to be reminded that along with being certified they need to be equipped to be able to provide quality instruction that includes CLSP. While we acknowledge that we need to update our instruction, we know that this is not a simple fix. Of course, providing more examples for our students to understand the concept is an effective way to start, but more so we need to provide more opportunities for our preservice teachers to become aware of how the status quo maintains institutionalized racism and institutionalized barriers for minoritized groups.

In short, the plan moving forward is to first review the readings we use to present the content and the lectures that support them. If the preservice teachers are not mastering the concepts, then a review of the primary sources used to disseminate the information is needed. After, a review of supplemental activities is warranted. Finally, a review of us as professors. The big question the research findings have left us with is: "How can we improve ourselves and our teachings to maximize student learning?" While we should focus on student performance, there is no denying that we directly influence their outcomes. We also acknowledge that having discussions with our students about power and privilege and how to advocate for themselves and their learning should be part of our classes. This needs to be purposefully covered at the beginning of every semester and continuously reinforced throughout the semester. We need to do more than talk about our preservice teachers being agents of change and fighting for social justice.

In short, we have a road ahead of us. True change does not happen overnight. We have begun our first steps by taking the time to analyze the impact we are currently making with our preservice teachers through this duoethnography and we welcome other educators to do the same. It is very easy to give ourselves a false piece of mind because we "preach" the truth. However, the preaching does not do any good if those we preach to are not using the information to make those pivotal changes in the education of ELs across the state. Of course, once the preservice teachers go into the classroom they will begin to gain experience and grow professionally. However, that does not guarantee that their understanding of something so critical will grow as well.

In summary, preparing our preservice teachers to understand the best practices of teaching English Learners (ELs) including addressing the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of the students they serve is of the utmost importance. Granted, to be able to address those needs a strong understanding of Culturally Linguistically Sustaining Pedagogies (CLSP) is needed. We made a conscious effort to present CLSP through lecture, modeling, and class discussion but it seems that some areas were understood and executed well by the preservice teachers while others were not. Based on the data, the power and participation category was the most poorly performed, even

though it is a critical piece to educating ELs. The subcategories of content knowledge and understanding, content discourse, cognitive demand, language support, funds of knowledge, and linguistic resources were well represented, showing that the preservice teachers understood some domains of CLSP better than others.

While the preservice teachers have a partial understanding of CLSP and its role in the classroom, the takeaway from this analysis is that we, as professors, can't take for granted that what we teach is fully understood. Yes, our students gathered knowledge of CLSP, but based on the artifacts analyzed they understood it at a superficial level, implying that we still have a way to go and require a redesign of each of our university courses. Providing a strong foundation in this imperative knowledge is key to not just preparing strong teachers, but in preparing ELs that are equipped with knowledge to know success while possessing the skills to question and challenge. Our advice to other educators is...stop and reflect. Do not take for granted that what you teach is being fully understood. More importantly, do not be afraid to change the way your content is explained. After all, the stronger and well-versed the teacher, the stronger and well-versed their students will be.

References

- Aguirre, J. M., & del Rosario Zavala, M. (2013). Making culturally responsive mathematics teaching explicit: A lesson analysis tool. *Pedagogies*, 8(2), 163–190.
- Allen, A., Hancock, S. D., Starker-Glass, T., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). Mapping culturally relevant pedagogy into teacher education programs: A critical framework. *Teachers College Record*, 119(1), 1–26.
- Bahr, D. L., Monroe, E. E., & Mantilla, J. (2018). Developing a framework of outcomes for mathematics teacher learning: Three mathematics educators engage in collaborative self-study. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 45, 113–134.
- Cann, C., & DeMeulenaere, E. (2010). Forged in the crucibles of difference: Building discordant communities. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, 7(1), 41–53.
- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Left Coast Press.
- Chang, H., Hernandez, K., & Ngunjiri, F. W. (2012). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Routledge.
- Chu, S.-Y., & Garcia, S. (2014). Culturally responsive teaching efficacy beliefs of in-service special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education*, 35(4), 218–232.
- Cruz, R. A., Manchand, S., Firestone, A. R., & Rodl, J. E. (2020). An examination of teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 43(3) 197-214.
- Docherty-Skippen, S. & Beattle, K. (2018). Duoethnography as a dialogic and collaborative form of curriculum inquiry for resident professionalism and self-care education. *Canadian Medical Education Journal*, 9(3), 76-82.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research*, 36(1), 273–290.
- Fitchett, P. G., Starker, T. V., & Salyers, B. (2012). Examining culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in a preservice social studies education course. *Urban Education*, 47(3), 585–611.
- Flynn J. E. (2015). White fatigue: Naming the challenge in moving from an individual to a systemic understanding of racism. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 17(3), 115-124.
- Gist, C. D. (2017). Culturally responsive pedagogy for teachers of color. *The New Educator*, 13(3), 288–303.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Howard, T. C., & Rodriguez-Minkoff, A. C. (2017). Culturally relevant pedagogy 20 years later: Progress or pontificating? What have we learned, and where do we go? *Teachers College Record*, 119(1), 1–32.
- Irvine, J. J., & Armento, B. (2000). *Culturally relevant teaching: Lesson planning for the elementary and middle grades*. McGraw-Hill.
- Jackson, T. O. (2015). Perspectives and insights from preservice teachers of color on developing culturally responsive pedagogy at predominantly white institutions. *Action in Teacher Education*, 37(3), 223–237.

- Kinloch, V. (2017). "You ain't making me write" Culturally sustaining pedagogies and Black youth's performances of resistance. In D. Paris & H.S. Alim (Eds). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 25-41). Teachers College Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*., 34(3), 159–165.
- Moll, L.C., & González, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior*., 26(4):439-456.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children (2021). *The socio-cultural context of child development and learning*. <https://www.naeyc.org/resources/position-statements/equity/social-cultural-context>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2022). *English language learners for public schools*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp#:~:text=The%20percentage%20of%20public%20school,%2C%20or%203.8%20million%20students).
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Pinner, R. S. (2018). Re-learning from experience: Using autoethnography for teacher development. *Educational Action Research*, 26, 91–105.
- Rose, H., & Montakantiwong, A. (2018). A tale of two teachers: A duoethnography of the realistic and idealistic success of failures of teaching English as an international language. *RELC Journal*, 49, 88–101.
- Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 1086-1101.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94–106.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2017). Critical race theory and the whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education*, 52(2), 155–169.
- Texas Administrative Code §235.117 (2020, May 1). *Bilingual Spanish Standards*.
<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/Agenda%20Item%2011%20Ch%20235%20Proposal.pdf>
- Texas Education Agency (2021). *English learners in Texas: Fact sheet #1*:
<https://www.txel.org/media/jvehnvgp/fact-sheet-1-7-15-20-final.pdf>
- University of Hawaii Manoa (2017). *Creating and using rubrics*. Retrieved from:
<https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/resources/creating-and-using-rubrics/>
- Valdés, G. (2000). Introduction in Spanish for native speakers. *AATSP professional development series handbook for teachers K-16, 1* (1), 1-20.
- Wall, S. (2008). Easier said than done: Writing an autoethnography. *International Institute of Qualitative Methodology*, 7, 38–53.

Whiting, E. F., & Cutri, R. M. (2015). Naming a personal “unearned” privilege: What pre-service teachers identify after a critical multicultural education course. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 17(1), 13–2.



**TEACHERS OF MULTILINGUAL DIVERSE LEARNERS: PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ACROSS PRESERVICE, INSERVICE, AND HIGHER
EDUCATION ROLES**

Dr. Gregory Knollman, Assistant Professor, Towson University

Dr. Kandace M. Hoppin, Assistant Professor George Washington University

Dr. Patricia Rice Doran, Professor and Dept. Chair, Towson University

Laura Cometa

Abstract

Teachers across roles and levels of experience often require additional, ongoing training and support in order to appropriately differentiate for these learners. It can be particularly challenging for administrators to gather input from professionals on what areas of training they perceive as most beneficial. This paper highlights findings from the delivery and evaluation of the first year of a series of professional development (PD) efforts designed to improve the knowledge and skills of educational personnel across roles including primary and secondary teachers of general education, special education, and English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and bilingual education related service providers and paraprofessionals, and professors in teacher education programs. Our findings indicate that participants across all roles and experience levels continued to voice needs for further training focused on standard-based instruction and scaffolding, classroom management, restorative practices, family engagement, and trauma-informed teaching to support MLs.

Key Words: English Learners, Multilingual Learners, Professional Development, In-service Teachers, Cross-Role Training, Special Education

TEACHERS OF MULTILINGUAL DIVERSE LEARNERS: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ACROSS PRESERVICE, INSERVICE, AND HIGHER EDUCATION ROLES

Introduction

As public schools in the United States become increasingly diverse, teachers face a growing challenge to meet all of their students' needs. For decades, the percentage of English Learners (ELs) in U.S. schools has been steadily increasing, with ELs comprising the fastest-growing student population in the country (NCELA, 2017). It is now estimated that approximately 5 million English learners (ELs) are enrolled in U.S. public schools, representing 10.1% of the total enrolled student population (NCES, 2020). According to federal statute, ELs are students who demonstrate a “sufficient difficulty in reading, writing, speaking or understanding the English language” that inhibits their ability to “learn successfully in classrooms where English is the language of instruction” (*Title IX*, 2005).

Linguistic and Cultural Diversity

Multilingual and EL students themselves are a diverse group of students, representing numerous languages, cultures, ethnicities, and nationalities (USDE, 2017). While ELs speak over 400 different languages, about 75% of ELs speak Spanish (USDE, 2017). ELs overwhelmingly identify as students of color (93.7%); only 6.3% of ELs identify as White (OELA, 2020). The largest race/ethnicity of ELs is Hispanic (77.2%), with smaller numbers identifying as Asian (10.5%) and Black (3.9%) (OELA, 2020).

ELs with Disabilities

Of the estimated 5 million ELs enrolled in U.S. public schools, approximately 14.3% of ELs have also been identified as students with disabilities (NCES, 2020a). This percentage has been steadily rising over the past decade (NCEO, 2018). For these students, schools must provide effective instruction to develop English language proficiency and provide appropriate disability-related services (OCR, 2015a). Today's classrooms have increasingly more ELs, ELs with disabilities, and students with disabilities in the general population (NCES, 2020b). While the percent of ELs with disabilities is equivalent to the percent of students with disabilities in the general school population, ELs are more likely than other students to be identified with a specific learning disability or speech or language impairment (USDE, 2017).

Economic Disadvantage

ELs are more likely than the general student population to come from households that are economically-disadvantaged. ELs are overrepresented in the percentages of students who are homeless and migrant (USDE, 2017). A higher percentage of ELs are served by Public Title 1 Schoolwide Programs or Targeted Assistance School Programs (USDE, 2017). Nearly 60% of ELs' families live below 185% of the federal poverty line, the qualifying criteria for free and reduced lunch programs (FARMS) (Grantmakers, 2013).

ELs with Interrupted Formal Education

Some ELs are referred to as Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE). While SIFE are estimated to comprise only 10-20% of the EL population, they can represent a big challenge for educators because they often have significant gaps in first-language literacy and greater social-emotional needs (Custodio & O’Loughlin, 2017). The highest percentage of SIFE in the U.S. come from Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean and many arrive in the U.S. as unaccompanied teenagers (Chishti, Pierce & Telus, 2019).

Unaccompanied Minors

The past decade has seen a sharp rise in the number of unaccompanied minors crossing the Mexico-U.S. border (Cheatham, 2020). While some youths come to the U.S. for economic reasons or to reunite with family members, an increase in drug trafficking and gang violence in Central America has also been identified as a catalyst for more youth immigration (Colorín Colorado, 2018). Unaccompanied minors who are permitted to remain in the U.S. would typically qualify for EL services.

Experiences Leading to Trauma

Some ELs may have increased experiences of adverse childhood events (ACES) that lead to trauma (Schmidt, 2018). ELs may have higher levels of fear, anxiety, stress, and depression, due to increased traumatic experiences of poverty, family separation and reunification, detention centers, uncertain immigration status, as well as the challenges of learning English and adjusting to a new culture (Flores, 2015). While ELs are not the only student population affected by ACES, schools are increasingly looking to trauma-informed teaching practices to respond to students’ needs and enhance learning for students who have experienced trauma (Mihanan, 2019).

Multilingual learners and families

While we have discussed students who are identified as ELs, there are many other students in U.S. public schools who do not qualify for EL services but who come from linguistically diverse or multilingual households. These are students with English-language proficiency who may speak other languages at home or have parents who speak languages other than English. In an analysis of Census Bureau data for 2018, the Center for Immigration Studies found that 21.9% of U.S. residents (native-born, legal immigrants, and undocumented immigrants) spoke a foreign language at home — more than double the 11% in 1980 (Zeigler & Camarota, 2019). As U.S. households are becoming more linguistically diverse, schools must find ways to effectively engage and communicate with parents who may be limited-English proficient. Schools are charged with providing information to parents in a language they can understand (OCR, 2015b). Moreover, schools and teachers seek to build relationships with parents that value their cultures and engage them in meaningful partnerships to support their students’ success.

Accountability

As the U.S. student population continues to grow more diverse, schools are under increasing pressure to meet the needs of all students, including ELs. In 1974, the Supreme Court ruled that ELs must be provided with equitable opportunities and access to learning, not merely provided with the same resources or instruction as non-ELs (Douglas & Supreme Court, 1974). Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, public schools are obligated to ensure that ELs can participate meaningfully and equally in their school's educational programs (OCR, 2015a). While all ELs are entitled to special services, school districts across the nation are permitted to take different approaches in creating their EL programs (OCR, 2015a). Therefore, EL programs may be referred to as dual language immersion, bilingual, structured English immersion, sheltered, among others, and generally fall under the umbrella titles of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs (OCR, 2018). While some teachers hold specialized ESOL certificates, *all* teachers of ELs are tasked with providing appropriate instruction, scaffolding, and differentiation, according to ELs' levels of English proficiency.

Over the past 20 years, the federal government has taken significant steps to hold states more accountable for ELs' achievement. Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001) required states to disaggregate data for ELs' performance on standardized tests, and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2012) required schools to report on EL's progress in developing English language proficiency. ESSA made English language proficiency a central accountability measure for all states and it has forced states to make ELs a priority (Sargrad, 2016). Still, standardized test scores and graduation data reveal that large disparities exist between the academic achievement of ELs and non-ELs (USDE, 2017). As an underperforming group, ELs have become a national focus for targeted improvement and states are compelled to make adequate yearly progress for ELs (Sargrad, 2016).

Teachers' Need for Professional Development

The increase in the number of students whose home language is not English, particularly those whose needs are compounded by trauma, interrupted education or an identified disability, pose both challenges and opportunities for teachers and schools (Esparza Brown & Sandford, 2011; Baker et al, 2014; Miranda, Wells, & Jenkins, 2017). As schools strive to meet their students' increasingly diverse needs, they face the challenge of determining which types of training and support to provide to teachers. Pre-service and in-service teachers in diverse, high-needs schools often receive professional development (PD) focused on strategies for working with diverse learners during their preservice training, but they also need multiple opportunities to practice and reflect upon what they have learned in order to apply knowledge effectively (Molle, 2013; More, Spies, Morgan & Baker, 2016; Miranda, Wells, & Jenkins, 2017).

In fact, in-service educators who are experiencing a shift in the populations they serve need ongoing PD that is purposeful, job-embedded (Croft et al, 2010) and designed to aid in collaboration across disciplines (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015; Stein, 2011). One complexity to developing adequate teacher PD is that both novice and veteran teachers may find it challenging to adequately reflect on their instruction if they lack an accurate understanding of the needs of

their multilingual learners. Last, even when PD is made available to teachers, it can be challenging for teacher-leaders or administrators to identify the best topics and delivery methods, given teachers' many other commitments and responsibilities competing with PD completion.

Purpose

This paper presents findings from the implementation of five PD sessions designed to improve the knowledge and skills of educators, across a range of roles, who work with multilingual learners. The paper also presents data regarding participants' preferred topics for future PD and concludes with recommendations for topics and delivery options for future PD for teachers of multilingual students.

Examination of Literature

Models of professional development for in-service teachers

Professional development (PD) often aims to improve teacher content knowledge and instruction in order to impact student learning, especially when the PD focuses on content to be taught or reinforced, corresponds with classroom activities, and offers opportunity for practice (Rotermund, DeRoche, Ottem, 2017). While workshops and training sessions continue to be the most prevalent types of PD used for teachers to learn specific content, it can be challenging to determine the impact of a workshop or training session on teacher and student outcomes because of their limited duration. PD can be offered in other formats and paired with assessments that examine longer-term outcomes, such as changes in student test scores or direct application of a teacher's knowledge or skills within classroom practice (Hill, Beisiegel, & Jacob, 2013). The literature is replete with examples of teacher preparation and PD models (Kennedy, 2016), although some are more effective than others, and many are difficult to replicate.

Among the many options, recent models of PD often include elements that extend beyond a traditional workshop or training with a focus on instruction and collaboration. These models often extend the workshop or training with additional elements, such as devoting specific time to collaboration among teachers serving multilingual learners (Mellom, Straubhaar, Balderas, Ariail, & Portes, 2018), emphasizing service or instruction of multilingual learners combined with fieldwork research (Li & Peters, 2016), considering specific learning needs through job-embedded PD involving peer-to-peer support (Doran, 2014). Hill, Beisiegel and Jacob (2013) examined common methods of job-embedded PD involving co-planning, observations, mentoring, coaching and in-service days across multiple school sites. In addition to changing methods of implementation, PD topics have also shifting to include measurement of teachers' transformative beliefs on areas such as the intersection of multilingual students and qualification for special education (Kose & Lim, 2011).

While PD is widely used in public schools, certain topics are emphasized more often than others. A 2017 report prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) indicated that among respondents to the 2011-2012 National Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), two of the least prevalent topics for teacher PD were related to teaching students with disabilities and teaching multilingual learners. Among public schools participating in the study, 65% of

respondents who indicated that their schools provided some PD on teaching multilingual learners received 8 hours or fewer on those activities within a twelve-month period. The prevalence of PD focused on teaching multilingual learners and/or students with disabilities also varied by grade and locale, with a higher proportion of teachers in urban elementary schools reporting PD on these topics offered within their districts (Rotermund, DeRoche, Ottem, 2017). The dearth of PD in these two areas (students who are multilingual and those with disabilities) also points to an additional gap related to their intersection: teachers have little available training on how to identify or support those learners who may be multilingual and also have disabilities or additional learning needs. Students who are refugees or recent immigrants, those who have experienced trauma, or those whose families are facing additional challenges or stress often need specialized support. Without sufficient PD, teachers may lack the skills or knowledge necessary to provide linguistically and culturally appropriate instruction, implement appropriate differentiation strategies, or connect families to needed resources (Islam & Park, 2015; Slapac, Kim, & Coopersmith, 2020). Professional development is offered in many formats, from single-session trainings or workshops to ongoing in-service experiences, as well as PD that includes more collaboration amongst teachers or the use of mentors and coaches. Using PD to teach or reinforce critical skills in areas of need, such as the instruction of multilingual learners and students with disabilities, is important, but it can be challenging given the many competing priorities for in-service teachers and administrators.

PD specific to instructing ELs

Prior research indicates that teachers who are trained in specific strategies to instruct ELs are more effective in increasing ELs' achievement (Quintero & Hansen, 2017). Yet, the U.S. Department of Education found that, on average, teachers of ELs report that they receive less than one hour of PD a year related to instructing ELs (Zehler et al., 2003). For decades, research has suggested several indicators of effectiveness for teachers of ELs (Gándara and Santibañez, 2016). These include knowledge of language uses, forms, and mechanics (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2002); a feeling of efficacy with respect to helping ELs achieve high standards (Garcia, 1996); the ability to build strong relationships with ELs and attend to their social-emotional needs (Moll, 1988); cultural knowledge and the ability to create culturally-responsive instruction (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2009; Milk, Mercado, & Sapiens, 1992); and specific pedagogical skills such as formative assessment of ELs' developing skills, organizing the classroom to invite greater EL participation, and scaffolding instruction for ELs at different proficiency levels (Garcia, 1992).

More recently, the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010 and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) in 2013 has amplified the importance of language instruction in content-area learning. With the new standards' increased language demands, teachers of ELs require greater expertise in how to recognize the developmental language needs of their ELs and appropriately scaffold or differentiate their instruction (Valdés et al., 2014; Rutherford-Quach et al., 2018). As adoption of the CCSS standards spread across the nation, Santos, Darling-Hammond, and Cheuk (2012) called for schools, districts, and teacher education programs to create more PD opportunities to build the knowledge, strategies, and skills of teachers of ELs. PD should not only be designed to increase teachers' understanding of academic language and literacy instruction in order to integrate scaffolds for students at each level of English

proficiency, but also to provide ongoing coaching and time for teachers to reflect during implementation (Santos et al., 2012).

Framework and Methods

While certain PD topics, such as the instruction of ELs and students with disabilities, have traditionally been overlooked in PD (Rotermund, DeRoche, Ottem, 2017), the need for information and guidance on how to serve these students remains. This paper describes one model for PD, utilized in a federally funded professional development project. The model is focused on job-relevant, classroom-ready skills delivered to heterogeneous audiences in order to facilitate common understanding across roles. This model, and this paper's analysis, are built on the principles of adult learning and knowledge transfer, in which training and P are authentic, purposeful, and job-embedded (Croft et al., 2010). The PD should be targeted to empower teachers to collaborate and work across disciplines (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). The PD and training are also aligned with Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) professional practice domains, including: evidence-based practices for ELs, responsive interventions, and family and community engagement (TESOL, 2019) Finally, our model draws from theories of culturally responsive and sustaining practice (Gay, 2000; Paris, 2012), which posit that teachers must be aware of their students' unique backgrounds, see those backgrounds as assets, and work to make their classrooms supportive of those diverse backgrounds.

The PD model in this study is situated within a larger five-year PD project that includes preparation of 60 pre-service teachers and 18 in-service teachers who are pursuing ESOL endorsement alongside their primary licensure area. The model also includes topical workshops and seminars for teacher preparation faculty and pre-service teachers, as well as job-embedded PD targeted to 250 educators focused on topics central to serving multilingual learners within local school systems. Providing both types of preparation – coursework and PD – expands the reach of information available to pre-service and in-service teachers and expands, also, the impact of the project itself.

Model Background

As part of this targeted PD strategy, we offered broad topical workshops related to ELs and MLs in order to improve educators' general knowledge and skills. The aim of these workshops was to employ multiple training sessions that were open to a wide audience but targeted toward those who were considering engagement in a longer period of study through the preparation project. The PD during the first year was designed to: 1) increase the knowledge of pre-service teachers at the undergraduate and graduate level; 2) highlight the resources and supports developed by in-service teachers working with families of children with disabilities and multilingual learners; 3) prepare higher education faculty to employ methods and increase awareness on current topics that impact multilingual learners; and 4) increase both student and faculty awareness of the course offerings and scholarship to be advanced through the funded preparation project.

The PD served as a multi-pronged tool for instructional planning and support. It was also used to disseminate information about the professional preparation project and to recruit pre-

service and in-service teachers who are considering enrollment in the preparation project. The PD sessions were also used to gather information about what potential students enrolling in the project might already know, which aided the team in the development of the future preparation coursework.

Based on informal, preliminary needs assessments performed with partner schools and colleagues in public and higher education, we identified five topics for opt-in PD workshops: 1) meeting the needs of multilingual students and families; 2) improving classroom management, including restorative practices, for students with disabilities and multilingual learners; 3) employing trauma-sensitive teaching techniques for diverse learners; 4) using culturally-relevant practices while implementing World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards for ELs; and 5) improving instructional practices to meet the needs of immigrant and refugee students. These areas of focus were translated into four distinct workshops with interrelated, yet discrete, themes. In-service teacher participants were primarily from two partner school districts, both with substantial multilingual populations, increasing numbers of refugee and immigrant students, and increasing needs for ESOL instruction and staffing. Data was collected anonymously and all analysis was conducted in accordance with approval from the Towson University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Some participants received workshop stipends from employers for attendance or completing future work related to the workshop topics; however, no compensation was attached to completion of the voluntary surveys analyzed in this paper.

TABLE 1. Professional development workshop session focus areas, participants, and response rates

	Focus Area	Participants	Survey Responses
Workshop 1	Family engagement	Pre-service and in-service teachers	77% completion rate (n=54) (see below p. 18)
Workshop 2	Management and restorative practices	Pre-service and in-service teachers	71% response rate (n= 74) (see below p. 19)
Workshop 3	Trauma and restorative practices	Pre-service and in-service teachers; higher education faculty; undergraduate and graduate students	*respondents (n=43) for all three summer workshops.
Workshop 4	Supporting immigrant and refugee students via responsive practices	Pre-service and in-service teachers; higher education faculty	*respondents (n=43) for all three summer workshops.
Workshop 5	WIDA standards and instructional practices for ELs	Pre-service and in-service teachers; higher education faculty	*respondents (n=43) for all three summer workshops.

The first workshop was designed to improve pre-service and in-service teachers' awareness of and ability to take an active role in improving family engagement. This included specifically aiding those in attendance with outreach and support of families who had children with disabilities and those from multilingual backgrounds. These were considered to be areas of need among teachers in the area. The workshop featured a panel of parents of children with disabilities, all of whom were from multilingual backgrounds. Parents shared their experiences with disability, including information about their child's diagnosis and functioning when appropriate, as well as their experiences and encounters with the local school system.

A second workshop featured a panel of teachers and administrators from local school systems who shared specific classroom management practices along with evidence of effectiveness within their classrooms for children with disabilities, multilingual learners, and students who were receiving both ESOL and special education services. The workshop featured a panel discussion, a coordinated set of interactive activities, and small group discussions. The panel featured staff members from a local school system, including two administrators, teachers, and a behavior interventionist, who had spent several years developing and implementing a school-wide system of support emphasizing restorative behavior management practices for the diverse learners in their school.

While restorative justice practices were first identified for use among youth who were served outside of the general education setting and preparing for re-entry into the classroom, restorative practices were specifically a topic that came out of conversations with teachers who were looking for techniques and support surrounding non-punitive approaches to discipline that focused on teaching social-emotional skills and empathy. Techniques like "restorative circles" were used as a school-wide approach to teaching those skills by the presenters from the district in one PD session. The methods were designed by the district to offer support to its teachers for time spent among all students within their classrooms (not specific to students with disabilities, students with discipline issues, or multilingual students). They were taking this approach to build community, improve student dialogue, and respond appropriately to challenging situations.

Given that restorative practices were used in our partner schools, we also wanted those who were targeted for the PD to learn how they could apply these techniques in their own classrooms with diverse learners, including multilingual students. The presenters shared several techniques to include all students in these practices. Our focus in the workshop was to ensure that participants walked away knowing how they could access additional materials and resources and utilize restorative practices with multilingual Learners, because some of these practices can present a language barrier for ELs.

The third, fourth and fifth PD workshops occurred in the first year of the project, two months after the spring workshops had concluded. The PD sessions offered during these three workshop days featured new content on addressing supports for students with trauma, improving instructional practices to meet the needs of immigrants and refugees, and the implementation of practices that meet the WIDA standards. For this training, the PD focused on incorporating

trauma-sensitive methods to ensure that teachers were prepared to incorporate the unique needs of multilingual learners into that framework.

Each workshop session was between two and four hours, running on multiple dates through the summer. Some topics were repeated to ensure that individuals who were interested in that topic had more than one opportunity to attend a PD session. Individuals were invited to participate in one or more of the workshops. Invitees included undergraduates and graduates enrolled in classes with the sponsoring school of education, selected alumni, faculty, in-service teachers from the targeted schools supported in the five-year project.

Methodology

This study is situated within the framework of practice-oriented research (Oancea & Furlong, 2007), in which research focuses on problems or issues of practice and connects directly back to practice in its implications and findings (Verschuren, 2009). Practice-oriented education research is intended to contribute to educational research and practice, and aims to engage practitioners in the research process (Furlong & Oancea, 2007). Validity of practice-oriented research is determined based on a cumulative series of sub-criteria by the involved practitioners, including 1) comprehension, 2) acceptance, 3) legitimacy, and 4) learning from the research (Verschuren, 2009). Our practice-oriented methodology involved planning the PD workshop sessions, conducting the PD workshop sessions with each group of participants (See Table 1), and then surveying the participants after completion of the PD workshop sessions.

Following each PD session, participants were asked to complete a survey which asked about their years of teaching experience, prior preparation to work with ELs and MLs, and experiences working with ELs, MLs, and students with disabilities. Participants were asked to rate the degree to which workshop content and presentations met their PD needs, using a Likert scale of 1 (least effective) to 4 (most effective). In addition, participants were asked to include qualitative feedback on the information that they gathered from the workshop, reflecting specifically on the following: 1) what would they recommend to further improve the PD offering; 2) what was a key takeaway or idea that they will incorporate into their current or future practice; and 3) is there any additional information that they would want to share related to their experience at the event.

Data collected from the surveys administered after each workshop was aggregated. Descriptive results were used by the project team to plan additional PD and courses used in the professional training sequence that starts in the second year of the preparation project. This population represented a convenience sample, distinguished by their interest in the topic (opt-in PD on issues related to multilingual learners), summer availability, and willingness to complete the survey. We performed descriptive quantitative analysis on quantitative responses and coding of qualitative constructed responses. Participants could also opt-in to receive information on future PD and course funding opportunities. By the conclusion of the first year, a cohort of 18 in-

service teachers and a cohort of 20 pre-service teachers were enrolled to start their 18 credit preparation programs.

Results

Improving engagement with children, families, and members of the community

The survey following the workshop on family engagement had a 77% completion rate (n=54). The participants who responded to the survey were primarily pre-service teachers at the undergraduate (n=37) or graduate (n=12) level. Other respondents were a mix of faculty and teachers within local school systems near the university. Of those who responded to the survey, about half (n=29) reported prior experience working with multilingual students, and an almost equal number (n=24) did not have prior experience working with ELs. Among those who were currently working with multilingual learners, seven respondents were working with at least one multilingual student in their classroom or field work site, and nine were working with two or more multilingual learners.

The family engagement workshop was designed to offer information on how to work with families of students with disabilities and multilingual students with disabilities. Therefore, participants were also asked to report on their prior experience working with families of children with disabilities. Among those who responded, 41 (76%) reported prior experience, while 10 respondents (19%) noted that they did not have prior experience working with families of children with disabilities. When asked if they had attended prior trainings or participated in prior coursework that taught about working with families of children with disabilities, 37 respondents (69%) had received prior training or course work.

Respondents rated the effectiveness of the panel of presenters in seeking and answering audience questions as effective (mean=3.28, SD=0.84). Respondents rated the ability of the panel to present information that added to the respondents' knowledge and skills in engaging with parents, families, and community members as highly effective (mean=3.82, SD=0.38). Respondents also rated the PD as highly effective in providing skills that can be applied in their current or future practice [Table 1].

Qualitative responses highlighted the unique aspects of working with students with disabilities and the relevance of ongoing PD in cross-cultural issues related to disability. Respondents also addressed the need to engage with families from multilingual backgrounds as they considered how different cultures view disability. Responses surrounding this theme included, "I really appreciated hearing parents from different backgrounds" and hearing about "the differences in cultural perspectives on autism/learning disabilities." One respondent described the impact in more specific terms, stating, "[One panelist] talked about how in her culture [people] do not talk about autism. This is so important to be aware of when working with families." This workshop highlighted the needs of students with disabilities who were also from multilingual backgrounds, and responses indicated that additional training should emphasize how to offer service and supports to teachers working with these students and families.

Classroom management and restorative practices

After the second workshop, which focused on classroom management and restorative practices for students with disabilities and multilingual learners, an evaluation was provided to all participants and returned with a 71% response rate (n= 74). Among those who responded to the survey, 59 (80%) reported that they were undergraduate students, 4 (5%) were graduate students, 8 (11%) were higher education faculty, and the remainder (4%) identified as in-service teachers or administrators within a local school system.

Participants were asked to report on their prior experience working with multilingual students. Among the respondents, 59 (80%) reported prior experience working with multilingual students, while 12 (16%) individuals did not have prior experience. Among the respondents, 33% were not currently working with EL students; however, just over 40% were currently working with two or more multilingual students in their classrooms. Furthermore, 50 respondents (68%) had participated in prior training or classwork that taught how to work with multilingual learners. The amount of time spent on this prior classwork or training was limited, and only 18 respondents had experienced more than 10 hours of prior training in this area.

In addition to rating the effectiveness of the workshop and the presentation of material in meeting their PD needs, respondents were asked to report on their prior experience working with restorative practices in schools. Among the respondents, 70 (95%) indicated that they had heard of restorative practices, and 44 (59%) respondents were currently utilizing restorative practices within their classrooms. However, when asked if they had specifically used restorative practices successfully with multilingual learners, only 20 (27%) respondents said they had employed restorative practices successfully with multilingual learners, 27 (36%) had not used restorative practices successfully with multilingual learners, and 22 (30%) were not sure whether they had used restorative practices successfully with multilingual learners. Average responses on a 1 (least effective) to 4 (most effective) Likert scale indicated that the workshop was effective in engaging the audience on topics relevant to the instruction of multilingual learners (mean = 3.53, SD = 0.63) and implementation of restorative classroom practices (mean = 3.71, SD = 0.56). Furthermore, average Likert ratings indicated the workshop was effective (mean = 3.76, SD = 0.49) in increasing the respondents' knowledge and skills as applied to their practice [Table 1].

Qualitative responses highlighted participants' views of the ways restorative practices can build relationships among stakeholders. One respondent noted, "Restorative practices [can] be most effective when all stakeholders commit to the program [...] the results can be life-changing." Another noted, "Make sure to accommodate all students – everyone learns differently and [participates] in restorative circles differently." Others emphasized the impact of watching evidence of restorative practices from school site videos that were presented by the panel. Respondents commented on how supports, such as those described in the session, might be included in their current or future practice, suggesting the value of immediately applicable content. As one respondent noted, "Circle talks encouraged ELs, and helped them feel comfortable." Similar comments reiterated the need to ensure that classroom practices included and encouraged participation from all students, regardless of ability or background. Respondents

reported that the meaningful participation of all students aided the advancement of an inclusive and multicultural classroom.

Addressing unique needs of instructors of Els

Our summer workshops [Table 1, Workshops 3-5] included fewer participants and a lower response rate among those surveyed. Among respondents (n=43) to the workshops, four (9%) identified as teachers in a local school system and 30 (70%) identified as higher education faculty. Almost half of the respondents had 10 or more years of experience and an additional 13 participants (30%) had between 5 and 10 years of teaching experience. Thirty-nine respondents (91%) indicated they had prior experience working with multilingual learners. One respondent also indicated having ESOL certification.

When asked specifically to rate the effectiveness of the workshop in engaging on topics relevant to the instruction of multilingual learners, ratings were consistent across all three workshops with an average rating of 3.55 out of 4. Additionally, when asked to rate the effectiveness of offering information that can be applied in their current or future practice, the average responses across all three sessions were rated as effective [Table 1].

Qualitative responses tended to highlight ways in which participants planned to use the knowledge from the workshop to aid in their future practice. One faculty member in higher education shared, “I will use my new knowledge of how trauma effects children neurologically to modify my curriculum for my interns.” Another noted, “Suggestions will be implemented in my own classroom as well as shared with interns.”

Discussion and Conclusions

These PD sessions were not intended as a full intervention, but served as a means to introduce concepts to a broad audience with limited knowledge about instruction for multilingual learners. The results of this embedded evaluation process indicated that the five workshops were useful in helping bring faculty together to determine ways to further improve course offerings for pre-service teachers surrounding methods of instruction for multilingual students. The evaluation results are limited in determining whether new knowledge and skills discussed in the sessions were later employed by participants that attended the session. However, the material distributed and concepts discussed within each training are reinforced throughout the remainder of the project in multiple ways. Additionally, those pre-service and in-service teachers who attended the PD sessions and then enrolled in the preparation project were also asked to enroll in a larger evaluation of the program and several research projects studying the impact of training on long-term student outcomes.

The post-workshop surveys were administered to a convenience sample of relatively motivated participants who had already demonstrated interest in the topic by opting-in to summer PD. In addition, respondents represented a cross-section of employment and experience levels, ranging from pre-service teachers to experienced in-service P-12 teachers, and higher education instructors. Nevertheless, these results provide a useful snapshot of educator needs and preferences regarding PD in this increasingly important area. Overall, respondents indicated the

PD workshops were effective in meeting their needs, and participation in the sessions increased the knowledge and skills that they could apply to their future practice. Respondents expressed interest in future sessions that could provide user-friendly, immediately useful material targeted toward the instructional and socio-emotional needs of their multilingual learners. Some participants expressed intent to continue exploring these topics with colleagues even after the conclusion of PD workshops. Participants valued opportunities to connect PD topics to actual classroom experience, and they further appeared to value opportunities to begin or continue exploring these important issues with colleagues.

Although PD as a single workshop or training may have limited impact (Rotermund, DeRoche, Ottem, 2017), when used as a means to introduce a topic, engage teachers and faculty, and identify individuals who are interested in more targeted and intensive support, stand-alone PD workshops may be useful to launch a larger intervention or study, as indicated by teachers' expressed interests at the conclusion of these sessions. Additional research on the progress pre-service and in-service teachers make through the training project and the impact on outcomes for their multilingual learners is needed to determine the potential long-term effects of this PD model on teacher preparation and student outcomes. Our results indicate that stand-alone PD could serve as an effective launching point to inspire educators to engage in more intensive, long-term study of relevant pedagogical topics. We recommend using creative ways to introduce methods of instruction for multilingual learners through PD or in existing coursework. Developing courses for preservice teachers that focus on teaching CLD learners can be helpful (Hutchison, 2013). The use of traditional PD in combination with these other methods may pique participant interest and encourage meaningful engagement in more intensive preparation.

Using one set of training techniques or methods at the exclusion of others may limit the ways in which teachers are prepared to work with multilingual learners. While relying on traditional approaches to PD as a stand-alone form of training may produce limited results, stand-alone PD can still serve as a catalyst to expose educators to new ideas and encourage them to engage in more intensive study. While it is difficult to assess the impact of the PD training beyond the immediate reflection of a participant's time during the PD session, expanding options for training and then using multiple means of delivery through varied approaches to teacher preparation may enhance both pre-service and in-service teachers' understanding of topics relevant to serving multilingual learners. In addition, the use of PD as a tool for recruitment is an area that should be further explored. Through these PD sessions, pre-service teachers were exposed to issues pertinent to their future roles in the classroom, which also has an immediate impact in their interest in taking additional coursework to support their role in the diverse classrooms that they will soon enter. In-service teachers and higher education faculty were able to engage in topics that were of immediate relevance to their teaching, potentially allowing them to become advocates for more PD and coursework related to multilingual students at their teaching sites.

Future PD efforts might effectively engage participants across roles on topics of common interests in order to facilitate collaborative reflection. In addition, future PD efforts might provide an overview of topics most likely to impact teachers' day-to-day activities, such as integrating

content and WIDA standards, supporting students who have experienced trauma, or understanding students' diverse cultures and backgrounds. Finally, single-occasion PD appears to be most effective when used to launch a larger effort or initiate a longer, more sustained sequence that will support educators' continued professional growth.

Our findings suggest that even in brief PD sessions, respondents gained increased awareness of the needs that multilingual learners may bring to the classroom, and respondents also appear to be willing to integrate the practices addressed in PD into their own instruction. These findings underscore the importance of continued efforts to increase teachers' knowledge about multilingual learners and to further support, through ongoing needs assessments and PD, teachers' integration of exemplary practices into instruction and intervention. Such PD, indeed, can challenge in-service teachers to engage with their students within their practice, as informed and reflective educators.

Declaration of Interest Statement:

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Acquisition under Grant NPD.2017.T36Z170189. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned within this manuscript is intended or should be inferred.

References

- Alismail, H. A. (2016). Multicultural education: Teachers' perceptions and preparation. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(11), 140-146.
- Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx.
- Cheatham, A. (2020, October 29). *U.S. Detention of Child Migrants*. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/us-detention-child-migrants>
- Chishti, M., Pierce, S. and Telus, H. (2019, June 26). Spike in Unaccompanied Child Arrivals at U.S.-Mexico Border Proves Enduring Challenge; Citizenship Question on 2020 Census in Doubt. Migration Policy Institute (MPI). Migrationpolicy.Org. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/spike-unaccompanied-child-arrivals-proves-enduring-challenge>
- Colorín Colorado. (2018, August 17). Addressing Student Trauma, Anxiety, and Depression. Colorín Colorado. <https://www.colorincolorado.org/immigration/guide/trauma>
- Croft, A., Cogshall, J., Dolan, M., & Powers, E. (with Killion, J.). (2010). Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well (Issue Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Custodio, Brenda & O'Loughlin, Judith B. (2020, March 11). Students with Interrupted Formal Education. American Federation of Teachers. https://www.aft.org/ae/spring2020/custodio_oloughlin#:~:text=Understanding%20Who%20They%20Are&text=Students%20with%20interrupted%20formal
- Doran, P. R. (2014). Professional development for teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners: Teachers' experiences and perceptions. *Global Education Journal*, 3, 62-80.
- Douglas, W. O. & Supreme Court of the United States. (1973) U.S. Reports: Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563.
- Esparza Brown, J., & Sanford, A. (2011). RTI for English language learners: Appropriately using screening and progress monitoring tools to improve instructional outcomes. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.rti4success.org/images/stories/pdfs/rtiforells.pdf>
- Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114thcongress/senate-bill/1177>
- Flores, Josephina. (2015). Information Resource Immigrant Youth: Some Implications for Schools. School Mental Health Project. Center for Mental Health in Schools. Department of Psychology. University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/immig.pdf>

- Furlong, J. & Oancea, A. (2007). Assessing quality in applied and practice-based research in education: continuing the debate. *Research Papers in Education*, 22(2), 115-118, DOI: 10.1080/02671520701296015
- Gándara, P., & Santibañez, L. (2016). *The Teachers Our English Language Learners Need - Educational Leadership*. Ascd.org; Educational Leadership. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/feb16/vol73/num05/The-Teachers-Our-English-Language-Learners-Need.aspx>
- Garcia, E. (1992). Teachers for language minority students: Evaluating professional standards. Focus on evaluation and measurement, Vols. I and II. *Proceedings of the National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Garcia, E. (1996). Preparing instructional professionals for linguistically and culturally diverse students. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 802–813). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2009). *Funds of knowledge: theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Grantmakers for Education. (2013). Grantmaking Strategies for Closing America’s Achievement Gap. https://edfunders.org/sites/default/files/Educating%20English%20Language%20Learners_April%202013.pdf
- Groothuijsen, S.E.A., Bronkhorst, L.H., Prins, G.T., & Kuiper, W. (2020). Teacher-researchers’ quality concerns for practice-oriented educational research. *Research Papers in Education*, 35(6), 766-787. DOI: 10.1080/02671522.2019.1633558
- Hill, H. C., Beisegel, M., & Jacob, R. (2013) Professional development research: Consensus, crossroads, and challenges, *Educational Researcher*, 42(9), 476-487.
- Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, M. G. (2015) *Co-Teaching ELLs: Riding a tandem bike*. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 56-60.
- Hutchison, M. (2013). Bridging the gap: Preservice teachers and their knowledge of working with English Language Learners. *TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 25-54.
- Islam, C., & Park, M.-H. (2015). Preparing Teachers to Promote Culturally Relevant Teaching: Helping English Language Learners in the Classroom. *Multicultural Education*, 23(1), 38–44.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980.
- Kose, B. W. & Lim, EY. (2011). Transformative professional learning within schools: Relationship to teachers’ beliefs, expertise and teaching. *Urban Review*, 43, 196-216.
- Li, N. & Peters, A. W. (2016). Preparing K-12 teachers for ELLs: Improving teachers’ L2 knowledge and strategies through innovative professional development. *Urban Education*, 51, 1-18.
- Mellom, P, J., Straubhaar, R., Balderas, C., Ariail, M., Portes, P. R. (2018). “They come with nothing:” How professional development in a culturally responsive pedagogy shapes teacher attitudes towards Latino/a English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 71, 98-107.

- Milk, R., Mercado, C., & Sapiens, A. (1992, Summer). Rethinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools. *NCBE Focus: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education*. Number 6.
- Minahan, J. (2019). Trauma-Informed Teaching Strategies. *Educational Leadership*, 77(2), 30–35. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1231183>
- Miranda, J. L. W., Wells, J. C., & Jenkins, A. (2017). Preparing special education teacher candidates to teach English language learners with disabilities: How well are we doing? *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817730665>
- Moll, L. C. (1988). Turning to the world: Bilingual school, literacy, and the cultural mediation of thinking. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *National Reading Conference Yearbook* (pp. 59–75). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Molle, D. (2013). Facilitating professional development for teachers of English language learners, *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 29, 197-207.
- More, C. M., Spies, T. G., Morgan, J. J., & Baker, J. N. (2016). Incorporating English language learner instruction within special education teacher preparation. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 51(4), 229-237.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2020a). English language learners in public schools. The Condition of Education 2020. Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2020b). *The Condition of Education - Preprimary, Elementary, and Secondary Education - Elementary and Secondary Enrollment - Children and Youth with Disabilities - Indicator April (2018)*. Ed.gov. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgg.asp
- National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO). (2018). *ELs with Disabilities*. Nceo.info. https://nceo.info/student_groups/ells_with_disabilities#:~:text=The%20percentage%20of%20English%20learners
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA). (2017). Fast Facts: EL Demographic Trends. Office of English Language Acquisition. Department of Education. Ed.Gov. https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/19-0193_De14.4_ELDemographicTrends_021220_508.pdf
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 101, Stat. 1425 (2001).
- Oancea, A. & Furlong, J. (2007). Expressions of excellence and the assessment of applied and practice-based research. *Research Papers in Education*, 22(2), 119-137. DOI: 10.1080/02671520701296056
- Office for Civil Rights (OCR). (2015a). *Ensuring English Learner Students Can Participate Meaningfully and Equally in Educational Programs*. English EL DCL Fact Sheet. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-el-students-201501.pdf>
- Office of Civil Rights (OCR). (2015b). *Information for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Parents and Guardians and for Schools and School Districts that Communicate with Them*. English LEP Parent Fact Sheet. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-lep-parents-201501.pdf>
- Office for Civil Rights (OCR). (2018). Developing ELL Programs: Glossary. *Ed.gov*. <https://doi.org/http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/glossary.html>

- Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). (2020, March). *English Learners Who Are Black: Office of English Language Acquisition | National Assessment of Educational Progress | Race and Ethnicity in the United States Census*. Scribd. https://www.scribd.com/document/456832567/FactSheet-ELsWhoAreBlack#download&from_embed
- Quintero & Hansen (2017). English Learners and the Growing Need for Qualified Teachers. Brown Center Chalkboard, Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/06/02/english-learners-and-the-growing-need-for-qualified-teachers/>
- Rotermund, S., DeRoche, J., & Ottem, R. (2017). Teacher professional development by selected teacher and school characteristics: 2011-12. [Stats in Brief]. NCES 2017-200. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from: <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017200.pdf>.
- Ros, A., & Vermeulen, M. (2010). *Standards for practice-based research*. Paper presented at EAPRIL conference; Lisbon, Portugal.
- Rutherford-Quach, S., Kuo, A., & Hsieh, H. (2018). *Understanding Their Language Online Professional Development for Teachers of ELLs*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1192845.pdf>
- Santos, M., Darling-Hammond, L., & Cheuk, T. (2012). *Teacher Development to Support English Language Learners in the Context of Common Core State Standards*. <https://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/10-Santos%20LDH%20Teacher%20Development%20FINAL.pdf>
- Sargrad, S. (2016). Hope for English-Language Learners. *US News & World Report*. <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2016-01-13/every-student-succeeds-act-brings-new-hope-for-english-language-learners>
- Slapac, A., Kim, S., & Coppersmith, S. A. (2020). Preparing and Enriching Linguistically and Culturally Responsive Educators Through Professional Development. In Slapac, A., & Coppersmith, S. A. (Ed.), *Beyond Language Learning Instruction: Transformative Supports for Emergent Bilinguals and Educators* (pp. 282-304). IGI Global. <http://doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-1962-2.ch012>
- Schmidt, Lauren. M. (2018). Trauma in English learners: Examining the influence of previous trauma and PTSD on English learners and within the classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 10(1), e00412. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.412>
- Sugarman, J. & Geary, C. (2018). *English Learners in Maryland: Demographics, Outcomes and State Accountability Policies* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org>
- Stein, J. C. (2011). The case for collaboration: Integrating information on English learners and special education in teacher preparation programs. *Multicultural Education*, 18(3), 35.
- Title IX - General Provisions*. (2005, December 19). Www2.Ed.Gov. <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg107.html>
- United States Census Bureau. (2019). *U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States*. [Www.census.gov](https://www.census.gov). <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/POP815219#POP815219>

- U.S. Department of Education (USDE). (2014). *Ensuring English Learner Students Can Participate Meaningfully and Equally in Educational Programs*. English EL DCL Fact Sheet. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-el-students-201501.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education (USDE). (2017). *Our Nation's English Learners*. Www2.Ed.gov. <https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/el-characteristics/index.html#:~:text=Though%20ELs%20made%20up%2010>
- Wong Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. (2002). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Zehler, A., Fleischman, L., Hopstock, P., Pendzick, M., & Stephenson, T. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities*. Arlington, VA: U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. https://www.ncela.ed.gov/files/rcd/BE021199/special_ed4.pdf
- Valdés, G., Kibler, A., & Walqui, A. (2014). *Changes in the Expertise of ESL Professionals: Knowledge and Action in an Era of New Standards*. <https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/papers-and-briefs/professional-paper-26-march-2014.pdf>
- Verschuren, P. J. M. (2009). *Why a Methodology for Practice-Oriented Research Is a Necessary Heresy*. Nijmegen: Radboud University.
- Zeigler, K., & Camarota, S. A. (2019, October 29). *67.3 Million in the United States Spoke a Foreign Language at Home in 2018*. Center for Immigration Studies. CIS.org. <https://cis.org/Report/673-Million-United-States-Spoke-Foreign-Language-Home-2018#:~:text=Among%20the%20findings%3A>



**Unexamined Ideas and Beliefs Shaping Efficacy and Implementation
of Dual-Language Programs for Better or for Worse**

Jose Orozco
Garland, TX

Michael Whitacre
Associate Professor, Bilingual & Literacy Studies
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Abstract

Educators' transformative power can be harnessed or arrested contingent on what scripts educators subscribe to and the schooling experience conceptual maps system they develop, which creates the mindset they want to exercise in their practice. Utilizing Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT), this study has captured the subtle transformation of a dual language program and how educators have choices even when satisfying the systems stifling requirements at different levels in a public education system. These choices can impact the execution and fidelity of any program, thus altering the expected outcomes and students' learning, including their road to biliteracy.

Keywords– linguisticism, itinerant curriculum, reflection

Unexamined Ideas and Beliefs Shaping Efficacy and Implementation of Dual-Language Programs for Better or Worse

Introduction Background of the Study

As indicated by Deacon (2006), the schooling experience is used as a form of moral orthopedics for the housing society, translating it into a process that shapes educational objectives, encases the teacher profession, the curriculum, how we teach and learn, and the expectations and duties of all participants. Hegemonistic traditions bind the education system, those rooted leanings of domineering methods favoring certain social groups more than others. Moreover, linguistic practices reinforce the imbalance of biased inequitable conduct towards specific languages and their communities. It fosters the suppression of some forms of knowledge, including languages with less social capital, because the system strives to norm conforming reproducible experiences across the spectrum of time and space (Janson & Silva, 2017; Moreira, 2017). Moreover, the bureaucratic elements of the teaching profession, including its tendency to be administered and enact change through officialdom, create a lumbering and monolithic apparatus, first, by being trapped in traditions, beliefs, and ideas. Second, the staunch complications stemmed from trying to persuade the community of the professionalism of the teaching vocation and academia's reluctance to ease on the power that dictates what is high-status knowledge (Labaree, 1992).

The study aims to attain and advance a more transparent grasp of how unchallenged myths, traditions, and ideologies contribute to the power struggle and efficacy of teaching within Dual Language Bilingual Education (DLBE). The prospect of balancing the dichotomies of the profession with the impetus of being an educator, realizing the power teachers hold on the learning experience. Choosing and designing the curriculum can be an act of aggression, including language acquisition programs, which Valdes (2015) describes as the curricularization of the language by determining the sequence, what is to be acquired, the process, the place, and the end goal of the language acquisition. All are based on the utilization of hegemonistic frameworks prevalent in the education system. Likewise, this can also be extended to selecting and implementing instructional programs with specific aims and objectives to serve the different populations in the learning experience, such as language learners who speak languages other than English.

Additionally, the fidelity of implementation is crucial to the success of any educational curriculum, including dual-language programs. Constant oversight and monitoring at all levels of the program's effectiveness are necessary, as proper record-keeping satisfies accountability and makes essential adjustments with accurate data analysis and interpretation. Li et al. (2016) stated that fidelity is the extent to which implementing the model or intervention represents the original plan as it was initially designed and envisioned.

Furthermore, using Mora, Wink, and Wink's (2001) findings, Li et al. (2016) caution that the match between the educators responsible for implementing the actual program patterns of execution and in dual language programs, the use of both target languages to the scope and sequence of the original model plan is crucial. The value systems used by educators guiding the schooling experience will determine the quality of the experience. "The importance of fidelity of implementation, pointing out that while well-implemented dual language programs give students access to optimal conditions for academic development in both languages, the label "dual language" does not guarantee success in meeting the program's goals." (Li et al. 2016, p. 33). The adherence to the initial program plan and the quality of delivery on the educators' part is necessary to meet any dual-language program's goals and objectives. The self-awareness of their value systems impacts all aspects of providing the best opportunities for students, whether in a dual-language classroom or not. The alternatives are adopting a decentered stance or continuing the existing state of affairs. One path accepts a prospect of a change leading to humanizing pedagogies, welcoming dialectical thinking, and decentering subtractive perspectives—the other surrenders to being typecast and the dogmatic ways within the profession.

Paraskeva (2016) proposes an itinerant curriculum theory (ICT) influenced in part by Sousa Santos' (1999) examination of an idea of translation that can be the bond and a conduit for emancipatory practices. For the most part imperfect and limited at encompassing or addressing cognitive and social justice individually, but when interconnected and channeled, it can cast a viable path towards more robust and profound liberation methodologies. ICT can become a path to start from a new beginning confronting and participating fully in challenging the silence of knowledge systems in favor of particular ones and fostering a knowledge democracy that avoids curriculum epistemicides by walking in this demanding path towards cognitive and social justice.

Likewise, educators can work within a changing dual language program by adopting a different posture and approaching education with a refreshing mentality. Carse (1986) describes it as opening the possibility of not being attached or bound by such constraints by adopting an infinite player mentality, being open to being surprised, and tapping on a force that would allow us to find a more dynamic self that is yet to be. Educators walking on this path will consider diverse epistemological platforms worldwide, scrutinizing methods, their validity, and scope with the forewarning of not sinking into a self-justifying position of predilection by denying particular frameworks based on provenance. "The struggle against epistemicides is also a struggle against how non-Western knowledge has been ideologically dismissed. However, the "Western" - "non-Western" framework must not marginalize the systems of power that legitimized dominant forms of knowledge as can be seen in the sciences." (Paraskeva, 2016, p. 102). It is possible to adopt the position beyond dealing with the ultimatums demanded by the contradictions within the experience tapping into the decentralized network of knowledge, borrowing what is needed, and expanding such network by adding the understanding gained described by Gough (2000) as a "rhizomatous approach that sees reality beyond dichotomies, beyond beginnings and endings; an approach that breeds

from the multiplicity of immanent platforms and, from its centerless and periphery-less position, defies clean knowledge territories" (Paraskeva, 2017, p.21)

Purpose and Importance of the Study

It is required to decenter these perspectives to avoid further epistemological purges that have already occurred in the schooling experience, including dual language education. "Schooling issues, such as assessment, subject matter, hours of, textbooks, and the knowledge being transmitted, are wrongly accepted as dogma. Such a limited vision makes it almost impossible to have a vision of schooling without meeting such conditions" (Paraskeva, 2016, p. 212).

The principle of learning resides in an infinite game frame of mind. Acquiring knowledge is a process of being lifetime learners who can broaden our individual and collective understanding of the world around us as we relate to one another through exchanging ideas. "There are at least two kinds of games. One could be called finite, the other infinite. A finite game is played to win, an infinite game to continue the play." (Carse, 1986, p.3) How we approach life, particularly the governing processes within the schooling experience, whether short-term or long-term choices are weighted as options and ramifications deliberated. Being fully aware is essential when acting as a school principal, addressing classroom issues as a homeroom teacher, or charting the direction of a DLBE program as a central office administrator. The awareness of what kind of decisions and choices are being made, whether they are part of a finite game, an immediate win, or are the actions about to be taken, part of a long-range long-lasting infinite game, will dictate and shape the learning experience.

The awareness of the impact of one's decisions when guiding the schooling experience is what Huebner (1966) indicates as the power or influence educators have on intervening in the life of others. The elements of this hidden force that educators exercise directing the education experience will need to conciliate the different participant needs and the system requirements as well involving careful consideration. Carse (1986) explains the finite acts mentality; everybody assumes all are constrained within the boundaries and behave accordingly. "Whoever plays a finite gameplay freely, but it is often the case that finite players will be unaware of this freedom and will think that whatever they do, they must do" (Carse, 1986, p. 44). Moreover, everyone will be typecast in roles that will force everyone into following scripts. The schooling experience becomes a series of learning activities that are selected depending on what values system is being used by the person guiding each level of the learning experience.

Valdes (2018) indicated that ideologies, including those about language, are derived from specific evaluative frameworks. Besides, we function and rely on behavioral processes derived from our experiences, education, perception, and interpretation of the world. Additionally, there needs to be more connection between the different levels of the schooling experience and each participant. Decisions on the learning experience, such as program

implementation and the reasons behind selecting systems, procedures, and approaches, are not evident because each level has a unique vantage point affecting all those living within the learning experience in diverse ways. "Important decisions that directly impact both students and instructors are made simply because policies or traditions require it, because existing ideologies surrounding groups of students and their characteristics have not been interrogated, and because reasonable alternatives have not been explored" (Valdes, 2018).

Viesca and Gray (2021) identify how our world understanding creates these processes as cultural scripts guiding our ways, habits, and actions, including those practices selected to head the schooling experience. Hidden within these cultural scripts are our predilections, biases, preconceptions, and even our prejudices that can go on continually unchecked if we do not intentionally reflect on and review our actions and practices, including those related to teaching. We navigate the schooling experience with warped cultural scripts shaped by our own experience, ideologies, beliefs, and values we have decided to adopt, which disrupt the way to practice education. "It is within these cultural scripts and practices that inequity is perpetuated, and humanizing learning evaded, aiding the preservation of the existing educational conditions" (Viesca and Gray, 2021, p. 213). Unchecked, these cultural scripts and majoritarian stories perpetuate inequality and create an unequal space for everyone. When using a raw framework that only values certain aspects of education, transforming the learning experience through meritocracy, English hegemony, and Western knowledge will only lead to a counterproductive cycle. A path that would not lead to cognitive and social justice.

The risks are palpable when acting on unchecked practices that may feel good and provide a false sense of progress toward cognitive and social justice when in reality is more about image than substance, including the negative impact of creating closed relationships that erect barriers and boundaries, relying on lower-dimensional behavior and linear exchanges. Our own volition alone can break the spell since it is a self-imposed parameter derived from our process and understanding. To disrupt the cycle of unchecked cultural scripts, we must exercise reflective practice to welcome a change of perspectives switching from a Finite Game to an Infinite Game mentality. Participating within this perspective will allow for building a flexible competency, detecting and altering prevailing designs. Evolving our ways within our cultural scripts and everywhere around us, acting on reflective awareness in ways that can influence those patterns within the system that alter the schooling experience negatively. To be successful, one must be able to analyze information from multiple perspectives, use both reason and intuition to make decisions, and then take action. It is also essential to be aware of the system's response to one's actions to learn from previous experiences and improve future actions.

Literature Review

In this ever-changing schooling experience, myths, traditions, and taboos constrain the education field and how the curriculum is delivered and instructed. According to

Paraskeva (2016), yet present at all times, these myths, traditions, and taboos should be acknowledged. There is a need to consider how these educational aspects entwine the fabric of schooling and teaching and understand how it demarcates the experience restraining educators in the name of accountability and trackable efficiency. Moreover, countering the dominant "Western Eurocentric perspectives" that permeates education is necessary. For what groups do the domineering traditions and structures grant an advantage, and what groups have been left marginalized? Janson and Silva (2017) criticize this tradition by defining it as part of the standardization movement; all aspects of schooling and learning become checkboxes to be tracked, measured, and monitored, losing meaning and value in the process. McLaren (2009) specifies that schools are the means and places that foster students' potential, enabling and granting the way for self-transformation. However, as Moreira (2016) indicated, the pervasiveness within the system guided by linguisticism is always present and palpable through a validated scientific production that privileges English above all languages. Making changes to the design and the learning experience under this attested guise of progress while using the same practices in the organization perpetuates the hegemony.

Huebner (1966) indicates that the schooling system is defined and bound by cultural perspectives and performance rituals that tend to produce inequality. These meritocratic interpretations hold enough truth and benefit that merit their continual use. Unchallenged and unrecognized myths in education are partly due to the surrender to the acceptance of the dogma of the particular language used in curriculum and instruction.

The selection of learning experiences, the organization of those learning experiences, and their evaluation are directed at enfolding the student body, including the different subgroups, including minority students with other languages and cultural backgrounds that are not aligned with what is considered mainstream ideologies.

Moreira (2016) indicated that there are particular ways the symbolic systems, including languages, are represented in the educational consciousness. These representations embody an obdurate aura that preserves and disseminates how participants interpret all aspects housed in the symbolic systems participating in the learning experience, extending the hegemony by cementing education processes that favor the schooling experience's systematic arrangement. "Teacher (and learner) images of languages and cultures are often 'schoolarised,' instrumental, ethnocentric, monolithic, and stereotyped. These images reinforce hegemonic understandings of the value of languages and a limited view of their social, cultural, political, and identity role" (Moreira, 2016, p. 153).

DLBE programs signify a counter-hegemonic pluralist discourse opposing assimilationist tendencies prevalent in education's political and theoretical realms. Creating an educational space within the learning experience that appreciates linguistic diversity demonstrates that monolingualism is not the norm and promotes multilingual competence (Henderson, 2020). As school districts and legislators at the state and national levels try to find ways to increase academic progress and student proficiency, the trend has been a considerable increase and proliferation of DLBE programs across the field (Li et al., 2016).

As Valdes (2015) indicated, "The design of language curricula is also influenced by ideologies of language — largely unexamined ideas and beliefs that shape people's thinking about language and about those who use language." Moreover, the curricularizing of language affects the program's implementation. Likewise, there is a tendency to price English above all else. Everything is coalescing within the educator that, for better or worse, can continue guiding the schooling experience with a series of runaway value systems bending the schooling experience towards places that would enfranchise some and disconnect the groups least aligned to such value systems.

Pluriversal Curriculum and Instruction Value System

According to Sousa Santos (2014), Western modernity is centered around the interactions of social regulation and social emancipation that aim at harmonizing dichotomies such as justice and autonomy, solidarity and identity, or equality and freedom with the imbalance created by world capitalism. One should welcome the postulation for a new stance that would include an abundance of distinct knowledge and practices, including subaltern ones. On its own, no single form of knowledge and practice can bestow well-founded advice and direction. As described by Paraskeva (2016), ICT can be seen as a conceivable fight by welcoming the central tenant of the theory that embraces not an all-encompassing platform but a concept that can be defined as pluriversal or multifarious platform of Southern epistemologies that shares the podium with any epistemologies allowing " (1) learning that the South exists, (2) learning to go to the South, and (3) learning from and with the South. Implying not only non-Westernizing the West but also avoiding any Eurocentrism" (Paraskeva, 2016, p. 209).

ICT informs us to stop reproducing and dogmatizing some forms of knowledge while preventing the mystification of Western hegemony. Equally important is not romanticizing indigenous forms of knowledge in the pursuit of being counter-hegemonic. It is not about selecting alternative or counterhegemonic knowledge from a different source within the South. It is not a struggle against science but the hegemonistic ideological and political barriers that are reticent to new understandings. The central tenant is to compare and contemplate distinct forms of knowledge. It is about identifying differences and similarities, being retrospective and fully aware. Thus reaching a decentered space and realizing a new understanding would decolonize our institutions and perspectives by adopting rhizomatic value systems. Moreover, we ask ourselves, "Whose indigenous knowledge? Who benefits? How racialized is that knowledge? How classed is that knowledge? How gendered is that knowledge? How democratic are such indigenous knowledge forms?" (Paraskeva, 2016, p.221).

Huebner (1966) indicated that decisions are made within the learning experience, and curriculum derives from the value systems we subscribe to. Moreover, we seldom use only one system but a combination; however, some have more significant influence than others, but all harbor the best and worst possibilities for the schooling experience. An ICT stance can help discern the possibilities but necessitates asking probing questions. Realizing

the answer to these concepts will provide awareness of how decisions influence and affect the schooling experience. Similarly, having an Infinite Game mentality is devoting time for introspection to analyze information from different angles, internalizing the understanding and how everything fits within the system, bringing the past to the present, and aiding in the decision-making process. It must be an active exercise of retrospection to decenter rooted traditions that perpetuate the hegemony.

Table 1: Huebner, (1966) Curricular Language and Classroom Meanings p. 14-18

Huebner, (1966). Value System definitions		
Technical	Current curricular ideology reflects, almost wholly, a technical value system. It has means-ends rationality that approaches an economic model. End states, products, or objectives are specified as carefully and accurately as possible, hopefully in behavioral terms. Activities are then designed, which become the means to these ends or objectives.	Sociological analysis of the individual. Objectives include concepts, skills, attitudes, or other behavioral terms. Evaluation system based on quality control. Overbearing towards the teacher's power and creativity.
Political	Educators have a position of power and control. He influences others directly or through the manipulation of resources. To remain in a position of adequate power, he must seek the support of those in positions to reward him or influence his behavior in some way.	Teaching or educational. Leadership becomes the vehicle by which people judge the worth and influence of other participants. More often covertly than overtly. Evil and immorality may be produced if power and prestige are sought as ends rather than means for responsible and creative influence.
Scientific	Scientific activity may be broadly designated as that activity that produces new knowledge with an empirical basis. Whereas technical valuing seeks to maximize student change, scientific valuing aims to maximize the attainment of information or knowledge for the teacher or educator.	Scientific methodology. Testing new teaching approaches and strategies or developing new learning spaces. Novelty.
Esthetic	Valued esthetically, the educational activity would be viewed as having symbolic and esthetic meanings. The educational activity is the possibility of life, captured and heightened and standing apart from the world of production, consumption, and intent. It may be valued for the meanings that it reveals and may be valued for its truth.	Wholeness and design. Non- functional and ephemeral. Reflects the meaninglessness and routine of the mechanistic world order.
Ethical	The educational activity is viewed primarily as an encounter between man and man and as ethical categories for valuing this encounter come into being. The educator meets the student, not as an embodied role, as a lesser category, but as a fellow human being who demands acceptance based on fraternity, not simply equality.	No barriers or the educational activity is life. Life's meanings are witnessed and lived in the classroom. To be lived within the fullness of the present moment or the eternal present.

Method

A descriptive survey research design was used for this study. A descriptive survey research design systematically and accurately describes a given population's characteristics or behaviors, in this instance, principals, supervisors, and teachers' attitudes towards dual language practices and implementing the Gomez and Gomez Dual Language Model. Participants were surveyed, and the data were analyzed through qualitative analysis.

The selection in this transcript is of two dual language teachers, Mr. B and Ms. S, both second-grade teachers. Also in the transcript is the conversations with two administrators, Ms. D (Elementary) and Mr. R (High School). Additionally, Ms. M is a Bilingual ESL specialist. All participants are involved in implementing dual-language programs in their district in different capacities. All educators answered a series of questions in a semi-structured interview on their roles, expectations, and experience as bilingual educators. The participants were selected because of their roles in the district and were known to the interviewer. Furthermore, out of all the footage collected for the professional development project, these interviews cover some aspects of policy and practice of bilingual education. This study reviewed several resources, including books, journal articles, and video-recorded conversations with teachers and administrators. The interviews were conducted for district promotional material for the DLBE program or professional development to showcase best practices among teachers within selected schools in designated feeder patterns within a district in Texas. The conversations were transcribed and categorized to interpret educators' comments and distribute them into categories to map their position within an established predetermined ideological spectrum, using Creswell's (2013) template for coding Ethnography and the Huebner (1966) value system to determine the ideological spectrum. The convenience sampling method was used to select the participants in the video recording conversations. The following table three provides a sample of the talks and analysis.

District A Dual Language Program Implementation

The following is a window to provide the context of the district where the research took place. The researcher has worked in different capacities for over a decade and characterizes some accounts witnessed during this time. Before 2006, District A needed an articulation of a DLBE district-wide program. The implementation of bilingual education across the district was not coherent due in part to the lack of certified bilingual teachers. In 2006, District A implemented a comprehensive district-wide DLBE program and employed Gomez and Gomez's model. The model was developed in 1995 in the Rio Grande Valley, located in southern Texas across the US-Mexico border. The one-way model was created as a dual language enrichment content model to serve areas with a large population of English language learners (Gomez et al. 2005).

The program's implementation also offered an opportunity for English language learners to access an education that utilizes their home language and part of their funds of

knowledge with a promise to become biliterate/bilingual. This is partially demonstrated by comments by Mr. B, one of the educators interviewed. He indicated the following about working with English learners from different parts of Latin America:

It is difficult finding the support of parents and colleagues and constantly communicating to ensure their growth and development are adequate. It is all a matter of attitude; it has been a challenge, but if you want, and the students do their part, and parents do their part, we all have the same idea that working as a team can be achieved.

“It is essential to understand our students, their origins, and their cultures and to honor everyone, respect everyone, and recognize each other. Also, coming from different places, we learn to respect each other when we give each other a moment to express ourselves freely and in an environment where we feel safe. The objective of our work is for students to become citizens who are leaders of the community, nationally and globally.

During our conversation, Mr. B was forthcoming about building that immediacy necessary with students. Immediacy is an integral part of teaching and, in particular, helps develop the district's bilingual program's three pillars (bilingualism, high academic achievement, and socio-cultural competence). Hidden within those comments, one can reflect that students need to be transformed into new “citizens who are leaders of the community.” The conversation veered to the socio-cultural aspect and how it is necessary to know the students' cultural backgrounds and incorporate them into the daily curriculum. Moreover, he tries to impart the urgency of speaking more than one language and navigating different cultures. This approach is partly shaped by his experience of having immigrated from Mexico, the capacity to speak two languages, and navigating different cultures by being bilingual. Mr. B uses multiple values; some of his answers are based on ethical and scientific value systems. However, he is aware that the majority are guided by realities and limitations imposed on them by the system driven mainly by the technical value system. Employing dual language immersion programs to assist English language learners is the best choice in reaching adequate achievement levels in both languages compared to other educational models, including transitional models early or late exit and the different programs of ESL. (Gomez et al. 2005). Moreover, these research results have boosted popularity and interest because of the demographics of the school population and the increase of English learners entering compulsory education. Bilingualism is associated with cognitive benefits, improving working memory, selective attention, and superior executive control. The benefits of participating in such programs have demonstrated that English learners and native speakers of English outperform their counterparts enrolled in traditional English-only or transitional programs. Li et al. (2016).

Sanchez et al. (2018) revealed that many dual-language programs had adopted language allocation policies that impose the separation of the two languages recommending exclusive space for English and a second exclusive space for a language other than English. The Gomez and Gomez enrichment model is no exception and prescribes a separation of the languages by content and time. "Instruction in English and the other language may alternate by day, time of day, week, academic subject, or teacher. The strict boundaries separating these

spaces are sharply enacted when two different teachers in two separate classrooms ... for the same group of students" (Sanchez et al., 2018, p.43).

During our conversation with Ms.S the strict separation and how educators adapt and create a space that allows the use of both languages and the interpretation of the program according to the educator's decisions:

"We have many activities, and we have to ensure enough time to teach them. I also have to help build vocabulary in both languages, and I use the program components that are better than others. One of the things we started this year is the bilingual bridge. The bridge thing is to compare and use both languages. It is perfect. It helps me a lot, especially in mathematics."

"Transferring the vocabulary or concepts we have learned in mathematics to Spanish helps greatly. Especially the children that I have who had just arrived and knew more Spanish than English because they come from Mexico. I have some shy children developing their vocabulary works. It helps them come out of their shell. The children are learning words in English; it is more complicated, but they learn with these activities to connect to their Spanish."

Ms. S's takes on dual language education focus on developing her students' vocabulary and language. Her focus is partly because she is a math teacher, and according to the program implementation guidelines, the language of instruction for math is English. She uses vocabulary activities to develop language acquisition and, more importantly, language transfer and translanguaging using strategies such as the bridge to allow students to make metalinguistic connections with the assistance and guidance of the teacher. Similarly, Ms. S is guided by multiple value systems; however, the most dominant are the technical and scientific systems because of the expectations imposed by the selected scripts. She must find ways to meet the system and model requirements of only instructing in English while trying to educate students that need to speak the language. All educational programs must be effectively implemented, and dual-language programs are no exception. Effective programs must be well executed and provide adequate administrative, faculty, and resource support. (Gomez et al. 2005). While always striving to adhere to language allocation mandates to maximize proper implementation, there are constraints in the field that will always work against the appropriate implementation of any program and compete for attention.

When curricularization of language and standardization/neutralization of the curriculum happens, practices, objectives, and focus get altered by the forces of such process because each aspect starts competing for the urgency to meet the different demands imposed by standardizing and curricularizing the language and content. Teachers must implement the dual language program and incorporate new initiatives. Students must continually demonstrate adequate progress toward mastery of the curriculum. The pressure adds up when administrators look for specific practices identified in standardizing the experience and the expectance to see particular elements in each classroom. The comments made by Mr. R as a school principal reflect some of the demands educators encounter:

Teaching a dual language class requires \extra preparation; not all the materials will come handed to you in Spanish, but what is great about that is you get to customize those materials. Many Spanish-speaking teachers who come to the program have not seen the connections with students like them, especially in a comprehensive school setting. There is a need for professional development, and learning to teach multiple languages is essential, but learning how to connect with individuals and develop people is key.

Our department, philosophy, and curriculum must reflect the needs and respect the values of the multicultural generations we serve. We scaffold our curriculum opportunities for our students to see scientists who look and sound like them. We have opportunities for translanguaging to occur so that students, if English is not their native tongue, can think, talk, write, and speak in their native tongue with time to process what they are learning. At the same time, building communities where students feel empowered both in their language capabilities and their culture, and a different connection comes in the dual language program from students selected to be a part of it.

Mr. R commented about the current reality many dual language educators have encountered, the need for more adequate materials. He is talking from the point of view of the administrator. Often materials need to be translated. Mr. R is mainly guided by the political and technical value systems, mentioning the lack of adequate materials and the impact of the learning experience. He is focusing on developing teacher capacity to accomplish the goals prescribed by the district. He also can be guided by Ethical values to provide the best environment possible for bilingual education. However, the lack of resources and the liberty principals take at their campuses to implement their tier versions of the program affects the efficacy and may not guarantee the benefits of participating in a DLBE program for all students. For instance, in District A, practices in the field varied depending on the campus. There were schools, administrators, and teachers that implemented the program differently. Clear examples were the typical constraints such as staffing, scheduling, testing priorities, or misguided understanding of the program goals that would end with manipulating the original plan's language allocation. Many campuses started teaching science in English because administrators perceived students needed to progress faster through the language classification system. Teachers were not using both target languages adequately and tended to ignore the language allocation guidelines because students would be testing in one language. They were justifying the practice of only teaching reading in Spanish because the end-of-year assessments would be in Spanish and a perceived notion that the lack of time and the amount of educational material needed to be covered would not allow for instruction in both languages. Valdes (2018) indicated that educators' ideologies on language, race, and culture generally inform how educators approach education in charge of students. "They inform constructions and conceptualizations of language itself and established emerging theories of what it means to "acquire" both a first and a second language." (Valdes, 2018, p. 396). Moreover, there will be a lack of understanding of the decisions made at the central office level and the actual practice

at schools since both elements of the organization have competing goals. Furthermore, the goals, objectives, and what is considered bilingual can differ for each practitioner. Each interpretation of what is to be bilingual and the program's objectives will inform their practice and what is being implemented, monitored, tested, and reported to mark progress in the language progression of the students. These meanings and frameworks in which educators operate regarding language, along with their subscribed educational theories, inform their definition of what it means to acquire and develop both languages and what is considered bilingualism, curricularizing language in the process (Valdes, 2018). Ms. M's vantage point is from a special education educator, and her concerns are different because she has a distinct focus on the experience:

Many teachers have a misconception about how special education services are implemented or when a student may need any special education. Suppose the students in our classroom are not progressing in some objectives in some tests. Many times, it is not that the student needs special education services. In many cases, specific interventions in this environment are often needed to see if the student can overcome those obstacles, that low grade, or that moment of his life. Interventions do not mean that the student is in special education; it means that the student, at this point in his life, needs a specific type of accommodation so that the student can succeed in class. Suppose the student is not successful in those interventions of specific goals. In that case, the teacher can request the specialist or particular education case manager to initiate the evaluation process for the student to receive services. Many times is just a lack of language development and acquisition and not special education services.

Ms. M supports teachers who serve dually identified students as language learners and special education. The process of initiating special education services is often long, with added responsibilities for the teacher that add to their workload. She is guided by providing the best experience for a particular population that often gets pushed to the side and driven by an ethical and scientific value system and the end goal that dually identified students could be successful in the classroom, which means a technical end goal value system.

Discussion

During these conversations with dual language educators, we can see how the different perspectives focus on several main goals: building the necessary immediacy to provide language learners with the best schooling experience possible. The means to reach that immediacy is to get to know the students in the classroom, be familiar with their cultural backgrounds, and involve the family as much as possible. Many of them are multilingual and understand the realities that language learners face in the classroom, which can serve as a tool to build connections, incorporate the cultural backgrounds of the classroom into the curriculum, and provide the best possible schooling experience for their students. It seems that all of them understand the need to provide students with adequate tools to master

the English language, navigate a multicultural environment, and succeed in school and the outside. This series of interviews or conversations only begins to cover the intricacy of being a dual language educator. Moreover, using the Huebner (1966) value system, educators in the DLBE program use more than one value system to conduct business within the classroom. Each educator represents different levels and perspectives of the individuals involved in implementing the program. One of the significant obstacles to proposing using different perspectives and stances is self-assurance of the individual's thinking process; this aspect generates a perception that matters are under control and being handled correctly. It is not an attempt to second-guess our thinking process or weaken the self-assurance of our decisions. It is a call to allow space and time for analyzing decisions from multiple perspectives questioning the effects and implications by being retrospective, and, more than anything being aware if our machinations are leading to a humanizing schooling experience. Adopting such perspectives and approaches as discussed before, such as using ICT or the Infinite game mentality to question and decenter such perspectives and traditions, perpetuates Western/English hegemony.

Conclusion

As mentioned before, we can take the first step to break the spell and adopt a different stand of our own volition. This perspective promises a decenter and eroding of the power of the current status quo in education and the change stemming from educators avoiding the bureaucratic approach of the system to reinvent itself in its self-image. The limitations of the research are that more encounters are needed to discern what ideologies and perspectives, and even though the technical value system is predominant in all of the decisions in education, there are ways to implement ICT and the Infinite game mentality. Moreover, one crucial aspect that should have been considered is the participants' self-esteem and self-efficacy as an educator. The lack of consideration is partly because it was absent in the selected value systems classification matrix or ICT.

References

- Bernstein, K. A., Alvarez, A., Chaparro, S., & Henderson, K. I. (2021). "We live in the age of choice": school administrators, school choice policies, and the shaping of dual language bilingual education. *Language Policy*. *Published*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-021-09578-0>
- Carse, J. (2013b). *Finite and Infinite Games*. Free Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gómez, L. Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50–50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29, 145–164. 10.1080/15235882.2005.10162828
- Henderson, K. (2020). Language Ideological Multiplicity and Tension within dual language bilingual education teachers. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1791708>
- Huebner, D. (1966). Curricular Language and Classroom Meanings. *The Lure of the Transcendent*, 1st Edition. Human Systems Dynamics Institute Finite and Infinite Games Description of Finite and Infinite Games. (2016). Human Systems Dynamics Institute.
- Janson, E., & Silva, CM (2017). Itinerant curriculum theory: Navigating the waters of power, identity, and praxis | *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* (JAAACS). <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/jaaacs/article/view/189711>
- Labaree, D. (1992). Power, Knowledge, and the Rationalization of Teaching: A Genealogy of the Movement to Professionalize Teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 123–155. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.62.2.h73x7422v3166102>
- Li, J., Steele, J., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Teaching practices and language use in two-Way dual language immersion programs in a large public school district. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10 (1), 31– 43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118669>
- McLaren, P. (2009). Critical Pedagogy: A look at major concepts. In A. Dardar, MP Baltodano, & R.D. Torres, (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 61–83).
- Moreira, M A (2017). "And the linguistic minorities suffer what they must?": A review of conflicts in curriculum theory through the lenses of language teacher education. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* (JAAACS). <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/jaaacs/article/view/189710>
- Paraskeva, J. (2016). *Epistemicide curriculum: Toward an itinerant curriculum theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Paraskeva, J. (2017). Itinerant curriculum theory revisited on a non-theorized towards the canonicide: addressing the 'curriculum involution.' *Journal for the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 12. 1-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14288/jaaacs.v12i1.189713>
- Sánchez, M, García, O. & Solorza, C. (2018). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41:1, 37–51, DOI:10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098
- Santos, B. D. S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Valdes, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*. 41. 1–25. DOI: 10.1080 / 15235882.2018.1539886
- Valdés, G. (2015). Latin @ s and the intergenerational continuity of Spanish: The challenges of curricularizing language, *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9: pp. 4, 253–273, DOI: 10.1080/19313152.2015.1086625
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A Cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Educational Review* 1 September 1997; 67 (3): 391–430. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948>
- Viesca, K. M., & Gray, T. (2021). Disrupting evasion pedagogies. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(3), 213–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1893173>



**BOOK REVIEW: EDUCATING ACROSS BORDERS: THE CASE OF A DUAL
LANGUAGE PROGRAM ON THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER**

Claudia Cabrera

Assistant Director of Dual Language Community Lab

University of Texas at San Antonio

Introduction

The authors conducted a three-year ethnographic study of transfronterizx (border-crossing) students in a dual language (DL) program at an elementary school on the U.S.-Mexico border (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). They sought to answer a broad question as to what tools do transnational students use to navigate U.S. schools, language practices, and kinds of knowledge these students used in the DL classroom. The main thesis statement is that by developing awareness of how transfronterizx students use their knowledge in schools will, in turn, provide teachers more complex understanding of the resource's students bring to school (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). This awareness of transfronterizx student knowledge will help teachers recognize ways in which to capitalize these mobile resources for relevant educational experiences (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). The authors chose a population that is characteristic of the region on the U.S.-Mexico border and highlighted their knowledge and resources salient to their lived experiences. They also focused on the constructed safe learning spaces in the DL classroom that were designed to promote literacy learning using multimodal and translanguaging practices (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). The findings of these multimodal and translanguaging practices in these DL classrooms will enhance research and implications for teaching and learning in a DL classroom. Chapter 7 Translanguaging: Access to Science Discourse will be the focus of this book review.

Summary

In Chapter 7, the authors elaborate on the effectiveness of a fourth-grade teacher utilization of meaning-making practices to "mediate understanding of science content knowledge" (p. 10). The teacher capitalized on the student's prior knowledge, epistemological beliefs, and language repertoire and provided scaffolding to bridge academic knowledge. Also, by creating safe spaces and community practices, students participated in activities in two languages, English and Spanish. First, the authors explain the theoretical framework they used to approach their research. The authors used the sociocultural perspective, and constructivism theory as a lens to analyze the learning process in science education in a dual language classroom (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca; Sawyer, 2014). The authors focus on how bilingual students use language mediation as a strategy to learn from each other and uses Olmedo's study where students used translation, modeling, and scaffolding to address miscommunication where a peer needed assistance in understanding due to lack of background knowledge in the content (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). Scaffolding was defined using Vygotskian Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), where learning occurs through social interactions, for example, peer collaboration, small group activities, and teacher-guided activities (Moll, 2014; Smagorinsky, 2011 as cited by de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018).

Also, the translanguaging framework was defined as bilingualism used as a tool to mediate learning. These teacher and student practices include manipulating text in two languages, discussions in one language and checking for understanding in another, reading in one language, and writing in another (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). The authors contend that few studies focus on Content and Language Integrated Learning (Coyle, Hood, & March, 2010 as

cited by de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018) where students use their full language repertoire for academic learning in a space that scaffolds prior knowledge in a supportive environment. Herein, students use their full language repertoire to create meaning and ultimately become mobile resources with the capability to adapt globally (Garcia and Wei, 2014 as cited by de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018).

Analysis

The authors offer three examples of translanguaging as a pedagogical practice that were observed in the DL classroom:

- (1) The teacher used real-life objects to introduce concepts and bridged prior knowledge to new scientific concepts.
- (2) The teacher elicited dialogue and collaborative science activities.
- (3) The teacher used peer scaffolding in a writing activity.

First, an example of translanguaging was observed in Ms. O's DL classroom while studying different forms of energy in the world around them. The instruction was conducted in English, videos, and teacher lead discussions, and students mostly answered in Spanish. She allowed students to answer questions about molecular structures in the language they were most comfortable answering in. Ms. O used familiar objects to demonstrate solids and used translanguaging to clarify the meaning of concepts to ensure students gained a deeper conceptual understanding (Sawyer, 2014). She translated an unfamiliar term from English to Spanish, such as cardboard into *cartón*. Researchers also observed Ms. O modeling the scientific process of observing the natural world by using real-world objects familiar to the students. By accessing the student's prior knowledge and language capabilities to develop scientific concepts demonstrates Piaget's work on constructivism and how new ideas emerge from old ones (Sawyer, 2014). By using translanguaging and a tool for mediation, the students were able to make meaning to scientific concepts (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). As recommended by Garcia and Wei teachers should also practice flexible language use during instruction to help translate and check for understanding. Macaro (2006), as cited by Garcia and Wei, states, "Taking away the bilingual teacher's right to codeswitch is like taking away the student's right to use a bilingual dictionary" (p. 60).

Second, Ms. O used an instructional strategy to elicit dialogue and collaborative science activities. The focus was for students to engage in self-reflection in their thinking process, which is indicative of metacognitive awareness. Ms. O and her students engaged in a dialogue about compost and what types of food are used to create this type of soil. She posed the question, "How do humans use soil? Think in real life." Ms. O encouraged the students to use prior knowledge to make meaning of new content and understand their thinking process and as a result, the students provided a variety of responses. Students took the time to reflect and took a risk with their answers even though they were not sure they were correct. Furthermore, students used Spanish and English interchangeably. They made connections to food that are nutritious for their bodies to soils that are nutritious for plants. She was able to build on their knowledge and bridge understanding to

make meaning, therefore scaffolding the students' understanding of the concepts of soil nutrition using translanguaging (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). This activity is an example of the development of metacognitive awareness as the students were able to reflect and experience conceptual change (Sawyer, 2014).

Third, Ms. O involved all students in journal writing activity by using a peer scaffolding. Students were able to utilize multiple meaning-making tools to define the phases of the moon and the position of the moon in relation to the earth and the sun (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). Some students were asked to define the teacher's pictures on the board while others drew pictures and wrote in their journals. She also handed out cards with the definitions. She asked the students to read and demonstrate understanding by drawing the picture that corresponds with the definition (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). She noticed that one student was struggling and reminded her to look for keywords that will help them understand. The student still was struggling, and another student intervened and instructed her, in Spanish, to cross out the words she did not understand. This student was able to use her understanding of her native language and was able to strategically assert meaning-making in a safe learning environment (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). As Smagorinsky and Meyer (2014) cited by Sawyer (2014) explain, the complexity of reading and writing includes decoding, interpret text and genres appropriate to the expectations of a specific community of practice. In this case, translanguaging was used as a mediation tool for conceptual understanding (Sawyer, 2014).

Moreover, the students demonstrated how peers scaffold reading comprehension. Similarly in the study conducted by Pacheco, Daniel & Pray (2017), the authors explain, "As students used language to turn and talk with partners, to examine texts in whole-group discussions, and to organize conceptual understandings on sticky notes, they had opportunities to consider language choices, to offer new ways of participating in the community, and to receive feedback on their ideas" (p. 74). This finding is in congruence with how communities of practice play a significant role in defining a high level of cognitive development in each of the literacy domains (Smagorinsky & Meyer, 2014). Also, Martin-Beltrán (2009), studied the interrelatedness of dual language practices and literacy learning (Martin-Beltrán, 2009). The researcher used a sociocultural theoretical framework that shifts independent learning to social activity of learning writing skills in English (Martin-Beltrán, 2009). However, in de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca's study, the focus extends to use translanguaging and metacognitive skills to gain a conceptual understanding of science concepts. Students demonstrated self-reflection, self-correction, self-regulation throughout these activities, and the teacher closely monitored student performance and provided prompt feedback to support the development of metacognitive awareness (Sawyer, 2014).

The learning sciences research supports the development of various modes of articulation that benefit learning, and this study has shed light on how translanguaging practices in a DL classroom are creating social change in the educational system (Sawyer, 2014).

Implications for Teaching

As bilingual students participate in literacy practices in a DL classroom, they shift from one language as they draw meaning from literacy. Gort (2006) as cited by Garcia & Wei (2014) discovered that young writers use their full linguistic repertoire when creating text. The students developed "spontaneous biliteracy," independent of formal instruction, as they participated in creative writing activities (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Kibler (2010), cited by Garcia and Wei, discusses how the use of native language also "gives voice and self-affordance to the bilingual student, which strengthens their writing and positions them as the expert" (p. 62).

Garcia and Wei (2014) describe translanguaging as transforming education by introducing the idea of multilingualism in a dominant monolingual educational system. With globalization and technological changes at our forefront, there is a need to change the monolingual dominant educational system to a bilingual educational system. As Garcia and Wei (2014) state so eloquently, "Translanguaging is a more encompassing and transformative concept than bilingualism because it transforms monolingual education, bilingual education and foreign/second language education programs" (p. 70). Also, Garcia and Wei's explanation of sustainability contrast to the maintainability of language is dynamic and future-oriented and denotes a new growth of native language. de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca's findings have demonstrated how translanguaging transforms bilingual education by merging two languages instead of two languages competing. Sawyer also states, "learning is more effective when learners are encouraged to ground new experiences and concepts in perceptual and motor experiences, language, and prior knowledge" (p. 31).

Conclusión

In sum, the authors sought to answer a broad question as to what tools do transnational students use to navigate U.S. schools, language practices, and kinds of knowledge these students used in the DL classroom. The central argument the authors made was that by developing awareness of how transfronterizx students use their knowledge in schools will, provide teachers better, more complex understanding of the resource's students bring to school (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018). Consequently, this awareness of transfronterizx student knowledge will help to recognize ways in which to capitalize on these mobile resources for relevant educational experiences (de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018).

Translanguaging was used as a tool for meaning making as they recognize and adjusted the language to communicate new knowledge. Students used their full language repertoire for academic learning in a space that scaffolds prior knowledge in a supportive environment. I explored these elements and why they are essential in framing translanguaging and meaning-making and their implications for the learning sciences. I explored this point from the perspective of the emergent bilingual/ multilingual and their adaptability to communicate using their full language repertoire learning new concepts in science in an ESL/bilingual/dual language classroom.

Finally, common themes in these studies that emerged resulting from studying communities of practice and translanguaging include: (1) the importance of engaging community learning activities for students to utilize their full language repertoire, multimodal tools for meaning-making; (2) the importance of eliciting student's epistemological beliefs and attitudes; (3) the importance in implementing self-directed, self-reflection, self-regulation and self-evaluation, planning and assessment of learning; and (4) the importance of integrating hybrid language spaces for co-constructing literacy skills. These findings are implications for framing and designing educational environments to facilitate conceptual learning. Herein, students use their full language repertoire to create meaning and ultimately become mobile resources with the capability to adapt globally (Garcia and Wei, 2014 as cited by de la Piedra, Araujo & Esquinca, 2018; Sawyer, 2014).

References

- De la Piedra, M., Araujo, B., & Esquinca A., (2018). Educating across borders: The case of a dual language program on the U.S.-Mexico Border. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- García, O., & LiWei. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, Beltrán (2009). Cultivating space for the language boomerang: The interplay of two languages as academic resources. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 8 (2) 25-53.
- Pacheco, M., Daniel S., Pray L., (2017). Scaffolding Practice: Supporting Emerging Bilinguals' Academic Language Use in Two Classroom Communities. *Language Arts*, 95 (2).
- Sawyer, K. (2014). *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences 2nd Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.