Preparing Ideologically Clear Bilingual Teachers

Honoring Working-Class Non-Standard Language Use in the Bilingual Education Classroom

Cristina Alfaro
San Diego State University
Lilia Bartolomé
University of Massachusetts, Boston

Deslenguadas. (We are de-tongued.) *Somos los del español deficiente*. (We are those with deficient Spanish.) We are your linguistic nightmare, your linguistic aberration, your linguistic *mestizaje* (your linguistic miscegenation), the subject of your *burla* (the subject of your derision). Because we speak with tongues of fire, we are culturally crucified. Racially, culturally, and linguistically *somos huérfanos* (we are orphans)—we speak an orphan tongue. (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 58)

As Gloria Anzaldúa's quote eloquently describes, Mexicanos/Chicanos in the United States have historically suffered derision and mistreatment by the mainstream culture because of their use of nonstandard Spanish and English, as well as codeswitching (alternating between two or more languages or language varieties). In the field of education, codeswitching and the use of nonstandard English and native languages among low socioeconomic status (SES) linguistic minority students, including Latinos, have generally been recognized as a deficiency that needs to be repaired (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Garcia, 2014). Thus there is an urgent need to help mainstream teachers develop ideological clarity

Cristina Alfaro is an associate professor in the Department of Dual Language and English Learner Education in the College of Education at San Diego State University, San Diego, California. Lilia Bartolomé is a professor of applied linguistics in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, Boston, Massachusetts. Their e-mail addresses are calfaro@mail.sdsu.edu & lilia.bartolome@umb.edu

that will enable them to interrogate their own deficit views of low-SES emergent bilinguals, and of the nonstandard languages they bring to the classroom.

Recognizing the need to prepare mainstream teachers to work more humanely and effectively with low-SES linguistic minority students, we maintain that it is crucial to explicitly help prospective bilingual teachers develop their ideological clarity in parallel with their pedagogical expertise. This will enable them to understand nonstandard language use more accurately and objectively, and resist responding to their students from a biased viewpoint. Bartolomé (2002) explains that ideological clarity refers to the ongoing process that requires individuals to compare and contrast their explanations of the existing social order with those propagated by the dominant society. The expectation is that, by consciously juxtaposing ideologies, teachers will understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and support unfair and inequitable conditions (p. 168).

Much of our previous work focuses on the need to develop mainstream teachers' ideological clarity in order to demystify deficit views, White supremacist assimilationist ideas, and meritocratic ideological myths (Alfaro, 2008, 2015; Bartolomé, 2008, 2010). In this chapter, we specifically highlight linguicist ideologies that are reproduced in bilingual classrooms and tout standard language as superior to nonstandard language varieties, which are viewed as undesirable.[1] In fact, while one key goal of Spanish-English bilingual education is to prepare emergent bilinguals to master both standard Spanish and English, it too often comes at the expense of the linguistic capital that low-SES emergent bilinguals bring to school (Fitts, 2006; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Garcia, 2014; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009).

Our position is that a concerted effort must be made to prepare teachers, including those who speak their students' native languages and are members of the same cultural groups, to perceive potentially negative language ideologies more clearly and intervene more proactively to prevent the potential discriminatory manifestation of such ideologies. Being a member of the same ethnolinguistic group does not guarantee that a bilingual teacher holds counterhegemonic views of her low-SES students. In fact, many Latino bilingual teachers and prospective teachers have likely been infected with deficit and linguicist views of their linguistic minority students and must consciously resist internalizing and acting on these negative ideologies.

In our experience, many Latino and bilingual teachers perceive the social order to be fair and just and thus see it as their role to assimilate their students into the school culture and to ways of speaking and being in the world. These teachers generally do not see a need to work against

the grain, as they find no fault with the schools' ideological and material conditions; they believe students need to learn to fit in and leave their "deficient" cultural and language practices behind. Furthermore, the internal colonization of Latinos, particularly Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, is fully evident when bilingual teachers show a preference for students who most resemble the White middle-class "ideal" (Acuna, 2014; Bloom, 1991). Research suggests that some Latino/a teachers more favorably view lighter skinned Mexican American pupils who speak standard varieties of Spanish and/or English (Bloom, 1991). Moreover, it has often been our experience that Latino/a bilingual teachers promote early exit into English and serve as apologists for efforts to sabotage native language development. As we discuss later in this chapter, the research has begun to capture harmful hegemonic ideologies and practices in bilingual classrooms, such as teachers' disdain for students who speak nonstandard varieties of Spanish and codeswitch, and their preference for students who speak English.

As of this writing, bilingual schools continue to proliferate across the nation, particularly in California, which is home to one-third of these schools (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2014). Given this extremely rapid growth and bilingual education's historical commitment to improving low-SES emergent bilingual students' academic achievement, the pressing need to prepare ideologically clear bilingual teachers has become even more evident (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Gándara & Contreras, 2009; Gándara & Maxwell-Jolly, 2000; Garcia, 2014; Gonzalez & Darling Hammond, 1997; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, 2013). We argue that teachers, in addition to developing humanistic bilingual pedagogical practices, must learn to identify hurtful dominant culture ideologies and their manifestation in the classroom so they can be prepared to intervene and create optimal learning condition for all their students.

In this article, we first discuss the concept of ideological clarity and the need for teachers to develop this ability. We then share the general research on teachers' ideological beliefs and attitudes about linguistic minority students, including specific research on bilingual teachers' perceptions of nonstandard language use in the bilingual classroom. We conclude by discussing the incorporation of a "cultural wealth" model into the study of ideology in bilingual teacher education as a strategy to potentially improve the academic and linguistic achievement of linguistic minority students. Throughout the chapter we offer real-life vignettes to illustrate some of our key points and thus render our arguments more concrete and accessible.

We want to point out that we write from the vantage point of active Chicana language-teacher educators and researchers, and former

bilingual education teachers and administrators. It is important to note that most of our teaching and research experience has been in English-Spanish language contexts, so most of our examples in this chapter thus reflect that experience. Given that a majority of current bilingual teacher candidates are products of restrictive language policies and have been schooled under the umbrella of structured English immersion, where the acquisition of standard English and assimilation into the dominant culture are the ultimate goals, we offer what we hope will be taken as constructive criticism from two teacher educators with 30+ years in the field of bilingual education.

Today's teacher candidates typically enter bilingual teacher credential programs without ever having had the opportunity to deconstruct their unconscious ideologies and free their minds from hegemonic teaching and learning practices (Ek, Sánchez, & Cerecer, 2013). We believe that having a well-articulated ideological stance can help a teacher navigate the political agendas they encounter, such as restrictive language policies and anti-Latino public sentiment. We subscribe to an ideological framework that challenges the notion of biliteracy development as a monolithic construct. We view it instead as the balancing of asymmetrical power relations embedded in complex sociocultural relations and tensions. Given the growing recognition of the significance of ideological factors in education and the need to address them, the conversations of critical bilingual teacher educators have begun to center around the challenge of identifying, naming, and confronting the sociopolitical and ideological aspects of bilingual teacher preparation and professional development (Alfaro, 2008, 2015; Bartolomé, 2009; 2010; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Garcia, 2009, 2014; Sayer, 2012, 2013).

Teacher Ideological Clarity:
What Is It and Why Do Bilingual Teachers Need to Develop It?

Giroux (1983, 2001) writes that critical theorists have always recognized that the most important forms of domination are cultural and economic, and that the pedagogical force of our culture, with its emphasis on belief and persuasion, is a crucial element of how we think about politics and enact forms of resistance and social transformation. Therefore, the explicit study of ideology should be one key principle in the preparation of educators. Darder, Baltodano, and Torres (2003) maintain that the study of ideology helps "teachers to evaluate critically their practice and to better recognize how the culture of the dominant class becomes embedded in the hidden curriculum that silence[s] students and structurally reproduce[s] the dominant cultural assumptions

and practice[s] that thwart democratic education" (p. 13). They recommend that teachers gain a firm understanding of dominant ideologies and develop effective counterhegemonic discourses that can resist and transform oppressive practices (Darder et al., 2003).

Gramsci (1935/1971) defined ideology as the power of ruling class ideas to overshadow and eradicate competing views, becoming in effect the commonsense view of the world. He theorizes that it is precisely because schools and other institutions successfully perpetuate dominant ideologies and legitimize the existing order that dominant groups need not oppress people deliberately or alter their consciousness. Given their pervasiveness, ruling ideologies as perpetuated in schools are generally invisible, and where they are perceived they are generally considered "natural." In fact, Eagleton (1991) explains that, because a society perceives hegemonic ideologies (such as deficit views of linguistic minority students and romanticized, supremacist views of middle-class White students) to be natural and self-evident, alternative ideas are generally overlooked because they are considered unthinkable. He maintains that dominant "ideologies exist because there are things which must at all costs not be thought, let alone spoken" (p. 58).

Consequently, we contend that, in addition to mastering the necessary technical skills and content knowledge, bilingual teachers need to acquire the critical skills that will enable them to deconstruct the so-called natural and commonsense negative perceptions they may hold about their low-SES, immigrant, and other linguistic minority students. In fact, the limited research on teachers' ideological orientations suggests that they typically reflect the dominant culture's deficit assimilationist, classist, linguicist, and racist views of these students, the language varieties they speak, and the communities they come from (Ek et al., 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Sleeter, 1993, 1994; Zeichner, 2003).

Freire (1993) reminds us that teaching and learning in schools constitutes a political act tied to the ideological forces that operate on behalf of the dominant class. Education never is, has been, or will be a neutral enterprise (p. 127). If teachers are to experience a breakthrough to epistemological solidarity, they must strive to become ideologically clear, particularly on issues of standard and nonstandard language use in the dual language classroom, so as to "announce and denounce" ideological or structural obstacles to teaching for equity and social justice.

Unmasking Dominant Discriminatory Ideologies: What Do We Know about Teachers' Ideological Orientations?

Although no research definitively links teachers' ideological stances

with particular instructional practices, many scholars have suggested that their ideological orientations are often reflected in their beliefs and attitudes and in the way they interact with students in the classroom (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Hollins, 2014; Marx, 2006; Marx & Pennington, 2003; Nieto, 2005; Sleeter, 1993, 1994). In a recent literature review on teachers' beliefs about English language learners, Lucas, Villegas, & Martin (2013) conclude that additional research is needed because many findings are inconclusive. Nevertheless, they note that various studies suggest that teachers continue to perceive emergent bilinguals as deficient.

Interestingly, although there is a profusion of literature examining educators' beliefs and attitudes, few systematic attempts have been made to examine the political and ideological dimensions of these beliefs and attitudes, or how educators' worldviews reflect particular ideological orientations. Indeed, teachers' beliefs and attitudes tend to be treated in the literature as overly psychologized apolitical constructs that magically spring from the earth and "merely" reflect personality types, individual values, and personal predispositions that have little to do with the larger political, ideological, social, and economic order. In other words, we know little about whether or how teachers view and rationalize the existing social order in terms of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language variety spoken, and whether or not their views influence how they treat and teach low-status, linguistic minority students. Moreover, there is still little acknowledgment that teachers' beliefs about the legitimacy of the greater social order, and about the unequal power relations it creates among cultural groups at the school and classroom level, be taken into account to improve the educational processes and outcomes of linguistic minority education.

Thus, although limited, teacher education research indicates that prospective teachers, regardless of their ethnic background, often have beliefs and attitudes about the existing social order that reflect potentially harmful dominant ideologies, and that they do so unconsciously and uncritically (Alfaro, et al., 2015; Davis, 1994; Gomez, 1994; Gonsalves, 1996, 2008; Haberman, 1991; Lucas, Villegas & Martin, 2013; Marx, 2006; Marx & Pennington, 2003; Sleeter, 1993, 1994). We maintain that educators who thus accept the existing social order will likely perceive—and possibly treat—low-SES linguistic minorities who speak nonstandard language varieties as being at the bottom of the hierarchy of social status and power (Valdes, 1998).

Key dominant ideologies held by educators include the belief that the existing social order—that is, the meritocracy—is fair and just, and that disadvantaged cultural groups are responsible for their own socioeconomic situation. In addition, deficit views of non-White and poor

students continue to be held by educators (Valencia, 1997; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997). Furthermore, many educators continue to subscribe to assimilationist viewpoints and believe that linguistic minority and immigrant students should conform to the mainstream culture. It is important to note that non-White immigrants typically arrive in the United States ignorant of the fact that a racialized social hierarchy exists and that it will affect the way they are perceived and treated (Gibson, 1988; Ogbu, 1987). This hierarchy is evident in the difference between how White immigrants and non-White newcomers have been assimilated. Ronald Schmidt (cited in Wiley, 1999) considers the colonial legacy when pointing out that the assimilation experience of linguistic minorities of color has been noticeably different from that of European immigrants, in that the education offered to non-White colonized or enslaved groups was exclusively assimilationist and functioned not to integrate the groups into the dominant culture but to *subordinate and socialize them for second-class citizenship* (authors' emphasis; Wiley, 1999, p. 28). It is important to reiterate that, even though language and education policies aimed at European immigrants and non-White linguistic minority groups can be described as "assimilationist," those for non-Whites (i.e., Indigenous peoples, African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Hawaiian Americans) involved a dimension of subordination rather than integration.

A third belief related to an "assimilate to subordinate" orientation is deficit ideology, also referred to in the literature as the social pathology or cultural deprivation model, which has the longest history of any educational perspective or "theory" (Flores, 2005; Menchaca, 1997; Valencia, 1997). Valencia (1997), who has traced its evolution over three centuries, found that the deficit model explains that the disproportionate share of academic problems among minority student is due largely to pathologies or deficits in their sociocultural backgrounds, such as cognitive and *linguistic deficiencies* (our emphasis). He explained that such "deficit" explanations continue to be the most prevalent in education (Valencia, 1997). It is our position that by not unmasking deficit thinking for what it really is—hegemonic ideology—it continues to exist and mutate in teacher education classrooms because, even though multicultural education attempts to "interrupt notions of deficit thinking, [it is] . . . often 'contaminated by other forms of deficit thinking'" (Pearl, 1997, p. 215).

The combination of a meritocratic view of the social order, an "assimilate to subordinate" colonial tradition, and a linguistic deficit orientation proves especially dangerous because it rationalizes a disregard for the nonstandard language varieties spoken at home by working-class linguistic-minority students. Educators who do not identify and interrogate

their negative ideological orientations may unknowingly reproduce the existing "assimilate to subordinate" social order (Gonsalves, 1996, 2008; Marx, 2006; Marx & Pennington, 2003).

Our own research (Alfaro, 2008; Alfaro et al., 2015; Bartolomé, 2004, 2008) suggests that many successful teachers have a counterhegemonic ideological orientation that enables them to question unfair and discriminatory practices in their schools. In studies of effective educators of linguistic minority students, we found that these educators reject discriminatory ideologies such as White supremacy, deficit views of low-SES nonmainstream students, and assimilation as a goal. They advocated instead for practicing "authentic cariño" (care) and incorporating their students' primary languages and cultural values into their school culture and curriculum (Bartolomé, 2008).

Furthermore, because they recognized that their minority students were not operating on a level playing field, these educators embraced their role as advocates and their responsibility to level the field for their students. These findings highlight the agency that teachers and other educators can wield in their work to create schools that are more just and democratic. Our findings also suggest that the formal study of ideology should be an essential component of any teacher education course of study.

By critically studying dominant ideologies and how they manifest in schools, prospective teachers can develop critical thinking similar to that articulated by educators in the studies previously shared (Alfaro, 2008; Alfaro, et al., 2015; Bartolomé, 2004, 2008). They can begin to be agents of change as they develop critical thinking around hegemonic ideologies and adopt an ethical posture accordingly. As part of their learning about potentially harmful ideologies and the typical impact they have, bilingual teachers require explicit sociolinguistic instruction around nonstandard language use, particularly in light of the student populations they work with. This sociolinguistic understanding is expected to give teachers the tools they need to create their pedagogical structures—structures that will, on the one hand, enhance linguistic minority students' ability to acquire standard Spanish and English and, on the other, create spaces in which the students' cultural voices can emerge. In other words, the aim is for these students to succeed within the expectations of the school culture without having to subordinate their own working-class home cultures and language varieties.

Standard and Nonstandard Languages:
A Critical Sociolinguistic Analysis

Despite the Spanish language varieties and codeswitching typically present in bilingual classrooms, bilingual teacher preparation programs focus on what is considered the essential content knowledge and skills needed to teach in bilingual contexts; this curriculum includes coursework to develop these teachers' standard Spanish proficiency. However, because few teacher educators master standard Spanish themselves and Spanish language teacher preparation materials are rare, the challenge is great. Furthermore, after decades of English-only public school instruction, many prospective bilingual teachers have weak standard Spanish skills. Nationwide efforts are currently underway to improve teacher preparation practices related to teaching academic content in Spanish (Guerrero & Valadez, 2011). We agree that such efforts are important, but we maintain that is insufficient and inappropriate to strengthen prospective bilingual teachers' standard Spanish language competence without also addressing dominant ideologies and asymmetrical power relations. Moreover, given the hegemonic nature of these issues, many prospective teachers have likely developed deficit views of their low-SES linguistic minority students of color.

The following vignette illustrates the need for bilingual teachers to recognize and monitor their low regard for students' nonstandard Spanish language use and codeswitching practices. During one of Alfaro's classrooms visits, she observed a content-area Spanish science experiment where students worked collaboratively. Yaniel, a low-SES Latino student, was fully engaged in his project when he excitedly stated, "*Es que tú le meneaste el baking soda antes de ponerle suficiente agua.*" ("That happened because you wiggled the baking soda before putting sufficient water.") At that moment, Mrs. Franco interrupted and adamantly interjected, "*Cómo que le meneaste, esa es una palabra grotesca* (authors' emphasis)*, la palabra indicada es mezclar . . . compañeros, por favor, díganle a Yaniel como se dice 'baking soda' en español. . . le dicen, bicarbonate de sodio.*" ("What do you mean, wiggled, that is a gross word—the correct word is mixed…students, please tell Yaniel how to say 'baking soda' in Spanish…they tell him *bicarbonate de sodio*.") Mrs. Franco clearly adheres to the need to keep languages separate and to use solely standard Spanish in her efforts to keep the language, as she described it, "pure." Her teaching and learning practices appear to be informed by what Ofelia Garcia (2014) refers to as "compartmentalized and monoglossic notions of language and bilingualism" (p. 101). Mrs. Franco risked humiliating Yaniel, and her disgusted reaction to

his using the word *meneaste* likely discouraged the creative, fluid, and dynamic nature of linguistic minority students' nonstandard language use (García, 2014).

Mrs. Franco's ideological orientation toward language use in the classroom appears to mirror the prevalent linguicist beliefs that are perpetuated in mainstream classrooms, and it is shocking, though not entirely unexpected, to see this harmful ideology manifested in a bilingual/dual language classroom by a committed Latina bilingual educator. Yaniel's tongue was essentially being "yanked," due to the teacher's insistence that standard language is a superior choice over students' home vernacular (Anzaldua, 1987). Although Mrs. Franco's goal was for her fourth-grade students to become proficient bilinguals and biliterates, her pedagogy was informed by her deficit view of nonstandard language use and codeswitching.

It is important to understand that teachers' disdain for nonstandard languages is not based on a linguistic rationale but on dominant ideologies that proclaim the superiority of standard Spanish, which has little to do with the language structure and a great deal to do with learned attitudes and biases, which are shaped by classist, linguicist, and racist notions intended to exclude rather than include (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Garcia, 2014). Ofelia Garcia's research demands that we leave behind the deficit ideologies that surround the concepts of standard and nonstandard language teaching and learning, and begin now to reinstate the linguistic databases that comprise bilingual education.

How Are Nonstandard Varieties of Spanish Treated in Bilingual Classrooms?

As bilingual educators, we like to believe that our emergent bilingual students are sheltered from much of the bias, mistreatment, and misunderstanding that occur in the world. However, despite the success of many bilingual/dual language and transitional bilingual education programs, the research suggests that social class and linguistic bias do show up in bilingual classrooms (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Garcia, Lei, 2014; Hernandez, 2015). In fact, given bilingual educators' commitment to producing bilingual students who are strong in the primary language, we often obligate our students to leave their nonstandard vernaculars at the door, in effect tongue-tying them (Delpit, 2008; Montaño et al., 2005). The unspoken assumption is that primary language teachers must aggressively model the standard because students come to the classroom speaking "uneducated" nonstandard varieties or "dialects" (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Garcia, 2014).

And yet, we know that one's primary language is inextricably linked to identity (Darder, 2012; Norton, 2010). In fact, as far back as 1981, sociolinguist Fernando Peñalosa explained one major problem of bilingual education:

> [The] vast majority of Chicano and Puerto Rican children, if they do speak Spanish, speak a nonstandard variety, often laden with regionalism, archaisms, and heavy influence from English . . . [and] whether in a bilingual education program or in an ordinary high school or college Spanish class, they are very likely to have a Standard Spanish speaking teacher who may place a very low evaluation on the local vernacular. (p. 156)

Peñalosa (1981) expressed his hope that bilingual educators would continue to work on this issue: "As more Chicano and Puerto Rican teachers are prepared, this problem will be alleviated, but only if these teachers, now having mastered the standard themselves, will be tolerant and understanding of the nonstandard speakers, and treat them as different, *not deficient*" (authors' emphasis; p. 156).

More current research by Ofelia García (2009a, 2009b, 2013, 2014) coins the term "translanguaging" to refer to the creative ways bilinguals use language to make meaning and maximize their communicative potential. Bilinguals often move fluidly between Spanish and English, as well as standard and nonstandard vernaculars. Translanguaging thus is seen as "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bi/multilingual worlds" (García, 2009, p. 45).

This translanguaging theoretical orientation and the discipline of sociolinguistics both purport that a preference for certain language varieties over others reflects social bias rather than linguistic facts (Garcia, 2009b, 2013, 2014; Peñalosa, 1981; Toribio, 2004; Wardhaugh, 1998; Williams, 1997). In fact, it is often said that "a language is a dialect with an army and a navy," and we find it difficult if not impossible to distinguish a language from a dialect using purely linguistic measures. In other words, a standard language is also a dialect—it just happens to be the dialect of speakers who are the most powerful in a society.

As far as linguists are concerned, nonstandard and standard languages are inherently equal linguistically, as no language is inferior or superior (Wardhaugh, 1998): they all follow linguistic rules (syntax), have a sound system (phonology), use particular words (lexicon), and mark words in particular ways (morphology). Sociolinguists are also quick to tell you that when we refer to a language—English, for example—we are not speaking of a single homogenous entity but to a conglomeration of regional and social dialects and personal and group styles. It would be more accurate, for example, to speak of "Englishes," given the many

different varieties of English spoken across the globe (Canagarajah, 2013; Delpit, 2008).

In the bilingual classroom, negative beliefs and attitudes about standard and nonstandard languages can be acted on in ways that are hurtful to students, particularly in dual language programs where a key goal is to maintain and develop students' native languages while adding English. In the following section, to illustrate the urgent need to develop and increase bilingual teachers' ideological clarity, particularly around language, we present a few representative research studies that capture bilingual educators' negative views of Latinos' use of nonstandard language varieties and a colloquial lexicon.

In one classic study by Ramirez and Milk (1986), bilingual teachers participating in a summer language institute were asked to react to and rate different varieties of English and Spanish across five contexts: (1) a standard version of both languages; (2) the local Spanish language variety; (3) the local Hispanicized English; (4) nonsense ungrammatical English and Spanish phrases; and (5) Spanish/English codeswitching or Spanglish. The teachers were asked to rate each variety's appropriateness for the classroom and degree of correctness, and the speaker's academic potential.

The bilingual teachers rated standard Mexican Spanish and American English highest, followed by the local Spanish variety, the local Hispanicized English, and ungrammatical English and Spanish. The teachers gave Spanish/English codeswitching the lowest rating, as they judged it least appropriate or correct.

Bilingual teachers' attitudes toward language varieties need to be recognized because they can affect their expectations for pupils' academic performance. Teachers often form erroneous impressions based on students' use of particular language varieties. In fact, almost a decade after the Ramirez and Milk study, Bloom (1991) studied Latina teachers' attitudes toward Mexican American students based on their skin color and use of standard/nonstandard English and Spanish. Bloom reports that these teachers tended to rate lighter skinned pupils more attractive and intelligent, and those who spoke close to standard Spanish and English were rated more intelligent and capable than nonstandard speakers.

There is a growing body of literature on bilingual/dual language education that captures the negative messages Spanish speakers receive about their primary language vernaculars. One well-known example is Pam McCollum's (1999) research study describing how the values communicated implicitly in a middle school bilingual/dual language classroom influenced native Spanish speakers' preference for English over Spanish, which is surprising, given that dual language proficiency is the goal of

bilingual education. McCollum reports that students came to value English over their native Spanish language variety despite their "official" positive attitudes about the value of bilingualism and its usefulness to their career aspirations. McCollum identified two main factors that appeared to cause this preference for English: the teacher's use of a formal academic variety of Spanish and her tendency to devalue the nonstandard variety students spoke in the classroom, and the fact that important standardized tests were administered in English but not in Spanish.

It is fascinating that the bilingual teacher in the study preferred formal academic Spanish because she was from the local Spanish-speaking community. She expressed a strong commitment to improving education for students like her and believed that Spanish language literacy would improve their life chances. Despite her admirable intentions, however, Spanish language arts became a battlefield of sorts, as she constantly corrected her students' speech and made negative comments about their nonstandard Spanish or use of the vernacular.

For example, McCollum describes this teacher's correction of a student's use of *elevador* (elevator); she informed him that the correct word was *ascensor*. When the student protested using an archaic rural form of así (roughly "in this manner"), "*Yo lo digo asina—elevador,*" the teacher countered, "*Tampoco se usa 'asina.' La forma educada es 'así.'*" She then wrote the word on the board and underlined it emphatically. Students responded to the teacher's constant correction and denigration of their Spanish by switching to English.

Equally incomprehensible to these native Spanish speakers was why their fluent communication in their vernacular was criticized, yet their native English-speaking peers were lauded when they produced incomplete Spanish phrases. Not only was their Spanish vernacular devalued, their teacher also denigrated the English they spoke. In effect, the Spanish-speaking students were being muzzled because they did not speak Standard versions of either Spanish or English.

Finally, students were assessed with both English and Spanish standardized tests, but it was evident that only the English test counted, as it required a flurry of preparation and the teacher stressed the importance of attending schooling during the week of the test. The Spanish standardized tests were shorter and were administered only to students in the bilingual program.

McCollum's study (1999) and others (Fitts, 2006; Palmer, 2008) suggest that Latino students in bilingual programs often resist speaking Spanish because they perceive themselves as being in a position of inferiority and powerlessness. This is ironic, given that these classrooms are run in what is supposedly the students' native language. In bilingual/dual

language programs made up of working-class native Spanish speakers and middle-class native English speakers, the English speakers learn the valued standard Spanish and typically do not feel denigrated in the process. Furthermore, they often come to school with middle-class cultural capital they can transfer from English to Spanish.

The fact that bilingual educators are unknowingly preparing native English speakers for successful additive bilingualism and native Spanish speakers for subordinating, subtractive bilingualism is powerfully illustrated in the following two vignettes that were captured by Cristina Alfaro when she visited an English-Spanish bilingual/dual language school in an agricultural area in Southern California. Alfaro had an opportunity to observe and interview fourth graders in a classroom where 50 percent of the class day was conducted in English and 50 percent in Spanish. Alfaro interviewed Brent, a native English-speaking, White middle-class fourth grader, and the son of a well-known rancher in the area. The interview consisted of questions about his experience in a dual language program. When Brent was asked why he thought it was beneficial and important to learn how to speak, read, and write in both Spanish and English, he responded, "I need to learn Spanish so that when I grow up, I can tell the workers what to do." At this very early age, Brent already had evidently received the message from his school, family, and society that English is the language of power. Brent also clearly expects to have the upper hand when he grows up to be a bilingual White middle-class man.

A second interview was with Carlos, a low-SES, native Spanish-speaking Mexican American, the son of an area migrant worker. Alfaro asked Carlos why he thought it was beneficial and important to learn how to speak, read, and write in Spanish and English, and he responded, "I think it is important so that when I grow up I can get a better job, but I think it is better to speak English." These two very different fourth graders have both clearly received and internalized the message that English is the language of power and that Spanish is the language of the poor, and thus Spanish has less value. In this case, the "invisible" language bias undoubtedly worked against these bilingual/dual language teachers' finest efforts and best intentions.

As we see it, if we are serious about leveling the education playing field, it is imperative that bilingual educators who teach students from the economically poorest populations resist and interrupt persistent hegemonic pedagogies. We should not be shocked by Brent's and Carlos' responses because they bear a direct relationship to the social status quo, which is a signal of the urgent need for prospective teachers to understand and deal with the ideological dimensions of bilingualism in a

neocolonial context where Spanish speakers are still marked as deficient (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Yosso, 2005, Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998).

Bilingual teacher education programs typically revolve around developing content-area knowledge in English and the partner language (i.e., Spanish), and around the Common Core State Standards and the like (Quezada & Alfaro, 2012). We maintain that it is equally important to increase bilingual teachers' ideological clarity and discover ways to honor and build on the nonstandard language varieties that working-class emergent bilinguals bring into the classroom.

Radically Transforming Bilingual Education: Increasing Teachers' Ideological Clarity and Honoring Students' Nonstandard Language Varieties in the Classroom

In the field of education, short-term technical responses in the form of pre-packaged curricula or lockstep methodologies have typically been the norm (Bartolomé, 1994). Thus it is challenging for us, as bilingual educators, to accept that there are no easy answers, no supernatural methods or curricula that will magically transform low-SES, nonstandard language speakers into middle-class achievers.

Groundbreaking research that challenges worn-out deficit and linguicist views of working-class linguistic minority students and embraces a "cultural wealth" view of these students offers us fresh hope that the cultural and linguistic capital our students bring to school will be acknowledged along with other forms of nonmonetary capital (Darder, 2012; Hollins, 2014; Nieto, 2005; Pérez Huber, 2009; Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Yosso, 2005). Yosso (2005) identifies seven forms of cultural wealth; given our focus in this chapter, we center on linguistic capital:

1. *Aspirational capital* refers to the ability to maintain hopes and dreams despite real and perceived barriers.

2. *Linguistic capital* refers to intellectual and social skills attained through communication experiences in more than one language and/or style, such as translating and interpreting abilities, creative storytelling, and other "oral culture" skills.

3. *Familial capital* refers to forms of knowledge nurtured among family members, such as dichos or proverbs, *consejos* or advice, *cuentos* or stories, etc.

4. *Social capital* refers to networks of people and community resources that can help students navigate school and other institutions.

5. *Navigational capital* refers to student resilience coupled with support networks that help students persist.

6. *Resistance capital* refers to knowledge and skills developed in opposition to mistreatment and unfair treatment.

7. *Spiritual capital* refers to a set of resources and skills rooted in a spiritual connection to a reality greater than oneself. It can encompass religious, indigenous, and ancestral beliefs and practices learned from one's family and community, or that reflect the inner self. Thus, spirituality in its many forms can provide a sense of hope and faith.

These seven forms of cultural wealth identify strengths particular to Latino students and challenge dominant deficit perspectives of them and their communities. Recent research studies framed using the cultural wealth model have begun identifying the characteristics of linguistic cultural wealth. In fact, a growing number of studies that examine Spanish/English codeswitching and the use of Spanglish to teach conventional academic skills strongly support this additive model (Martinez, 2010; Martinez, Orellana, Pacheco & Carbone, 2008; Sayer, 2008, 2010). Many of these studies capture linguistic minority students' strengths and skills as translators and interpreters, and have begun to examine how these skills and abilities link positively to their schoolwork (Faulstich Orellana, Dorner & Pulido, 2003; Faulstich, Reynolds, Dorner & Meza, 2003; Garcia, 2009a & b; Martinez et al., 2008).

For example, in Martinez's (2010) research on sixth-grade Mexican American students' codeswitching, he included a component that asked students to explain their codeswitching practices, which resulted in increased metalinguistic awareness. Martinez reports that Spanglish functions as a semiotic tool that enables Latino emergent bilingual students to accomplish important state-required language functions, such as clarifying and/or reiterating utterances; quoting and reporting speech; joking and/or teasing; establishing solidarity and intimacy; shifting voices for different audiences; and communicating subtle nuances of meaning.

Martinez and the teacher tapped into the students' growing metalinguistic awareness to help them transfer their codeswitching skills, such as shifting voices for different audiences and communicating subtle nuances in meaning, to their academic writing. Martinez maintains that "leveraging the skills embedded in students' use of Spanglish could radically transform how students view the relationship between every day and academic knowledge, and thereby have a transformative impact on their academic literacy learning" (p. 146). Sayer (2013) reports comparable findings in his research in a transitional bilingual second-grade classroom, where the teacher encouraged students to use

all their linguistic resources during classroom instruction. The teacher, a "TexMex" speaker herself, allowed students to codeswitch, use archaic forms of Spanish, and speak rural varieties of Mexican Spanish without castigating them. She instead celebrated their multilingual skills and allowed them to use their mixed language vernacular to communicate and to demonstrate their learning in the classroom.

Sayer (2013) recommends that teachers "recognize a need to contest language ideologies that favor dominant languages [and]. . . develop translanguaging instruction that (1) teaches the standard language form through the vernacular; (2) use the vernacular to mediate academic content; and (3) impart lessons that instill ethnolinguistic consciousness and pride" (p. 85). We similarly encourage bilingual educators to devise a pedagogy that encourages linguistic minority students to tap into and proudly display their linguistic wealth in the classroom and to build on it as a strategy for appropriating standard academic discourses in both target languages.

Bilingual teacher educators must take an informed critical sociolinguistic view of the linguistic resources linguistic minority children bring to the classroom and consciously and critically take into account these students' "linguistic funds of knowledge" (Sayer, 2010). These connections between students' vernaculars and academic language, as Martinez (2010) states, "constitute potentially transformative points of leverage for academic literacy, teaching, and learning" (p. 145). Moreover, as Flores and Rosa (2015) brilliantly argue, teachers require an alternative pedagogical approach that celebrates the dynamic linguistic practices of linguistic minority students while concurrently raising their awareness about issues of language and power. They state:

> This approach would also empower teachers to move beyond pedagogies geared toward responding to students' purported linguistic deficiencies or "gaps" and . . . provide these students with tools to challenge the range of inequalities with which they are faced. This is a powerful shift from teaching students to follow rules of appropriateness to working with them as they struggle to imagine and enact alternative, more inclusive realities. (p. 168)

Conclusion

Given the projected growth of the cultural and linguistic diversity of students in U.S. public schools, it is critical that bilingual educators factor social class diversity into their view of language variation and clearly understand how "invisible" social class and language bias can undermine their best efforts with students from the economically poorest

populations. We contend that bilingual teacher educators and teacher candidates must resist and interrupt persistent hegemonic ideologies and practices in their daily work as part of a powerfully transformative pedagogical process and a deep political imperative (Darder, 2015).

Our discussion begins by indicating the need for additional research to help prepare ideologically clear bilingual teachers who work toward continually developing an elevated critical consciousness of their students' linguistic capital. A fundamental challenge, in our opinion, is to teach middle-class "school language" varieties in intellectually honest and bias-free ways. We must teach low-SES linguistic minority students using "cultural wealth" pedagogical approaches so they can ultimately appropriate new language varieties in an additive and self-empowering fashion. Teaching standard academic discourse in both English and Spanish cannot be accomplished without taking a detour through the richness of students' vernaculars.

We would like to close with a quote by the well-known feminist, Gloria Anzaldúa (1987). Although Anzaldúa wrote about Chicanas, her words apply powerfully to anyone whose tongue has been "yanked" because standard languages have been imposed on them as being superior to their home vernaculars—a form of silencing that devoices and tongue-ties students:

> So, if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity—I am my language.
>
> Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself. Until I can accept as legitimate Chicano Texas Spanish, Tex-Mex and all the other languages I speak, I cannot accept the legitimacy of myself.
>
> Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having always to translate, while I still have to speak English or Spanish when I would rather speak Spanglish, and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate.
>
> I will no longer be made to feel ashamed of existing. I will have my voice: Indian, Spanish, white. I will have my serpents' tongue—my woman's voice, my sexual voice, my poet's voice. I will overcome the tradition of silence. (p. 59)

As we see it, the hard task we now face is how to honor our students' working-class languages, their legitimate multiple voices, and their ways of being in a multilingual and multicultural world, while simultaneously helping them to critically and happily appropriate academic middle-class discourses in standard Spanish and English. We need to acknowledge that, in the field of bilingual education, we already have pedagogically sound principles anchored in an ongoing sincere commitment to our

students' learning and emancipation. Most importantly, we need to be conscious that, unless we have the courage to intervene strategically, forcefully, purposefully, and consistently, discriminatory hegemonic ideologies and practices will continue to contaminate our best bilingual education efforts and intentions.

Note

[1] Phillipson (1992) explains the concept of linguicism as referring "exclusively to ideologies and structures where language is the means for effecting or maintaining an equal allocation of power and resources" (p. 55). He states that linguicism is "in operation if a teacher stigmatizes the local dialect spoken by the children and this has consequences of a structural kind, that is, there is an unequal division of power and resources as a result" (p. 55).

References

Acuna, R. F. (2014). *Occupied America: A history of Chicanos* (8th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Alfaro, C., Duraìn, R., Hunt, A., & Aragoìn, M. J. (2015). Steps toward unifying dual language programs, Common Core State Standards, and Critical Pedagogy. *Association of Mexican American Educators Open Issue, 8*(2), 17-30.

Alfaro, C. (2008). Teacher education examining beliefs, orientations, ideologies & practices. In L. Bartolome (Ed.), *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality* (pp. 231-241). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Anzaldua, G. (1987). How to tame a wild tongue. In G. Anzaldua & S. Saldivar-Hull (Eds.), *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza* (pp. 33-45). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th edition). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Becker, A. L. (1988). Language in particular: a lecture. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context: Connecting observation and understanding* (pp. 17-35). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Becker, A.L. (1991a). A short essay on languaging. In F. Steiner (Ed.), *Research and reflexivity* (pp 226-234). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Becker, A.L. (1991b). Language and languaging. *Language and Communication, 11*(2), 33–35.

Bartolomé, L. (2010). Daring to infuse ideology into language-teacher education. In S. May, & C. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: From theory to practice* (pp. 47-60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bartolomé, L. (2008). Authentic cariño and respect in minority education: The political and ideological dimensions of love. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 1*(1), 1-16.

Bartolomé, L. (2008). Beyond the fog of ideology. In L. Bartolomé (Ed.), *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality* (pp. ix-xxix). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Bartolomé, L. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 97-122.

Bartolomé, L. (2002). Creating an equal playing field: Teachers as advocates, cultural border crossers, and cultural brokers. In Z. Beykont (Ed.), *The power of culture: Teaching across language differences* (pp. 167-191). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(2), 173–194.

Beltrán, R. (Ed.). (2013). *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century: Building on experience* (pp. 155-175). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bloom, G. M. (1991). *The effect of speech style and skin color on bilingual teaching candidates and bilingual teachers' attitudes towards Mexican American pupils*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Stanford University, California.

California Department of Education. *Facts about English learners in California—CalEdFacts*. Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp

Callahan, R., & Gándara. P. (Eds.). (2014). *The bilingual advantage language, literacy and the US labor market*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd Edition). Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Center for Applied Linguistics. *Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the U.S*. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/twi/directory/

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at Dual Language Immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 37*(1), 64-82.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity and social justice in teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of research and Practice, 2*(1), 1-20.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 585–592.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2003). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 1-21). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Darder, A. (2015). *Freire and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Darder, A. (2012). *Culture and power in the classroom: Educational foundations for the schooling of bicultural students*. New York, NY: Paradigm Publishers.

Davis, K. A. (1994). Multicultural classrooms and cultural communities of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*, 553-563.

Delpit, L. (2008). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New York Press.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London, UK: Verso.

Ek, L. D., Sánchez, P., & Cerecer, P. D. Q. (2013). Linguistic violence, insecurity, and work: Language ideologies and Latina/o bilingual teacher candidates in Texas. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 7*(3), 197-219.

Faulstich Orellana, M., Reynolds, J., Dorner, L., & Meza, M. (2003). In other words: Translating or "para-phrasing" as a family literacy practice in immigrant households. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(1), 12-34.

Faulstich Orellana, M., Dorner, L., & Pulido, L. (2003). Accessing assets: Immigrant youths' work as family translators and "para-phrasers." *Social Problems, 50*(4), 505-524.

Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(2), 337-365.

Flores, B. M. (2005). The intellectual presence of the deficit view of Spanish-speaking children in the educational literature during the 20th century. In P. Pedraza & M. Rivera (Eds.), *Latino education: An agenda for community action research* (pp. 75-98). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the city*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Gándara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequence of failed social policies.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Gándara, P., & Maxwell, J. (2000). *Preparing teachers for diversity: A dilemma of quality and quantity*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

Gándara, P. C., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (2010). *Forbidden languages: English learners and restrictive language policies.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

García, O. (2014). U.S. Spanish and education: Global and local intersections. *Review of Research in Education: Language Policy, Politics, and Diversity in Education, 38*(1), 58-80.

García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (eds.), *The global-local interface, language choice and hybridity* (pp. 100-118). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. (2013). From diglossia to transglossia: Bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the 21st Century. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. M. Chandler, M. D. López-Jiménez, & R. Chacón- Beltran (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century: Building on experience* (pp. 155-175). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 385–400.

García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O. (2009b). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. K. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.). *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local*. New Delhi, India: Orient BlackSwan.

Garcia, O. (1993). From Goya portraits to Goya beans: Elite traditions and popular streams in U.S. Spanish language policy. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 12*(1-2), 69-86.

Gibson, M. (1988). *Accommodation without assimilation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. London, UK: Falmer.

Gómez, M. L. (1994). Teacher education reform and prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching "other people's" children. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(3), 319-334.

Gonsalves, R. E. (2008). Hysterical blindness and the ideology of denial: Pre-service teachers' resistance to multicultural education. In L. I. Bartolomé (Ed.), *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality* (pp. 3-28). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Gonsalves, R. E. (1996). *Resistance in the multicultural education classroom* (Unpublished manuscript). Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.

Gonzalez, J. M., & Darling Hammond, L. (1997). *New concepts for new challenges: Professional development for teachers of immigrant youth*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selection from the prison notebooks* (!. Hoare & G. Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: International. (Original work published in 1935.)

Guerrero, M., & Valadez, C. (2011). Fostering candidate Spanish language development. In B. Bustos-Flores, R. Hernández-Sheets, & E. Rioja (Eds.), *Teacher preparation for bilingual student populations* (pp. 59-72). New York, NY: Routledge.

Haberman, M. (1991). Can culture awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teacher Education, 4*, 2-31.

Hernández, A. M. (2015). Language status in dual immersion: The dynamics between English and Spanish in peer interaction. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education 3*(1), 102–126.

Heywood, A. (2003). *Political ideologies: An introduction* (3rd edition). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hollins, E. (2015). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning* (3rd edition). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leeman, J. (2005). Engaging critical pedagogy: Spanish for native speakers. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*(1), 35-45.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2013). 100 bilingual lessons: Distributing two languages in classrooms. In C. Abello-Contesse & R. Chacon Beltran (Eds.), *Bilingualism in a school setting* (pp. 107-135). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: Native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 3*2(6), 531-545.

Lucas, T, Villegas, A. M., & Martin, A. D. (2013). *Teachers' beliefs about English language learners: A poverty of belief?* Symposium paper presented at the 2013 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

McCollum, P. (1999). Learning to value English: Cultural capital in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal, 23*(2 & 3), 113-134.

Macedo, D. (2000). The colonialism of the English Only Movement. *Educational Researcher, 29*(3), 15-24.

Martinez, R. A. (2010). Spanglish as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English, 45*(2), 124-149.

Martinez, R. A., Orellana, F., Pacheco, M., & Carbone, P. (2008). Found in translation: Connecting translating experiences to academic writing. *Language Arts, 85*(6), 421-431.

Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Marx, S. & Pennington, J. (2003). Pedagogies of critical race theory: Experimentations with White preservice teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 91-110.

Menchaca, M. (1997). Early racist discourses: Model of deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 13-40). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Menken, K., & Garcia, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Montaño, T., Ulanoff, S. H., Quintanar-Sarellana, R., & Aoki, L. (2005). The debilingualization of California's prospective bilingual teachers. *Social Justice, 32*(3), 103-121.

Norton, B. (2010). Language and identity. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 349-397). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority responses to schooling: Nonimmigrants vs. immigrants. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive ethnography of education* (pp. 255-280). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Palmer, D. (2008). Building and destroying students' "academic identities": The power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 21*(6), 647-667.

Pearl, A. (1997). Democratic education as an alternative to deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 211-241). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Peñalosa, F. (1981). *Introduction to the sociology of language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pérez Huber, L. (2009). Challenging racist nativist framing: Acknowledging the community cultural wealth of undocumented Chicana college students to reframe the immigration debate. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(4), 704-729.

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism and linguicism. In *Linguistic imperialism*, (pp. 50-57). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Quezada, R., & Alfaro, C. (2012). Cutting to the Common Core: Moving pedagogic mountains. *Language Magazine, 11*(12), 19-22.

Ramirez, A. G., & Milk, R. D. (1986). Notions of grammaticality among teachers of bilingual pupils. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 495-513.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bi-

linguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63-88.

Sayer, P. (2008). Demistifying language mixing: Spanglish in school. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7*(2), 94–112.

Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *Urban Review, 41*(5), 391-415.

Sleeter, C. E. (1993). How White teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race identity and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E. (1994). White racism. *Multicultural Education, 1*(3), 5-8.

Solorzano, D., & Villalpando, 0. (1998). Critical race theory, marginality and the experi ence of students of color in higher education. In T. Mitchell & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Sociology of education: Emerging perspectives* (pp. 181-210). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Solorzano, D., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Maintaining social justice hopes within academic realities: A Freirean approach to critical race/LatCrit pedagogy. *Denver University Law Review, 78*(4), 595-621.

Toribio, A. M. (2004). Spanish/English speech practices: Bringing chaos to order. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(2 & 3), 133-154.

Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(5), 879–912.

Valdes, G. (1998). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391-429.

Valencia, R. R. (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. London, UKn: Falmer Press.

Valencia, R. R., & Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Contemporary deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 160-210). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (3rd edition). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wiley, T. J. (1999). Comparative historical analysis of U.S. language policy and language planning: Extending the foundations. In Huebner, T. & Davies, K. (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the U.S.* (pp. 17-38). Philadelphia, PA: Johns Benjamins.

Wright, W. E., Boun, S., & Garcia, O. (2015). *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Williams, C. (1997). *Bilingual teaching in further education: Taking stock*. Addysgu, Bangor, UK: Welsh Language Board.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*(1), 69-91.

Zeichner, K. M. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record, 105*(3), 490-519.