

## Border-Crossing in Language Teacher Education

**Colleen Hamilton**

*National Louis University*

**Xiaoning Chen**

*National Louis University*

### **Abstract**

*In this paper, we bridge fields of English as a Second Language, Bilingual, and World Language teacher education through curricular innovation in methods coursework for future Chinese language teachers. We apply a language curricularization framework to analyze theoretical, ideological, political, and contextual factors underlying connections and distinctions across disciplinary borders and to guide collaboration within a language equity lens. Our work indicates the affordances of translanguaging approaches, a multilingual turn, and critical curricular analysis in preparing critically conscious language educators.*

**Keywords:** *language teacher education, curriculum, English as a Second Language, Bilingual Education, World Language Education*

### **Background**

While language education fields including English as a Second Language, World Languages, and Bilingual Education may be characterized as parallel pathways toward a shared goal of language learning, we argue that a multifaceted, historical perspective is essential for understanding both the distinctions and connections, as well as the potential for bridging fields in language teacher education. To this end, we apply an analytic framework to examine the influence of theories, ideologies, policies, contexts, and core program elements on language teacher education across English as a Second Language (ESL), World Languages (WL), and Bilingual Education (BE). We consider a situated case of curricular bridging—what we term *border-crossing*—in language teacher education from our own work crafting ESL and BE methods courses for future WL and BE Chinese language teachers. Specifically, we explore a heteroglossic (García, 2009) vision for cross-disciplinary teacher training that prepares critically conscious language educators (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Caldas, 2021; Valenzuela, 2016) to facilitate inclusive instruction in light of learners' diverse linguistic profiles.

In this paper, we first provide a brief historical overview that illuminates sociopolitical trends influencing the development of the ESL, BE, and WL strands of language education. With this history in mind, we outline the framework of language *curricularization* proposed by Valdés (Kibler & Valdés, 2016; Valdés, 2018; Valdés & Parra, 2018) that can guide collaboration across disciplinary borders in language education. By detailing our own setting and curricular innovation in language teacher education, we advocate for a transition toward translanguaging approaches to ESL, a multilingual turn in WL, and critical curricular analysis in BE in order to train future teachers in these areas within a cross-disciplinary language equity lens. We close by reflecting on the factors enhancing and inhibiting our curricular innovation and by encouraging further border-crossings across language teacher education programs.

### **Historical Literature Review**

Historically, English as a Second Language, World Languages, and Bilingual Education developed as separate domains for specific populations of learners in distinct U.S. cultural-historical contexts, giving rise to unique priorities and pedagogies. In their extensive work on the history of BE in what is now the United States, Crawford (1991) and García (2009) begin by noting the tapestry of hundreds of Native American languages, numerous African languages, and waves of European languages, often reduced to a single English monolingual thread in the modern era: Native American tribes were forcibly relocated and assimilated, with children sent to English-only boarding schools; enslaved Africans were linguistically isolated and denied schooling; following an early period of tolerance, European immigrant languages other than English were outlawed in several states, including in schools.

It is essential to note this history of settler colonialism, symbolic violence, and xenophobia when considering the resurgence of language education in the latter part of the 20th century and its current categorization into ESL, WL, BE, and other strands. Prior to this, English-only education had become the norm under a campaign of “Americanization” in Native American boarding schools, the U.S. Southwest, new immigrant communities, and the newly occupied territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico (García, 2009; Grinberg & Saavedra, 2000; Macedo, 2000). State-level restrictions on German, for example, were so extreme during and after World War I that a U.S. Supreme Court decision warned against coercion in English language education (*Meyer v. Nebraska*, 1923). At the same time, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish capitalized on anti-German sentiment precisely to bolster Spanish language study (García, 2009). Yet rather than supporting existing Spanish-English bilingual programs in the U.S. Southwest that were being targeted as “non-American,” Spanish language education focused on reading and metalinguistic skills during a short program of study at the secondary level (García, 2009; Grinberg & Saavedra, 2000). In a subsequent shift toward classroom language immersion with the communicative approach to WL teaching, the monolingual paradigm dominated (Leung & Valdés, 2019). These models of foreign language teaching distinguished BE from WL and continue to influence professional identity and practice.

During the Cold War period, the U.S. federal government began to promote the study of foreign languages in the country’s national interests (National Defense

Education Program, 1958). These initiatives continue today for languages deemed “critical” to national security (García, 2009). At the same time, several school districts (re-)initiated bilingual education programs to serve Spanish-speaking students in Florida, Texas, New Mexico, California, and Arizona (García, 2009). The Bilingual Education Act (1968) supported the development of these programs and others to teach English to so-called language minority students. Subsequent court decisions and legislation reinforced the importance of bilingual schooling for these learners as a bridge to English, which remained the primary focus. Later, with the re-emergence of polemical English-only discourse, the opportunity for meaningful bilingual education for emergent bilingual learners seemed to recede (Krashen, 1996). It is noteworthy that one model of bilingual education called *two-way dual language immersion* became newly ascendant among calls to dismantle bilingual education. However, two-way dual language immersion is critiqued for disowning the label of bilingual education and underserving minoritized emergent bilingual learners, instead prioritizing ready-made language environments for English-speaking students to learn an additional language (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Delavan et al., 2021; Valdés, 1997). Paradoxically, Spanish-speaking minoritized students are at times portrayed as deficient language models in the classroom (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

In sum, we view the historical development of language education in the United States not as a question of *which* language, but language *for whom*. Minoritized emergent bilingual learners nationwide are provided few alternatives to coerced English-only schooling that subtracts native languages and cultural wealth (Valenzuela, 1999; Yosso, 2005). Meanwhile, English-speaking students enjoy educational enrichment through the study of *foreign* (or recently termed *world*) languages. When brought together in two-way dual language immersion programs, these two groups compete for speaking time, teacher attention, and validation in ways that mirror the symbolic dominance of English speakers in U.S. society (Palmer, 2009). In an effort to confront this historical context and English hegemony, we ask teacher educators to cross borders in language education. In doing so ourselves, we recognize that while parallels may be drawn across these fields, such as a common aim to develop language proficiency, these implied similarities are in fact historically embedded and often obscured points of contention in these fields’ theories, conceptualizations, and ideologies (Valdés, 2018).

Yet, the intersection of these language education fields can be seen in the everyday work of learners and educators. For example, a bilingual education student may speak a third language—such as an indigenous language—in addition to the languages of instruction. A student previously labeled an English Learner may be moved from ESL to a new two-way dual language immersion program alongside students formerly studying Spanish as a WL. A former English as a Foreign Language teacher abroad returns to teach ESL and/or a WL in the United States. A WL teacher becomes a BE teacher when the school program model changes. ESL, BE, and WL teachers are brought together as a “Multilingual Department” by school leadership. These sample trajectories motivate language teacher educators to collaboratively design training and practice across disciplinary boundaries. Just as importantly, language teacher educators should leverage Valdés’ (1997, 2018) cautionary notes to cross these borders with a historically aware language equity lens.

## Conceptual Framework

Valdés (2018) has proposed the framework of *curricularizing* language to enable a discussion of the goals and outcomes of language education programs. Focusing on bilingual education and specifically two-way immersion, Valdés highlights the theories and ideologies of language and language learning that can differ across similarly named programs, leading to divergent goals and outcomes despite a stated shared commitment to fostering language learning. In our analysis and discussion, we consider the implications of the same framework for teacher education across ESL, BE, and WL.

*Curricularization* indicates the design and implementation of a subject of teaching; that is, the decision-making process regarding what is to be taught, in what order, and how (Kibler & Valdés, 2016). Translating a dynamic, multimodal, symbolic communicative experience such as language into an ordered, static, and seemingly neutral divisible product is necessarily imbued with conceptualizations of what language is, who can and should learn it, how best to do so, and why. Thus, language curricularization conveys language ideologies and dominant theories of language, which are mediated by factors that shape what is popularly and politically possible and desired, and then again transformed during implementation according to local discourses, resources, and constraints (Valdés, 2018).

ESL, BE, and WL education since the Cold War era have been informed by theories of second language acquisition that traditionally adhered to a cognitive view of language as an individual linguistic system, the elements of which can be dissected, studied, and learned by the mind (Ortega, 2009). This view is manifested in language education through linear proficiency levels and language learning standards that aim to measure and guide the development of this individual linguistic system (e.g., ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and WIDA English Language Development Standards). The strong emphasis on cognitive approaches that formed the basis of second language acquisition has been tempered by the inclusion of other social perspectives, each with their own disciplinary research base (e.g., Douglas Fir Group, 2016; Firth & Wagner, 1997). This theoretical expansion, however, has not settled debates about best practices in language teaching, nor diminished the role of the idealized monolingual native speaker model as the target of additional language learning. The ideological assumption that a language learner should, and should want to, resemble two monolingual native speakers in one person continues to shape important aspects of ESL, WL, and BE, including whose bilingualism “counts” (Flores et al., 2020). Ideologies of bilingualism thus intersect with raciolinguistic ideologies about the identity and language use of bilinguals (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Language ideologies and dominant theories of language and language learning shape every aspect of language education. They imbue policies, discourses, and approaches in local contexts, as well as core program elements such as instructional materials, student labels, assessments, and teacher qualifications (Valdés, 2018). The current risk, Valdés (2018) argues, is that top-down policies and authoritative publications influencing language education do not necessarily reflect recent significant shifts in understandings of language learning and use. Specifically in BE, new program models grouped under the term *dual language education* are guided

by principles and field manuals that have failed to keep pace with the theoretical evolution of second language acquisition toward a multilingual approach (e.g., May, 2014; Ortega, 2013). Popular guides also do not adequately reckon with the impact of ideologies on educational language policies and classroom pedagogical decisions, although there is evidence that both are influenced by neoliberal thinking that commodifies language (Cervantes-Soon, 2014). These deficit ideologies orient core program elements, for example, away from the pedagogical role of translanguaging and toward learning materials from abroad, under the assumption that the U.S. Spanish varieties spoken by emergent bilingual learners are not adequate for “academic” learning (Flores, 2020). Whether implicit or expressed, these ideologies followed to their logical conclusion through policy and programmatic decisions can harm learners, educators, and communities. For this reason, Valdés states, “In [two-way immersion], how we manage the addition of new resources to these students’ repertoires—without doing violence to their existing communicative practices and their unique identities—will be our biggest challenge and our most important accomplishment” (2018, p. 407). In the context of our own border-crossing work in language teacher education, we utilize Valdés’ (2018) framework of language curricularization to understand how training teachers to expand learners’ linguistic repertoires can be undertaken with this charge in mind.

### **Setting and Curricular Innovation**

Our urban institutional setting in Chicago, Illinois places us in the center of growing emergent bilingual learner populations. More than 75% of students labeled English Learner (EL) in Illinois public schools speak Spanish, numbering over 205,000; this population grew by 23,000 or 13% in a single academic year (2021-22, most recent data available; Illinois State Board of Education, 2023). Other prominent languages spoken by Illinois students are Arabic, Polish, and Urdu; Cantonese and Mandarin Chinese also rank among the top 15 languages spoken by ELs in the state (Illinois State Board of Education, 2023). The approximately 2,900 Chinese-speaking ELs in Illinois are served by 60 credentialed bilingual Chinese teachers, resulting in a statewide student-teacher ratio of 48 to one. By contrast, the statewide ratio for Spanish-speaking ELs is 22 students for every credentialed bilingual Spanish teacher (Illinois State Board of Education, 2023). The relative need for Chinese language teachers who are certified and endorsed in Chinese is thus substantial in Illinois. While the state issued nearly 16,300 ESL/BE endorsements between 2016-2021, we do not know what portion of these were credentialed to teach and support Chinese (Illinois State Board of Education, 2023). By order of magnitude, however, we can conclude that Illinois would need to more than double the number of Chinese teachers to attain similar ratios to its most widely spoken non-English language.

Moreover, according to data on WL enrollment, an additional 6,500 Illinois K-16 students were studying Chinese as a WL in 2014-15 (most recent data available, American Councils for International Education, 2017). In the same year, 223,500 Illinois students were studying Spanish as a WL (American Councils for International Education, 2017). In the five-year period 2016-2021, the state of Illinois licensed 1,300 new WL educators, although the language breakdown is not published (Illinois State Board of Education, 2021).

Given the enrollments in the K-12 student population, as well as a significant bilingual student population at our Hispanic-Serving Institution and faculty expertise and involvement in Spanish-English transitional, developmental, and dual language BE, Spanish-English bilingualism is the primary focus of our BE methods courses. In addition, we are fortunate within our faculty to have extensive pedagogical expertise in another top-enrolling language in Illinois: Chinese. Through curricular innovation, we have been developing our course offerings to prepare future Chinese language teachers to serve in Illinois where the need for bilingually certified teachers is on the rise.

At our institution, ESL/BE and WL programs are located within the College of Education, but administered by separate units. This division reflects the categorization of ESL/BE as endorsement types added to any Professional Educator License, while the WL endorsement is offered as a concentration in the Secondary Master of Teaching degree program. The ESL/BE endorsement coursework is designed to enroll any candidate (pre-service or in-service teacher, at any level, in any content area) from any program in any order; it covers foundations, assessment, methods and materials, and cross-cultural studies relevant to emergent bilingual learners. The WL program provides training in teaching and clinical experiences and requires coursework in both ESL methods and WL methods. Due to this requirement that WL candidates enroll in ESL methods, we experience crossover in which WL candidates learn about ESL methods and materials alongside candidates aiming to be ESL certified.

This enrollment crossover has manifested the need for differentiated instruction in our ESL teacher education coursework that is inclusive of WL settings. The content of the ESL methods course presents an opportunity for WL teacher candidates to not only draw parallels to their own methods of teaching a WL, but also to better address the needs of identified emergent bilingual learners who enroll in WL classes. In essence, when learners cross disciplinary borders between language education fields, educators and teacher educators must adapt and follow their lead. Moreover, when teachers attend to the English language and WL learning needs of the students before them, their classrooms are effectively bilingual learning environments and can benefit from BE insights. Below, we outline these dynamics and describe our curricular innovations in light of the disciplinary border-crossing of learners, teachers, and teacher educators in language education.

### ***Phase 1: Crossing from English as a Second Language to Translanguaging***

At our institution, the ESL methods course enrolls not only ESL, WL, and BE candidates, but also pre- and in-service content area teachers, administrators, early childhood educators, special educators, and paraprofessionals who have diverse experiences with bi/multilingualism. Given this broad enrollment, the growing population and diversity of emergent bilingual learners in Illinois, and longstanding scholarship on the importance of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1995; Lucas et al., 2008; Paris & Alim, 2017), we first determined that the ESL methods course presented an opportunity to affirm that all teachers are language teachers and contribute to the success of language learners (TESOL Writing Team, 2018). Furthermore, as the only required ESL course in

many of the above programs, we found it essential to emphasize equity-oriented pedagogical frameworks as the course cornerstone. Prior versions of the course had followed a widely-used instructional model for teaching emergent bilingual learners (Echevarría et al., 2017); however, further reading called into question the model's narrow behaviorist, monolingual focus (Crawford & Reyes, 2015). In redesigning the course, we selected recent scholarship on translanguaging in order to flexibly serve the needs of diverse educators, who teach in a range of settings, with learners of diverse backgrounds. This opportunity was the key motivation for beginning the first phase of our work in crossing language education fields and other disciplinary boundaries.

In a *translanguaging classroom*, learners' diverse linguistic repertoires are acknowledged, valued, and leveraged for learning (García, 2009; García et al., 2017). This work specifically foregrounds the bilingualism of minoritized students in contexts of dual language bilingual education, sheltered content instruction, and ESL push-in support. The new text for the ESL methods course demonstrates translanguaging pedagogical applications in a variety of language education settings with diversely trained educators. Throughout, teachers play a central role in facilitating learning—including language learning—even when they do not speak all the languages of the classroom community. The shift in perspective from ESL to translanguaging allowed us to design a more inclusive curriculum to better serve all candidates enrolled in our ESL methods course.

In our curricular shift to translanguaging, we also revised course learning outcomes to better serve WL candidates as fellow language educators. Prior to the redesign, our program had received internal feedback that candidates perceived ESL methods as outside of the scope of their WL training, unrelated to their future classrooms (where they did not anticipate teaching students labeled EL), and inflexible with few clear options for adapting assignments to better fit the WL classroom. In response, we articulated course learning outcomes emphasizing shared professional knowledge and practices across language education fields, including common theories of language learning and culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy, approaches to integrating language and content learning across communicative modes, aligning instruction with standards and assessments, materials curation, differentiation strategies, and critical reflection on pedagogical practices.

We then crafted learning activities that could serve language educators across program models. For example, teacher candidates develop strategies for documenting learners' language and cultural backgrounds and discuss how this knowledge can shape instruction. Candidates design classroom routines, norms, and visuals to support learners' socioemotional learning and motivation. They study multiliteracies and plan learning activities to enhance visual literacy, biliteracy, and content area literacy. Additionally, candidates connect with professional organizations and learning communities in their field experiences.

Lastly, we redesigned the culminating assessment to leverage all learner languages and all languages of instruction in an aligned unit of instruction based on translanguaging approaches and supports. For example, candidates articulate unit learning objectives drawn from both English Language Development Standards (WIDA, 2020) and other language standards such as the World-Readiness Standards

for Learning Languages (The National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015). Candidates further identify student background knowledge in multiple languages that relates to the unit topic, differentiate for learner linguistic profiles, and assess learning in multiple languages to demonstrate achievement of language learning objectives.

The emphasis on language professional skills and multiple languages in these learning outcomes, activities, and assessment facilitates WL candidates' flexibility in adapting the ESL methods coursework to their classroom contexts. These revisions shift the course's monolingual focus on English learning toward the flexible and strategic use of multiple languages—translanguaging. The updated course complements candidates' training in WL pedagogy in their degree program by providing training in translanguaging pedagogy that is inclusive of identified emergent bilingual learners. It is thus an avenue for moving the monolingual mindset in WL (Leung & Valdés, 2019) toward a more inclusive pedagogy cognizant of learners' diverse linguistic profiles.

### ***Phase 2: Crossing from Translanguaging to World Languages***

In a second phase of curricular design, we continued to re-envision the place of WL in ESL/BE coursework as a way of bridging language education fields. While in Phase 1, we succeeded in differentiating ESL methods coursework to be inclusive of WL, in Phase 2 we sought ways to further support WL candidates' instruction of specific languages. To do so, we developed an iteration of the ESL methods course entitled "Methods of Teaching English as a Second Language and World Languages." In its first offering, the new course focused on ESL and Chinese language teaching. We selected Chinese because of its importance as one of the fifteen languages most widely spoken by emergent bilingual learners in Illinois and our programmatic capacity to serve future Chinese language teachers.

The new methods course sits at the nexus of ESL and WL education, and involves collaboration across the ESL/BE and WL programs at our institution. It caters to future Chinese language teachers who may work across language program models with learners who are English speakers, Chinese-speaking English Learners, Chinese-English bilinguals, and Chinese heritage speakers. It connects the candidates to language educators in the field who teach in bilingual and WL settings and provide mentorship. Course instruction, materials, and learning activities are provided bilingually in Chinese and English. Excerpts of course descriptions highlight this shift in focus from content-based ESL instruction to ESL-WL partnerships where language is the partnering content area:

**ESL Methods course description:** This course prepares candidates to teach language and content in English as a Second Language settings. Candidates examine and apply conceptual and pedagogical tools for teaching English as a second language and supporting students' bilingualism. Candidates explore tools to create effective language and content instruction that is differentiated according to language proficiency.

**ESL and WL Methods course description:** This course prepares candidates to teach a World Language to culturally and linguistically



diverse learners in classroom settings. Candidates examine and apply conceptual and pedagogical tools for teaching World Languages and supporting students' emergent bilingualism across language program models. Candidates explore tools to create effective language and content instruction that is differentiated according to language proficiency.

The above excerpts underscore key differences in the target audience for each course and potential professional trajectories. While the former focuses on candidates who plan to teach in ESL settings, the latter targets WL candidates while explicitly expanding the focus to various language program models and emphasizing classroom learners' multifaceted linguistic profiles. For this reason, it may be framed as a multilingual approach (May, 2014). This phrasing is significant because WL candidates may set out to teach the target language under the assumption that their future learners are English monolinguals who should learn to behave as Chinese monolinguals in an immersive classroom environment. This change invites them to adopt an asset-based approach to leverage learners' multilingual resources as funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992) to learn an additional WL.

As in Phase 1, Phase 2 course learning outcomes are illustrative of curricular modifications. In the combined ESL and WL Methods course, candidates apply theories of second language acquisition and foreign language learning. In addition to noting shared professional knowledge and overlapping constructs, this course delves into differing emphases and traditions (e.g., communicative language teaching). By inviting WL candidates to explore the similarities and differences, we create space for them to cross borders in language teacher education. Further, candidates examine the role of cultural learning in concert with language and content learning; this shift reflects the emphasis on culture as one of the critical components of WL education included in professional standards (The National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015). Lastly, course learning outcomes shift from a focus on English-medium program models (e.g., push-in, self-contained, and sheltered) toward broader language program models including immersion, dual language, world language, and heritage language. Candidates identify models that best support different learner profiles, and select methods appropriate for each.

Learning activities throughout the course leverage the language expertise of WL candidates to enhance the learning trajectories of emergent bilingual learners of diverse profiles. Candidates are encouraged to look beyond learner labels (e.g., EL, heritage language speaker, and Chinese-dominant) to understand bilingualism as a dynamic and complex system (Douglas Fir Group, 2016; García, 2009). We utilize case studies, such as the example below, to bring candidates into conversation around pedagogical questions with opportunities to draw on learners' funds of knowledge as well as current scholarship.

**Case Study:** You have accepted a teaching position at Riverside Elementary, which offers a dual-language bilingual Mandarin Chinese and English program. Among the learners enrolled in the cohort, there are heritage Chinese speakers, English-dominant learners, and Spanish-English bilinguals. While designing the curriculum for the program, you need to decide when and how to teach Pinyin, the

Mandarin Chinese pronunciation system using the Latin alphabet, based on the best practices recommended by research.

Accompanying this case study are two scholarly articles centered on the role of Pinyin in promoting metalinguistic skills that enhance biliteracy development (Lü, 2017; Luo et al., 2018). The WL candidates draft and present a proposal on when and how to teach Pinyin, drawing on research evidence in light of learner linguistic profiles.

In another learning activity that invites border-crossing in language education, candidates become familiar with professional standards guiding language program models where a WL such as Chinese is taught. They observe or interview a mentor teacher working in one of these models as part of the field experience component of the course. Putting it all together, candidates explain the role of standards in designing culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum for emergent bilingual learners in the setting of their field experience. Through this activity, WL candidates develop a deeper understanding of the linguistic diversity among students, varied program model outcomes, and the intersectionality of different professional standards guiding curriculum design.

Lastly, an ongoing assessment asks candidates to build a WL teaching portfolio demonstrating how to support learners' bilingualism and biliteracy across languages. The portfolio includes a statement of teaching philosophy in which candidates consider the main issues of Chinese language teaching in the U.S. context, draw upon their field experiences and research findings, and reflect on their own linguistic and cultural identities. Candidates additionally make connections to course assignments such as the classroom observation with a mentor teacher and outline instructional strategies that integrate culture, content, and language learning. In this portfolio, candidates may grapple with, for example, their background as Chinese immigrants to the United States whose classroom experiences reflected a top-down, teacher-centered approach that differs from what they may find in U.S. classrooms (Yue, 2017). In dialogue with course materials, candidates analyze and negotiate ideological influences on teaching and learning that can be observed in curriculum design, theme selection, classroom activities, classroom management, and family engagement. In this way, they engage in an analysis of the theoretical and ideological factors at play across fields of language education, contextualized within Chinese language teaching.

The ESL and WL Methods course resulting from Phase 2 of our curricular innovation features learning outcomes, activities, and assessments that leverage WL candidates' professional expertise to cross borders in language education. We designed this bridging course as an ongoing conversation across the fields' research and pedagogical foundations and professional standards, with firm grounding in classroom field experiences that enable candidates to envision their future multilingual classrooms. This focus on professional identity and positionality, on the one hand, and classroom reality on the other, guides future WL teachers in taking a multilingual turn and enacting an asset-based stance toward classroom learners of diverse linguistic profiles (May, 2014).

### ***Phase 3 (Future Work): Crossing from World Languages to Bilingual Education***

Our future third phase of curricular innovation focuses on crossing borders from WL to BE. As noted in the historical literature review, these fields have traditionally diverged in learner population, programmatic goals, and instructional materials. For example, WL learners are often assumed to be (monolingual) majority language speakers who will benefit from intensive use of the target language in an immersion environment created within the constraints of the traditional classroom (García, 2009; Leung & Valdés, 2019). Additionally, the native speaker model continues to hold sway as the presumed ideal WL teacher and purported goal of WL learning, despite decades of critique (e.g., Cook, 1999; Macedo, 2019). Indeed, learner non-native-like use of the target language has received intense scrutiny and led to more explicit instruction in grammar (Swain, 1985), reinforcing a traditional pillar of foreign language education. Lastly, as the term *foreign languages* implies, language models from abroad have been portrayed as authentic and privileged over U.S. communities where the language is spoken. These characteristics distinguish WL from BE program models.

Despite its prestige as a means to travel abroad and expand one's cultural horizons, WL study is increasingly embattled. Already minimal hours of instruction in K-12 schooling have been decreased or entire programs eliminated to accommodate increasing attention to math and reading in the accountability era (García, 2009), while in higher education, WL enrollments dropped precipitously by 16% from 2016 to 2021 (Lusin et al., 2023). WL education has been criticized as adopting neoliberal discourse, lacking diversity in the teaching force and instructional materials, and insufficiently addressing its colonial history (Bernstein et al., 2015; Bori & Canale, 2022; Hines-Gaither & Accilien, 2023; Macedo, 2019). Perhaps as a strategy for increasing enrollments in WL, K-12 two-way dual language immersion models of BE are promoted to pair WL learners with emergent bilingual learners who speak the target language. The contentious issues of WL education are thus becoming intertwined with BE concerns, and vice versa, as noted by Valdés (1997, 2018) and others (e.g., Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Palmer, 2009).

In light of these trends bringing together the learners, teachers, and fields of WL and BE, we have argued that WL educators should attend to the target and English language learning goals of their learners; at which point, we feel equally compelled to advocate for training WL educators as, in fact, bilingual educators. The design of a BE methods course that can cater to both WL and bilingual educators across program models, but with a particular focus on increasingly widespread models of dual language bilingual education, is thus the focus of our current curricular innovation. As we consider the future careers of WL candidates enrolling in ESL/BE coursework, we see BE as a generative framework for training candidates who can fulfill multiple roles, while heeding Valdés' (1997, 2018) cautionary notes with a commitment to language equity.

Looking specifically at the case of Chinese in Illinois schools, the number of speakers and learners appears to be growing. The state reported approximately 2,340 Chinese-speaking English Learners in 2021, increasing to 2,900 in 2022 (Illinois State Board of Education, 2021, 2023). Additional data on WL enrollment in Chinese

from 2014-15 indicate that 6,500 students were enrolled in Chinese language courses across 64 programs in public and private schools in Illinois (American Councils for International Education, 2017). This report also notes the nationwide “explosion of Chinese enrollment” (p. 18): Chinese is the most offered Advanced Placement language course after Spanish and French; 72% of high schools offer courses or online instruction in Chinese; 100 schools anticipated expanding their Chinese language course offerings; Chinese makes up 80% of enrollment in so-called “critical” languages, notably targeting language proficiency at the most advanced levels. These trends indicate increasing interest in Chinese as a WL coupled with rising numbers of Chinese-English emergent bilingual learners.

Our border-crossing between WL and BE centers on three curricular priorities that build on Phases 1 and 2 above and invite candidates to engage directly with Valdés’ framework of language curricularization (2018). First, we aim to document and affirm candidates’ linguistic repertoires, dynamic bilingualism, and histories of bilingualism and schooling using decolonizing methodologies (Hamilton, 2018). These linguistic autobiographies and landscape studies are built on reflexive and community-building activities, for example, language portraits, sociolinguistic inquiry, and community cultural wealth surveys inspired by pedagogical and theoretical resources (e.g., España & Herrera, 2020; Tian & King, 2023; Yosso, 2005). Learning activities will address the historical and personal contexts of BE as well as key pedagogical approaches including translanguaging.

Second, we aim to leverage and hone candidates’ critical consciousness to build linguistic ideological clarity, which professionally prepares them for the field, classroom, and sociocultural contexts of education (Caldas, 2021; Venegas-Weber & Martinez Negrette, 2023). These framing ideas are generated through scenarios and debriefing discussions based on drama arts pedagogy in teacher education (Cahnmann-Taylor & Souto-Manning, 2010; Caldas, 2018). Learning activities involve reading and representing narratives of tension confronted by experienced bilingual educators and reenacting possible responses to develop candidates’ ability to advocate for emergent bilingual learners in the moment. These scenarios address current equity issues in dual language bilingual education (e.g., program gentrification, raciolinguistic ideologies, and translanguaging; Delavan et al., 2021; Flores & Rosa, 2015; García et al., 2017).

Lastly, our goal is to crystalize candidate historical, equitable, and pedagogical perspectives through critical curricular analysis of an existing program through case study. Candidates will address core program elements (e.g., target learner populations, instructional approach, materials, and assessments) of a specific BE program model in practice, while also uncovering the mediating influence of policies, contexts, and traditions and the underlying ideologies and theories of language and bilingualism that shape these program elements. Valdés (2018) points out that educators are not often invited to examine these factors that can contribute to a language program’s success or failure. We view the invitation to engage in such analysis as essential to fostering candidates’ critical consciousness and re-ordering the traditional priorities of BE (Palmer et al., 2019). As part of the case study, candidates will design a bilingual unit of instruction guided by language and content objectives and reflecting key

ideological, theoretical, political, contextual, and programmatic elements shaping the unit context.

This future third phase of curricular innovation will foster convergence between WL and BE teacher education within a language equity frame built on critical consciousness. The work follows curricular priorities inspired by the professional expertise of WL and bilingual educators, with a vision for training teachers for the future of language education in which learners, educators, and teacher educators cross disciplinary borders to pursue bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness (Palmer et al., 2019).

### **Curricularization and Heteroglossic Vision**

By inviting ESL, BE, and WL educators to cross disciplinary borders during their teacher training, we are preparing them to imagine new possibilities for the field of language education. We urge candidates to transform the status quo, in which:

In some cases, 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/or because reasonable alternatives have not been explored. (Valdés, 2018, p. 405)

As a first step in this transformation, we have considered our own role and responsibility as language teacher educators to reshape curriculum. We have engaged in a process of identifying and interrogating ideologies and theories of language and bilingualism, state policies, institutional contexts and curricular arrangements, and assumed teacher candidate profiles that have shaped our existing ESL/BE curriculum. Thanks to the enrollment of WL candidates in our ESL/BE coursework, we have been called to cross disciplinary borders to facilitate translanguaging pedagogies, a multilingual turn, and critical consciousness in light of diverse teacher candidate profiles, as a model for candidates to use with their own future learners.

To undertake this curricular innovation, we have utilized the framework of language curricularization to analyze the alignment of our program elements with current theories of language and language learning, as well as the language ideologies communicated through our curricular choices. The essence of this process began with asking *what do we teach, how, and for whom?* In redesigning an ESL methods course, we shifted the course focus from sheltered instructional models to translanguaging classrooms guided by a heteroglossic view of language (García, 2009). That is, the course's foundational theoretical concept posits that learners' languages do not exist as parallel monolingualisms that switch on and off, but rather span a continuum of flexible and heterogeneous practices crossing categories of language, variety, register, genre, and mode in communicative contexts across time. This thinking reflects prominent theoretical orientations in second language acquisition that describe language as the complex, dynamic, and holistic subject of a learning process, typified by variability and change and mediated by ideologies; learners with a range of linguistic competencies negotiate agency and make investments in new social identities through language learning in sociocultural contexts (Douglas Fir Group, 2016).

This heteroglossic, complex view can be seen in the dynamic translanguaging progressions outlined by García et al. (2017) and now part of the translanguaging unit of instruction that serves as a culminating assessment in the redesigned ESL methods course. Rather than utilize the marker of proficiency, which emphasizes a linear and standardized view of individual language development, the progressions document learners' bilingual performances from various perspectives (e.g., self, teacher, and family) with a focus on academic tasks in any language and language-specific tasks. Teacher candidates, from monolingual English-speaking content teachers to ESL specialists to WL educators, must indicate how they will document learners' linguistic repertoires and utilize this information in designing instruction. In this way, candidates are equipped to not only leverage learners' resources in culturally and linguistically responsive instruction, but also to account for how these repertoires shift across time, task, and perspectives.

In a second phase, we embraced a multilingual turn in ESL and WL Methods to address the needs of WL teacher candidates. The redesigned course establishes a platform for them to explore the intersectionality of second and foreign language acquisition through a culturally and linguistically responsive framework that assumes learner multilingualism rather than English monolingualism. Revisions to the course description and learning outcomes emphasize our commitment to aligning with equity-oriented ideologies, where WL candidates cultivate dispositions that ensure learners with diverse linguistic profiles have equitable access to flexible and differentiated instruction in the process of learning a new language. Consequently, instructional materials, class activities, and assessments involve candidates in leveraging the diverse linguistic repertoires of their learners, selecting inclusive curricular materials that reflect the diversity of both the learner and target language communities, and designing and implementing instruction that is culturally and linguistically relevant to learners while challenging them to consider and evaluate multiple perspectives.

In the interest of expanding the heteroglossic vision of named languages traditionally considered in WL education, we integrated an additional diversity lens into this course drawing on antiracist frameworks (Hines-Gaither & Accilien, 2023; Kendi, 2019). Alongside candidates, we reflected on what an antiracist WL classroom looks like and for whom it is designed. This reflection opens possibilities for analyzing, learning, and using language varieties that raciolinguistic ideologies portray as nonstandard. Indeed, this commitment to antiracism in our curricular work has provided necessary and meaningful context to the asset-based perspective on learner linguistic repertoires as funds of knowledge. As multilingual experts by virtue of their language training, WL candidates can leverage linguistic expertise across languages to design instruction that not only responds to but expands learners' linguistic profiles.

Lastly, we have articulated curricular priorities to guide the future redesign of our BE methods course to prepare WL and BE candidates for the politicized contexts of education that they may encounter, in addition to the multiple roles they may be asked to serve. This course offers a chance to foreground critical consciousness as a necessary component of BE in addition to the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et

al., 2019). Critical consciousness is enhanced through drama-based pedagogical strategies in the course, providing opportunities for candidates to rehearse social change and ready themselves to counter inequities they will likely face in educational settings (Cahnmann-Taylor & Souto-Manning, 2010). Secondly, candidates study Valdés' (2018) analytic framework of language curricularization in the context of program model case studies, seeking to assess how well core elements of various BE program models reflect stated and implicit ideologies and current research in second language acquisition, and how factors such as policies and traditions affect program implementation. The case study culminating assessment invites candidates to ask questions drawn from Valdés' (2018) framework such as: *What is considered correct and standard language in this program model?; Which varieties of language are taught or not taught?; How are learners labeled and categorized in terms of language?; How are languages understood to be learned, and how does this relate to teaching?; How is bilingualism defined?.* Addressing these points through concrete case studies allows candidates to engage in critical curricular analysis and examine the complex factors that imbue bilingual instruction beyond grammar and vocabulary, oracy and literacy, proficiency and competence.

### **Implications**

Curriculum redesign in a given teacher education program to resolve a particular problem of practice can provide insights for similar undertakings by language teacher educators in other settings. We have narrated the specificities of our curricular innovation across three courses to provide an example of disciplinary border-crossing and collaboration across language teacher education, even as we worked within institutional, educational, and political constraints. For example, due to divergent program schedules and formats that are served by ESL/BE coursework at our institution, we are often not able to organize enrollment in a specific sequence through the curriculum (any course is available to any candidate at any point in their program). Relatedly, WL candidates may enroll in any one (but only one) of the three courses discussed, without necessarily being advised on which course or section is the most relevant to their studies. Enrolling in further coursework represents an additional investment of candidates' time and financial resources. Further, in most cases, candidates' major program advisors and a separate team of supervisors monitor field experiences; our understanding of these important sites of learning is thus once removed. We therefore believe that language teacher educators implementing similar curricular innovation in programs whose coursework is designed to follow a certain sequence, by candidates organized into cohorts, where learning can be documented and solidified over several terms, with close relationships to field sites—as in traditional pre-service teacher education—could experience great success with the multi-tiered, spiral curriculum we have designed.

At the same time, our unique institutional context has led to the enrollment crossover that initially inspired our curricular innovation. We regularly differentiate instruction for educators who are pre-service or in-service teachers; content, language, or special education-certified; licensed for early childhood, elementary, or secondary; and administrative leaders, classroom teachers, or paraprofessionals. In addition, candidates are culturally and linguistically diverse given our institutional

identity as Hispanic-serving and Minority-serving and our broad reach in Illinois teacher education. We have found this heterogeneous context ideal for maintaining a heteroglossic vision that dismantles myths of teacher identity, knowledge, and pedagogy. Language teacher educators in similar settings will have the advantage of a honed pedagogical flexibility that is well adapted to the curricular innovations we put forth.

We argue that curriculum benefits from regular review to refresh the material and align with theoretical developments in foundational disciplines. As part of this process, certain factors enhanced our work, including collaboration with related programs to highlight convergence, harmonize pedagogical approaches, and develop materials (especially in areas lacking resources such as Chinese language teaching and antiracist WL scholarship); as well as outside review by non-specialists (e.g., faculty in other areas) and external partners (e.g., current bilingual educators in schools). Additionally, a guiding analytic framework such as that proposed by Valdés (2018) has been indispensable for framing a larger conversation about theoretical development in second language acquisition research, language ideologies embedded in curriculum, and the mediating influences of policy and tradition, beyond the customary emphasis on core program elements such as language allocation and instructional materials.

A key takeaway from our curricular innovation is to model for teacher candidates what we hope they will enact in their future classrooms with emergent bilingual learners, and to present the modeling and rationale as an ongoing, explicit focus of learning. Across all three redesigned courses, for example, we begin by eliciting candidate experiences of language and schooling: In ESL Methods, candidates produce a language identities drawing; in ESL and WL Methods, they narrate their journey to bilingualism; and in BE Methods, they compose a linguistic autobiography and landscape. Candidates then study and generate tools of their own for documenting learners' linguistic repertoires in similar ways. The coursework also leverages multimodality to enhance and demonstrate learning (e.g., video learning materials and multimodal teaching portfolios). Candidates then design multimodal learning activities for emergent bilingual learners using research-based strategies to teach visual literacy. Through this approach emphasizing modeling, reflection, and authorship, language teacher educators can form a community of practice with candidates as critically conscious, pedagogically capable language professionals.

## **Conclusion**

In this paper, we have surveyed the historical emergence of English as a Second Language, Bilingual Education, and World Languages as distinct strands of language education in the United States. We then applied Valdés' (2018) framework on the curricularization of language in order to illuminate distinctions and connections across these strands' theoretical foundations, ideological influences, contexts, and core program elements, as seen within our own work crossing borders in language teacher education. In our analysis and discussion, the key role of a heteroglossic view on language and language learning is explored in terms of a translanguaging pedagogy, a multilingual turn, and critical consciousness that can be honed across and throughout language teacher education (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Caldas, 2021;



García, 2009; May, 2014; Venegas-Weber & Martinez Negrette, 2023). We address the implications of our work in terms of affordances and limitations for language teacher educators undertaking similar curricular work. Throughout, we foreground multilingual learners of diverse linguistic profiles, with particular attention to minoritized emergent bilingual learners, as we ask *language for whom?*

By way of answering this question, we do not advocate for compressing the language teacher education curriculum into a single path that would cater to all future language teachers. Instead, we argue that bridging language education fields in teacher education presents an opportunity to historicize the fields of English as a Second Language, Bilingual, and World Language Education with teacher candidates, as we address the processes and consequences of the curricularization of language in different fields. We explore ways to harmonize theoretical foundations and to critically examine ideological influences that inform language education in all its forms, maintaining a historical awareness and pedagogical flexibility adapted to each learner's linguistic profile. We view culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy in light of learners' backgrounds, grounded in larger sociopolitical contexts and historical trends, as a meaningful guiding principle in crossing borders in language teacher education.

## References

- Alfaro, C., & Bartolomé, L. (2017). Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers: Honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 11–34. <https://www.itejournal.org/wp-content/pdfs-issues/summer-2017/06alfaro&bartolome.pdf>
- American Councils for International Education. (2017). *The National K-12 Foreign Language Enrollment Survey Report*. Author. <https://www.americancouncils.org/sites/default/files/FLE-report-June17.pdf>
- Bernstein, K. A, Hellmich, E. A, Katznelson, N., Shin, J., & Vinnall, K. (2015). Critical perspectives on neoliberalism in Second/Foreign Language Education. *L2 Journal: An electronic refereed journal for foreign and second language educators*, 7(3), 3-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/L27327672>
- Bilingual Education Act, Public L. No. 90-247, Title VII (1968).
- Bori, P., & Canale, G. (2022). Neoliberal foreign language education: *The search for alternatives*. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 19(4), 307-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2090362>
- Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Souto-Manning, M. (2010). *Teachers act up! Creating multicultural learning communities through theatre*. Teachers College Press.
- Caldas, B. (2018). “More meaningful to do it than just reading it.” Rehearsing praxis among Mexican-American/Latinx pre-service teachers. *Teaching Education*, 29(4), 370-382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2018.1510482>
- Caldas, B. (2021). Hablando Pa'tras: Developing critical conscious bilingual teacher education programs in Mexican-American/Latinophobic times. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1864202>

- Cervantes-Soon, C. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the New Latin@ Diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893267>
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 403–427. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X17690120>
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 185–209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717>
- Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Crane.
- Crawford, J., & Reyes, S. A. (2015). *The trouble with SIOP®: How a behaviorist framework, flawed research, and clever marketing have come to define - and diminish - Sheltered Instruction*. Institute for Language & Education Policy.
- Delavan, M. G., Freire, J. A., & Menken, K. (2021). Editorial introduction: A historical overview of the expanding critique(s) of the gentrification of dual language bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 20(3), 299–321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09640-5>
- Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 19–47. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44134994>
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M.E. & Short, D. (2017). *Making content comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP® Model* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- España, C., & Herrera, L. Y. (2020). *En comunidad*. Heinemann.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x>
- Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory into Practice*, 59(1), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Flores, N., Tseng, A. & Subtirelu, N. (2020). *Bilingualism for all? Raciolinguistic perspectives on dual language education in the United States*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800410053>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., Ibarra Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom*. Caslon.
- Grinberg, J., & Saavedra, E. R. (2000). The constitution of bilingual/ESL education as a disciplinary practice: Genealogical explorations. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 419–441. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070004419>
- Hamilton, C. (2018). Bilingualism as a borderland: Researching bilingual youth's practices, perspectives, and positioning between languages. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 19(3), 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708618817881>

- Hines-Gaither, K., & Accilien, C. (2023). *The antiracist world language classroom*. Routledge.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2023). *English Learners in Illinois: SY2021-22 Statistical Report*. <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/2022-Eng-Learner-Stat-Report.pdf>
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2021). *2021 annual report*. <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/2021-Annual-Report.pdf#page=50>
- Kendi, I. (2019). *How to be an antiracist*. Random House.
- Kibler, A. K., & Valdés, G. (2016). Conceptualizing language learners: Socioinstitutional mechanisms and their consequences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 96–116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12310>
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Language Education Associates.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
- Leung, C., & Valdés, G. (2019). Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(2), 348–370. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45172005>
- Lü, C. (2017). The roles of Pinyin skill in English-Chinese biliteracy learning: Evidence from Chinese immersion learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(2), 306–322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12269>
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English Language Learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322110>
- Luo, Y. C., Koh, P. W., Deacon, S. H., & Chen, X. (2018). The roles of metalinguistic skills in Chinese–English biliteracy development. *Reading and Writing*, 31(1), 1721–1740. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-017-9778-5>
- Lusin, N., Peterson, T., Sulewski, C., & Zafer, R. (2023). Enrollments in languages other than English in US Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2021. Modern Language Association of America. <https://www.mla.org/content/download/191324/file/Enrollments-in-Languages-Other-Than-English-in-US-Institutions-of-Higher-Education-Fall-2021.pdf>
- Macedo, D. (2000). The colonialism of the English only movement. *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029003015>
- Macedo, D. (2019). *Decolonizing foreign language education: The misteaching of English and other colonial languages*. Routledge.
- May, S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. Routledge.
- Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923). <https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep262390/>
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
- National Defense Education Program, 20 U.S.C. §§ 401–589. (1958). <https://www.loc.gov/item/uscode1958-004020017/>

- The National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (4th ed.). Author.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge.
- Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st Century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning*, 63, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00735.x>
- Palmer, D. K. (2009). Middle-class English speakers in a two-way immersion bilingual classroom: "Everybody should be listening to Jonathan right now..." *TESOL Quarterly* 43(2), 177-202. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27785001>
- Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 121-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569376>
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies*. Teachers College Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence. *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 165-179.
- TESOL International Association Writing Team. (2018). *The 6 principles for exemplary teaching of English learners*. TESOL Press.
- Tian, Z., & King, N. (2023). *Developing translanguaging repertoires in critical teacher education*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110735604>
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391-429. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948>
- Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 388-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1539886>
- Valdés, G., & Parra, M. L. (2018). Possible goals and pedagogical approaches in teaching language to heritage speakers: Towards the development of an analytical framework. In K. Potowski (Ed.), *Handbook of Spanish as a heritage language* (pp. 301-330). Routledge.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. SUNY Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (2016). *Growing critically conscious teachers: A social justice curriculum for educators of Latino/a youth*. Teachers College Press.
- Venegas-Weber, P., & Martinez Negrette, G. (2023). From ideological clarity to linguistic ideological clarity. *Linguistics and Education*, 77, 101201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101201>
- WIDA. (2020). *WIDA English language development standards framework, 2020 edition: Kindergarten–grade 12*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>
- Yue, Y. (2017). Teaching Chinese in K-12 schools in the United States: What are the challenges? *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(3), 601-620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12277>