





Language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers implementing dual language teaching for the first time: pro-multilingual beliefs, practical concerns

Katie A. Bernstein , Sultan Kilinc , Megan Troxel Deeg, Scott C. Marley, Kathleen M. Farrand and Michael F. Kelley

Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods study examines the language ideologies of 28 preschool educators in their first month transitioning from English-only to dual language education (DLE). Using the language ideology survey developed by [Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2011). "Language ideology dimensions of politically active Arizona voters: an exploratory study." *Language Awareness* 20 (4): 295–314; Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2014). "Language ideologies of Arizona voters, language managers, and teachers." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 13 (1): 34–52], we analyzed the preschool teachers' language ideologies, as well as the relationships between the ideologies and demographic and experiential variables. We found that teachers generally held pro-multilingual ideologies, but that particular ideologies correlated with different teacher experiences. For instance, while teachers' level of education and having studied a language other than English were positive correlates of pro-multilingual beliefs, years of teaching overall was instead positively associated with viewing *English as a tool* and years at the current placement was positively related to viewing *multiple languages as a problem*. Neither general teaching experience nor experience having a home language other than English was a significant predictor of pro-multilingual beliefs. Qualitative analysis of transcripts from teacher focus groups reflected teachers' pro-multilingual beliefs, but also showed teachers' concerns with DLE implementation. We found, however, that these concerns were practical – balancing district priorities; managing new divisions of labor in the classroom – rather than ideological. Our findings highlight the theoretical and methodological importance of viewing teachers' experiences, ideologies, and classroom language policies as connected.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 19 July 2017
Accepted 10 May 2018

KEYWORDS


Language ideologies; dual language education; early childhood education; teacher experience; Arizona; language policy and planning

APA Citation:

Bernstein, K.A., Kilinc, S., Troxel, M., Marley, S., Farrand, K., Chapman, K., & Kelley, M. (2021). Language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers implementing dual language teaching for the first time: pro-multilingual beliefs, practical concerns. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 24(4), 457-480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1476456>

Introduction

Although P-12 language education is shaped by policymakers at state and national levels, children's on-the-ground learning experiences are mediated by the decisions of those closer to them. In classrooms, teachers act as local language policy makers (McCarty 2011), making choices about which languages or kinds of language are acceptable. Even in classrooms that are officially dual language (DL), teachers make myriad tiny daily decisions – from whether or not to accept an answer in a given language to whether to model strict separation of languages or fluid translanguaging (Martínez,

CONTACT Katie A. Bernstein  kbernstein@asu.edu  Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, 1050 S. Forest Mall, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA

© 2018 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Hikida, and Durán 2015; Pontier and Gort 2016) – that impact learning on the ground (Rajuan and Beckerman 2011). These decisions are often mediated by teachers' language ideologies, or beliefs about language acquired over lifetimes of participating in linguistic and cultural practices (Kroskrity 2004). As dual language education (DLE) expands in the United States, language researchers must therefore engage not only with language policy at state or district levels, but also must explore teachers' classroom-level policy making, including their ideologies about language.

In this study, we examine the language ideologies of 28 teachers in 14 pre-kindergarten (pre-K) classrooms¹ transitioning from English-only to 50-50 Spanish-English dual language (DL) models. Specifically, we explore teachers' beliefs about language, language learning, and bilingualism just after the start of the first DL school year.

Theoretical framework

Language ideologies

The concept of language ideologies comes first from Silverstein (1979), who described 'linguistic ideologies' as how people think language functions and how it should be used. Irvine (1989) expanded Silverstein's definition, emphasizing the culturally-shaped nature of language ideologies, as well as the moral and political interests that are always part of them. Irvine's expansion made it possible to understand how language ideologies, like other cultural practices, are learned; and it illuminated the intersection between language ideologies and power. Kroskrity (2004) built on Irvine and Silverstein's work, proposing a five-part definition of language ideologies (or, as we see it, a definition followed by four points of elaboration), which guides our work. He wrote: 'Language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group' (501). This definition, like Irvine's, considers power – ideologies are always in the interest of someone – and underlines that ideologies are socially constructed. Kroskrity's (2004) framework offers four further principles. First, relationships between language and culture are fluid, allowing many ideologies to circulate in a group at a time. Second, awareness of ideologies varies among members of a group, with some unable to explicitly report on ideologies in circulation. Third, ideologies mediate (but do not determine) the relationship between language and social structures. Finally, language ideologies play a role in the creation of identities ('We talk like this here.'). Together, these principles guide our understanding of ideologies in this work.

Language policy

When a person or group seeks to impose their language ideologies on others through management of others' language, ideologies are translated into language policies (Shohamy 2006). According to Spolsky (2004), language policy is always a combination of three things: *ideologies*, or beliefs about language and use, *practices*, or patterns of how language is used, and *management*, or 'any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice' (5). Management can be carried out through explicit, or *de jure*, planning and intervention, such as codifying a national language or posting a company policy to only speak English to customers (Spolsky 2004). It can also be carried out through *de facto* management, in which social practices – rather than a posted rule or a written law – shape others' language use (Spolsky 2004). When a teacher pretends not to understand a student saying, 'Can I go to the bathroom?' (rather than 'May I?'), or when a waitress shakes her head and says 'What?' in response to a customer's accent, these individuals are engaging in *de facto* language management. Policy, therefore, can often be understood from examining speakers' beliefs and practices, even in absence of *de jure* management.

Additionally, even when there is *de jure* management, policies rarely translate directly into uniform practices (Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Spolsky 2004). Instead, policies – even those policies codified at the state or federal level – are negotiated by actors at every level of context (Johnson 2010).

Policy might therefore be compared to an onion, made up of layer upon layer of contexts in which a policy is interpreted and applied anew, with the potential for substantive change (Ricento and Hornberger 1996). From this perspective, studying policy in a given context, such as a classroom, means studying not just management, but also ideologies and practices.

Literature review

Teachers as language planners and policy makers

'Implementation, by definition, involves policy-making, with educators acting as policy-makers' (Menken and Garcia 2010a, 2). Whether a language policy is crafted at the federal, state, district, or school level, teachers always interpret that policy and can implement practices that reflect, resist, or reimagine it. While teachers might, therefore, simply carry out policies handed to them, decades of research illustrate that teachers are far more likely to actively engage policies through creation of classroom practices based on their own ideologies (Auerbach 1993; Fang 1996; Garrity and Guerra 2015; Menken and Garcia 2010b; Merritt 2011; Stritikus 2003; Pettit 2011; Ramanathan 2005). Researchers who study teacher policy-making frequently focus on two clusters of language ideologies, which can be categorized as 'pro-monolingual' and 'pro-multilingual.'

Pro-monolingual language ideologies and teacher policy-making

In the U.S., pro-monolingual ideologies typically involve two perspectives: first, that a singular, standardized language (English) helps create a unified national identity; and second, that English provides access to opportunities and symbolic power (Fitzsimmons-Doolan 2014; González 2001; Palmer 2011). When teachers hold these perspectives, they are more likely to see students who speak other languages through deficit lenses, conceive of home languages as liabilities, and enact classroom language policies reflective of these views. For instance, in Razfar and Rumenapp's (2012) study, students reported that teachers restricted the use of Spanish, Arabic, and other languages in their classrooms, invoking the class title, 'English class,' to justify this rule. In other studies, teachers saw Spanish only as a scaffold for use until students could fully transition to English, and they viewed students needing Spanish as a support as academically inferior, placing them in remedial classes separate from native English speakers (Allard et al. 2014; Palmer 2011). Studies in Greece, Ecuador, and Belgium confirm that monolingual language ideologies can prompt teachers to adhere to 'one classroom language' models – even in officially multilingual countries like Belgium – in the name of supporting students and creating a unified classroom (Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, and Tsokalidou 2015; King 2000; Pulinx, Van Avermaet, and Agirdag 2017).

Pro-multilingual language ideologies and teacher policy-making

At the other end of the spectrum, pro-multilingual ideologies support the presence of multiple languages and view speaking multiple languages as an economic and cultural asset (Fitzsimmons-Doolan 2014; Palmer 2011). Teachers holding pro-multilingual ideologies are more likely to allow students to express themselves in multiple languages (Volk and Angelova 2007) and to permit the presence of students' home languages, even within officially monolingual classrooms (Hélot 2010). Johnson's (2010, 2013) research in Philadelphia showed that district personnel who held pro-multilingual ideologies resisted English-only policies in favor of bilingual programs that fostered development of both languages. The teachers explicitly encouraged multilingual practices, based on the belief that multilingual speakers are beneficial to society as a whole. Newcomer and Puzio (2016) found that even in a state with restrictive language policies, teachers' and administrators' own ideologies could lead to the adoption of pro-multilingual practices, resulting in one case in a transformation of relationships with families at the whole school level. Thus, even in

contexts where *de jure* or *de facto* language policies at larger scales reflect pro-monolingual ideologies, teachers, as the ‘final arbiters of language policy implementation’ (Menken and Garcia 2010, 1), can act based on their language ideologies to ‘appropriate, resist, and/or change dominant and alternative policy discourses’ (Johnson 2010, 16) and create multilingual spaces (Combs, González, and Moll 2011).

(Some) sources of teacher language ideologies

How do teachers’ language ideologies form? As Irvine (1989) and Kroskrity (2004) wrote, ideologies are cultural practices, and are thus learned through social participation and experiences (English and Varghese 2010; Haukås 2016; Pettit 2011). Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning (1996) suggest that teacher attitudes toward multilingualism may stem from regional differences, with teachers from areas with greater linguistic diversity holding more positive attitudes toward multilingualism. Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2014) found that among people in the same state (including teachers), those who spoke more than one language were more likely to embrace multilingual beliefs. Others (e.g. Lee and Oxelson 2006) have presented similar findings about the relationships between teachers’ own multilingualism and pro-multilingual ideologies. Moreover, Flores and Smith (2009) found language skills to be more important than ethnicity of teachers, with bilingual proficient Hispanic teachers holding greater pro-multilingual ideologies than Hispanic teachers who only spoke English. While factors like geography and language background are not easy to change, evidence suggests other, more malleable factors also shape language ideologies. Many researchers have found that teacher education – particularly in approaches to teaching multilingual students – positively predicts pro-multilingual ideologies (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Palmer, and Henderson 2017; García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias 2005; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll 2005; Lee and Oxelson 2006; Shin and Krashen 1996). Language ideologies themselves are therefore also malleable and have the potential to shift through experience and education.

In summary, teachers, as classroom language managers, create language policy for the students in their classes. These policies are shaped not only by national, state, and local language policies, but by teachers’ own language ideologies. Even in schools where teachers have been asked to implement specific language programs, whether English-only or dual language education, teachers’ ideologies still shape what implementation looks like on the ground. Understanding implementation of these programs, therefore, requires an examination of teachers’ language ideologies, as well as the factors that influence them.

The present study

This study uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine the language ideologies of 28 teachers in 14 pre-kindergarten (pre-K) classrooms, each in the first month of transitioning from an English-only model to a 50-50 Spanish-English dual language model. We ask the following:

Research questions

- RQ1. What are the language ideologies held by Arizona preschool teachers in their first semester of transitioning to dual language education in their classrooms? (Data source: Survey; Methods: Quantitative)
- RQ2. What are the relationships among various language ideologies held by the teachers? (Data source: Survey; Methods: Quantitative)
- RQ3. Which teacher characteristics are associated with holding particular language ideologies? (Data source: Survey; Methods: Quantitative)

RQ4. Which language ideologies are expressed in teachers' focus group discussions about DLE implementation, and how do these ideologies relate to their practices and experiences? (Data source: Focus group transcripts; Methods: Qualitative and Discourse Analytic)

Setting: Arizona

The fourteen classrooms in this study are located in the metropolitan area of Phoenix, Arizona. Despite the presence of Spanish and of indigenous languages throughout Arizona, Arizona has not been a paragon of pro-multilingual policy. A proposition to make English the official state language narrowly passed in 1988, and although it was later struck down by the Supreme Court (Ruiz 1998), a reworked version passed in 2006 (Arizona Secretary of State 2006). Additionally, in 2000, Arizona voters passed Proposition 203 (now Arizona Revised Statute §15-751-755), which regulates who can enroll in K-12 DLE programs. It limits participation to children who are already deemed proficient in English by the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA), and it separates English language learners out of mainstream classes into Structured English Immersion classrooms (Combs et al. 2005; Gándara and Orfield 2012; Lillie et al. 2012; Moore 2014). While there are some exceptions to the law – children older than 10, children with special needs – accessing DLE programs requires knowledge of the rules, considerable paperwork, and coordinated efforts on the parts of parents and schools (Jimenez-Silva, Bernstein, & Baca, 2016). While these restrictions on participation in DLE apply only to K-12 classrooms and not pre-K, the vast majority of schools in Arizona – at any level – remain English-only, and the perception, even among teachers and students, is that Arizona is an 'English-only' state (Fredricks and Warriner 2016; Heineke 2015).

Setting: the districts

The districts in which this study's classrooms are located – two urban, public, elementary school districts – are hoping to begin to change that 'English-only' reputation by creating new DL pre-K programs. District A serves 3000 students (see Table 1 for demographics) and has a 20-year history of Spanish-English DL programming (although, since Prop 203 passed in 2000, pupils have had to show English proficiency to participate). The district anticipates that by expanding DLE to pre-K, more students will be attracted to the district's DL kindergarten programs and Spanish-dominant students will be better prepared, linguistically and academically, for kindergarten. District B serves 6000 elementary students and does not have a history of DL education. The district aims to eventually open DL elementary programs and hopes that starting with pre-K will allow them to build upward. Each district made the decision, therefore, to open several DL pre-K classrooms. Eight

Table 1. Student demographics.

	District A	District B
Student ethnicity	48% Hispanic 25% White 14% African American 6% Asian American/Pacific Islander 2% Native American 5% Unknown	87% Hispanic 7% Native American 5% White 1% African American
Student primary home language	70% English 22% Spanish 3% Amharic 1% Arabic 1% Burmese 1% Hindi 1% Kru, Ibo, and Yoruba 1% Nepali	48% English 51% Spanish 1% Other
Free or reduced lunch	95%	100%
Students in DLE pre-K	132	85

new classrooms, serving 132 students, were opened in District A. Six classrooms, serving 85 students, were converted from English-only classrooms into DL classrooms in District B.

Setting: the classrooms

Arizona mirrors the nationwide trend with critical shortages of certified bilingual teachers (Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017; Cross 2017; Gándara and Escamilla 2017). While some teaching teams² in our study were composed of a bilingual³ teacher and a bilingual paraprofessional, the more common way to create the new dual language classrooms was to pair one English speaker and one Spanish speaker. In most cases, this meant pairing an English-dominant teacher (credentialed; master's or 4-year bachelor's degree) with a Spanish-dominant paraprofessional (2-year associate's degree or high school diploma) and asking the two to take turns leading the classroom. Additionally, at the start of the first DL year, none of the teachers had any special training or experience in DL approaches to teaching. Thus, in addition to re-negotiating power relationships and roles in classrooms where paraprofessionals were being asked to lead in Spanish for half the day, teaching teams were also working to understand the principles of DLE and to find and create content in Spanish. At the time of the research described in this paper, therefore, DLE implementation varied widely in the classrooms, with some teams attempting to teach 50% in Spanish, others trying just some songs or books in Spanish, and others still not yet knowing where to begin.

Participants: the teachers

Twenty-eight preschool teachers participated in the study ($n = 16$ in District A, and $n = 12$ in District B). Table 2 shows demographic information for the teachers, as well as their confidence and

Table 2. Teacher characteristics.

Variable	<i>N</i>	%
Race/Ethnicity ^a		
White	13	46.4
Hispanic	11	39.3
African American	1	3.6
Mixed	1	3.6
Highest degree obtained		
Ph.D./Ed.D.	1	3.6
Master's degree	8	28.6
Bachelor's degree	9	32.1
Associate's degree	5	17.9
High school diploma	4	14.3
GED	1	3.6
What language(s) did you grow up speaking?		
English	14	50.0
Spanish	6	21.4
Two or more languages/Bilingual	8	28.6
Have you ever learned or studied additional languages?		
Yes	19	67.9
No	9	32.1
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	40.926	13.71
Years of teaching	8.214	7.65
Years of teaching at current placement	2.214	2.97
Proficiency in English	8.35	0.79
Confidence in English	8.41	0.87
Proficiency in Spanish	4.74	3.22
Confidence in Spanish	4.65	3.22
TOK: DL terminology	8.10	4.62
TOK: best practices in DL literacy instruction	4.17	1.81

^aTwo teachers did not specify race/ethnicity.

proficiency in Spanish and English and their scores on a DLE terminology assessment. These measures are described in the section immediately following the table.

Data collection/instruments

The following data were collected at the beginning of the fall semester:

Demographic information survey

Teachers completed a one-page demographic information survey on their age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and teaching experience (Appendix A).

Language beliefs survey

Teachers completed a survey of their language ideologies, consisting of 31 statements of that teachers rated on a six-point Likert scale from 1 = 'strongly disagree' to 6 = 'strongly agree.' These statements were developed by Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2011, 2014, 2018), based on a review of previous studies examining language ideologies in the U.S. and were used with her permission. Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2014) surveyed 1294 Arizona voters, language managers, and teachers to examine the factor structure of the measure. Her analysis of the 31 survey items identified five underlying factors (see Appendix B for the factor solution). These five factors were *pro-monolingualism* (example survey item: 'Language represents a national identity'); *pro-multilingualism* (e.g. 'In the U.S., the use of native languages other than English is helpful for sharing tradition'); *multiple languages as a problem* (e.g. 'The use of more than one language makes social mobility difficult'); *English as a tool* (e.g. 'In the U.S., using English is important for gaining material wealth'); and *language as an intelligence standard* (e.g. 'Languages stay the same over time.'). Since our sample of teachers closely matches Fitzsimmons-Doolan's (2014) teacher participants, and because our small sample size precludes a meaningful factor analysis, we analyzed our data based on Fitzsimmons-Doolan's (2014) previously identified factor structure. Cronbach's alpha, a single-administration measure of score reliability, for the factors were low to adequate with our sample: pro-monolingualism ($\alpha = .527$); pro-multilingualism ($\alpha = .609$); multiple languages as a problem ($\alpha = .847$); English as a tool ($\alpha = .777$); and language as an intelligence standard ($\alpha = .673$).

Language experiences survey

A second survey tool gathered information about the teachers' individual language backgrounds (Appendix C). Teachers also rated their English and Spanish proficiencies and confidences on a 1–9 scale (1 = not being proficient at all; 9 = being very proficient) in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Large correlations ($r_s > .949$) between teachers' ratings of reading, writing, speaking, and listening in each language indicated that the subskills were not separable constructs, and teachers' item scores were aggregated into overall scores for proficiency and confidence in each language.

Test of knowledge of DLE terminology

A test of knowledge of DLE terminology (Appendix D) was developed through an extensive literature review followed by vetting by several experts external to the study. This measure was designed to assess preschool teachers' knowledge about DL terminology, as way to gauge teachers' education in DLE approaches. We asked teachers to match 20 DL terms (e.g. 'cognate') with respective definitions (e.g. 'Words that are similar in form and meaning across languages, like *temperature* and *temperatura*'). This scale had adequate score reliability ($\alpha = .828$).

Focus groups

After completing the surveys, teachers participated in a one-hour, semi-structured focus group with 5–6 colleagues. In these groups, we asked about their past experiences with language and with teaching, their current classes, the current implementation of dual language in their classrooms,

the division of responsibilities in their teaching team, and their concerns and expectations for the year. To limit response bias, we did not specifically ask about teacher language beliefs. To facilitate open conversation about classroom roles and relationships, we grouped credentialed teachers together and paraprofessionals together so two members of a teaching team were never part of the same group. The researcher posed each question then allowed conversation to follow.

Data analysis

Quantitative data analysis

The purpose of the quantitative analysis was to describe and examine relationships between language ideologies and to examine associations between ideologies and demographic characteristics. For the language ideologies, items were summed and divided by the number of items associated with each subscale resulting in average scale scores for each individual. Then, means and standard deviations of the average scale scores were calculated to describe teachers' language ideologies. This approach allows for comparing means within scale anchors of 1 = 'strongly disagree' and 6 = 'strongly agree,' as well as comparing group means across scales.

We calculated bivariate correlations to understand the relationships between continuous variables of language ideologies and language proficiency, language confidence, and knowledge of DLE terminology. As a measure of effect size, correlations of .10, .30 and .50 are considered small, medium and large relationships, respectively. We used analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the relationships between categorical independent variables of education level, ethnicity, studying another language, and childhood home language with continuous dependent variables (e.g. language ideology factor scores). Cohen's *d* was calculated for statistically significant group differences as a measure of effect size, with *ds* of .20, .50 and .80 considered small, medium and large standardized differences, respectively. All analyses were conducted with a type I error rate of .05.

Qualitative data analysis

The purpose of the qualitative analysis was to understand which ideologies were expressed in teachers' focus group discussions about DLE implementation, as well as how these ideologies related to teachers' practices and experiences. To do this, we engaged in multiple rounds of qualitative coding (Saldaña 2012) integrated with discourse analysis (Bloome et al. 2008; Erickson 1992). Our first step was to mark all stretches of talk in which teachers discussed language or language teaching/learning. We continued with a first round of thematic coding, for content, or *what* teachers were talking about when they talked about language (e.g. DLE implementation, their own experiences with language learning, their other responsibilities in the classroom, etc.). We then used close discourse analysis to understand, beyond content, what participants were *doing* with their talk in any given stretch of text, or what conversational purpose(s) each section of talk served (e.g. expressing a concern, making a claim, justifying a claim, etc.). From this analysis, we created a set of conversational purpose codes, laying them over the content codes.

Finally, we used close discourse analysis to examine each stretch of coded talk for the language ideologies it expressed. Drawing on our theoretical framework, we considered a comment to express a language ideology if it included a statement about how language works, how language is/should be used, or how language is/should be taught and learned (e.g. 'They [children] just learn so quickly. They soak everything up so quickly. Even the language.') We did not consider a comment to express a language ideology if it was about a specific, concrete practice (e.g. 'We have been singing in Spanish one day and English the next'). The resulting code families from this analysis of ideologies were: *beliefs about how learning works/how languages should be taught*; *beliefs about who counts as a proficient/good speaker of a language*; and *pro-multilingual/pro-DLE beliefs*. (Notably, we did not encounter any pro-monolingual belief statements, a result that is discussed in depth below.) We used these ideologies codes in a final round of coding, laying them over the content and function codes. This three-layer coding enabled us to look for patterns across data and to ask questions of our data,

such as: 'When teachers expressed concerns, what were the concerns about?'; 'When teachers talked about experiences, what was the conversational purpose of this talk?'; and 'When teachers expressed beliefs about DLE/bilingualism, how did they support these beliefs?'

Results: quantitative analysis of survey data

RQ1. What are the language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers in their first semester of DLE?

The majority of the teachers positively endorsed items associated with the *pro-multilingualism* factor ($M = 5.19, SD = .47$), such as, 'Native languages are beautiful' and 'In the US, the use of more than one language should be promoted.' They did not agree with those associated with *multiple languages as a problem* ($M = 1.98, SD = 1.00$), such as 'The use of more than one language creates social problems.' The mean score for the *pro-monolingualism* factor ($M = 3.39, SD = .73$), however, which included statements like, 'The use of more than one language makes social unity difficult,' indicates that teachers were neutral on pro-monolingual ideologies. The teachers were also neutral on *English as a tool* for social and economic wealth, ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.33$) and they somewhat disagreed with *language as an intelligence standard* ($M = 2.70, SD = 1.02$).

RQ2. What are the relationships between various language ideologies held by the teachers?

Statistically significant correlations between several language ideology factors were observed (see Table 3). *Pro-monolingualism* correlated negatively with *pro-multilingualism*, ($r = -.514$) and positively with *multiple languages as a problem* ($r = .575$) and *English as a tool* ($r = .540$). The results of this analysis aligned with our expectations, as those who are pro-monolingual would logically be more likely to agree with items associated with the value of English and to disagree with those associated with multilingualism.

RQ3. Which teacher characteristics are associated with holding particular language ideologies?

Categorical demographics and language ideologies

See Table 4 for means and standard deviations of comparison groups.

Pro-multilingualism: ANOVA results showed that teachers' education level had a significant relationship with pro-multilingual ideologies, $F(1, 26) = 4.552, p = .042$. Teachers who held a BA or higher ($M = 5.32, SD = .46$) endorsed pro-multilingual statements more so than teachers who had less than a BA ($M = 4.95, SD = .40$), Cohen's $d = .833$. There was also a significant effect of studying another language on pro-multilingual ideologies, $F(1, 26) = 4.805, p = 0.015$: Teachers who had studied another language agreed more strongly with items in the pro-multilingualism factor

Table 3. Correlations between language ideologies scales.

	Factor				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
F1: Pro-monolingualism					
F2: Pro-multilingualism	-.514**				
F3: Multiple languages as a problem	.575**	-.324			
F4: English as a tool	.540**	-.134	.252		
F5: Language as an intelligence standard	.294	-.301	.273	.109	

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. Means (standard deviations in parentheses) of language ideologies by categorical demographic characteristics.

	Dependent variables				
	Pro-monolingualism	Pro-multilingualism	Multiple languages as a problem	English as a tool	Language as an intelligence standard
<i>Demographic characteristics</i>					
<i>Education</i>					
Bachelor's or higher (<i>n</i> = 18)	3.314 (0.834)	5.323 ^a (0.465)	1.833 (0.849)	4.055 (1.423)	2.472 (0.904)
Less than a bachelor's (<i>n</i> = 10)	3.537 (0.530)	4.950 ^a (0.400)	2.266 (1.235)	3.600 (1.173)	3.133 (1.135)
<i>Ethnicity</i>					
White (<i>n</i> = 13)	3.230 (0.594)	5.086 (0.422)	1.923 (0.973)	4.076 (1.133)	2.961 (1.118)
Teachers of color (<i>n</i> = 13)	3.530 (0.886)	5.313 (0.535)	2.076 (1.139)	3.692 (1.627)	2.384 (0.941)
<i>Studied other language</i>					
Yes (<i>n</i> = 19)	3.338 (0.604)	5.335 ^b (0.487)	1.719 ^c (0.855)	4.000 (1.333)	2.570 (1.145)
No (<i>n</i> = 9)	3.509 (0.996)	4.882 ^b (0.245)	2.555 ^c (1.105)	3.666 (1.391)	3.000 (0.666)
<i>Childhood home language</i>					
English (<i>n</i> = 14)	3.555 (0.866)	5.326 (0.526)	2.119 (1.059)	3.964 (1.365)	2.476 (0.921)
Spanish (<i>n</i> = 6)	3.250 (0.632)	5.229 (0.329)	2.222 (1.241)	4.500 (1.264)	3.083 (1.504)
Multilingual (<i>n</i> = 8)	3.218 (0.562)	4.921 (0.383)	1.583 (0.660)	3.312 (1.251)	2.833 (0.776)

Note: Means with matching superscripts (^{aa}, ^{bb}, ^{cc}) have statically significant differences between them ($\alpha=0.05$).

($M = 5.33$, $SD = .48$) than teachers who had never studied another language ($M = 4.88$, $SD = .24$), Cohen's $d = 1.052$. No other statistically significant group differences were observed for this factor.

Multiple languages as a problem: The ANOVA with 'studied other languages' as an independent variable was statistically significant, $F(1, 26) = 4.839$, $p = .037$. Participants who studied a language were less likely to endorse items on this factor ($M = 1.857$) than those who have not studied other languages ($M = 2.476$), $d = 0.889$.

Pro-monolingualism, English as a tool, and language as an intelligence standard: No statistically significant differences were identified between groups on these measures (i.e. all $ps > .05$).

Continuous demographics and language ideologies

See Table 5 for correlations between continuous demographic factors and language ideologies.

Multiple languages as a problem: Correlations revealed that the teachers' years of experience in their current placement (positive, $r = .427$), as well as their confidence in English (negative, $r = -.473$), correlated with the 'multiple languages as a problem' factor. That is, teachers who had been in their job longer were more likely to agree with statements like, 'The use of more than one language creates social problems.' Teachers who were less confident in their English ability were also more likely to agree with these statements.

English as a tool: There were positive correlations of 'English as a tool' with teacher age ($r = .391$) and years of experience in teaching ($r = .428$). In other words, older teachers and teachers who had been teaching longer were more likely to agree with survey items, 'In the US, using English is important for gaining material wealth' and 'In the US, using English is important for social gains.'

Language as an intelligence standard: Proficiency ($r = -.458$) and confidence ($r = -.551$) in English negatively correlated with 'Language as an intelligence standard,' meaning that teachers who rated themselves as more proficient and confident in their English abilities were less likely to agree that: 'One can know a person's intelligence from how he uses language,' 'Languages stay the same over time,' and 'A language has one standard form.'

Pro-monolingualism and pro-multilingualism: There were no statistically significant correlations between the demographic variables and these factors (i.e. all $ps > .05$).

Discussion: quantitative findings about survey data

Although the teachers in this study live in a state with official language education policies aligned with 'pro-monolingualism,' 'multiple languages as problem,' and 'English as a tool,' (Gándara and Orfield 2012; Moore 2014), the teachers' survey data point to strong pro-multilingual views. The teachers were also, on average, neutral toward pro-monolingual views and negative toward the ideology that multiple languages are a problem. These results were not surprising, based on Fitzsimmons-

Table 5. Correlations between demographic variables and language ideologies factors (factor-based scores in parentheses).

	Pro-monolingualism	Pro-multilingualism	Multiple languages as a problem	English as a tool	Language as an intelligence standard
Age	.255	.231	.100	.391*	.216
Total years of teaching experience	.331	.141	.299	.428*	-.120
Total years of teaching experience in current assignment	.145	.198	.427*	.151	.346
Proficiency in English	-.242	.359	-.290	-.182	-.458*
Confidence in English	-.325	.299	-.473*	-.213	-.551**
Proficiency in Spanish	-.294	-.208	-.053	.027	.255
Confidence in Spanish	-.265	-.215	-.035	.029	.261
TOK: DLE terminology	-.008	-.365	-.064	.191	-.370

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Doolan's (2014, 2018) findings in that teachers leaned more pro-multilingual than other Arizona voters, regardless of political orientation. The present findings were encouraging, however, given that none of the teachers were trained in bilingual or DLE approaches, nor did any have specific ELL credentials. Previous research has shown that specific preparation in language acquisition, including a teaching credential in bilingual education, increases teachers' self-efficacy in working with ELLs (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll 2005), positive attitudes toward bilingual education (Shin and Krashen 1996), and view of students' first languages as resources in the classroom (García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias 2005; Hopkins 2013). Not only did our teachers *not* have this training, half of our participants were teaching assistants who are not credentialed as teachers. Future work, therefore, might explore whether working in education in any capacity – teaching assistant, cafeteria worker, afterschool program coordinator – has a positive effect on pro-multilingual views, separate from the effect of one's training/credential.

We did find, however, a statistically significant difference on the 'pro-multilingualism' factor, with teachers with a bachelor's degrees (or higher) holding significantly more pro-multilingual views than teachers with less education. Given our small sample size, the visibility of such an effect ($d = .833$) might indicate that while those in the field of education hold pro-multilingual views, more education provides an extra boost. We cannot tell from our work, however, whether this difference comes from teacher training in particular or simply higher education levels. Future work might compare language ideologies and level of education across teachers and non-teachers in order to better understand this relationship.

We found that across age groups and levels of teaching experience, knowledge of terminology related to DLE predicted pro-multilingual views. This suggests that while credentials and training serve as useful proxies for teacher knowledge (García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias 2005; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll 2005; Hopkins 2013), that there may be other paths to knowledge of DLE, such as through first-hand experience. That said, teachers' age and years of experience in teaching shared moderate-sized positive relationships with the belief 'English is a tool' and years of experience in one's current placement positively correlated with 'multiple languages as a problem.' Given that teachers' prior experiences were all in English-only classroom settings, where English *would* be the most important linguistic tool and multiple languages may present additional instructional challenges, perhaps these findings are not surprising. Indeed, other researchers have noted this relationship between more years of teaching and increasingly negative attitudes toward ELLs (Karabenick and Noda 2004; Rader-Brown and Howley 2014), bilingual education (Shin and Krashen 1996), and language varieties other than Standard English (Blake and Cutler 2003; Fitzsimmons-Doolan 2014).

Importantly, we did not find relationships between ideologies and home language (English vs. Spanish/other). This was unexpected, given prior work implicating these relationships as significant (Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning 1996; Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Palmer, and Henderson 2017; Lee and Oxelson 2006; Rader-Brown and Howley 2014). Based on that prior work, we also expected that Spanish-speaking teachers would be more pro-multilingual across the board. We were surprised therefore to find that regardless of their Spanish skill, Spanish-speaking teachers who were less confident in their *English* skill were more likely to see 'multiple languages as a problem' and 'language as an intelligence standard.' This suggests a more complex relationship between ideologies and language backgrounds than prior work has shown. In states like post-Prop 203 Arizona, assimilationist discourses (de Jong 2013) and hegemonic views of English as the language of power and access (Wiley and Lukes 1996) may influence the beliefs of teachers who are bilingual themselves (Garrity et al. 2016).

Of all the demographic factors, the largest impact on pro-multilingual ideologies was not being bilingual, but having *studied* another language. When teachers themselves had formal experience as language learners, they were more likely to hold pro-multilingual views and were less likely to see multiple languages as a problem (Ellis 2006; Flores 2001; Youngs and Youngs 2001).

Our results nuance prior findings that educators are generally pro-multilingual, and they suggest some ideas about how teachers become so. While more teaching experience in general may not lead

to pro-multilingualism, certain *kinds* of experiences, such as second language study and teacher education, seem to support multilingual ideologies. This aligns with research suggesting approaches to combating teacher resistance to multilingual instruction: firsthand experience with second-language learning (Ellis 2006; Rader-Brown and Howley 2014; Youngs and Youngs 2001); pre-service education and professional development in language development and dual language approaches (García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias 2005; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll 2005; Karathanos 2009; Shin and Krashen 1996); and teaching experiences in dual language settings (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Palmer, and Henderson 2017). Given our findings, we also recommend that future work include variables beyond first/home language to account for how perceptions of one's own language skill and how language learning experiences, both in childhood and later, might influence beliefs (Ellis 2006; Flores 2001; Youngs and Youngs 2001).

Results: qualitative analysis of focus group conversations

RQ4. Which language ideologies are expressed by teachers' focus group discussions about DLE implementation and how do these ideologies relate to their practices and experiences?

Our analysis of focus group conversations showed that, similar to our quantitative findings, teachers expressed many pro-multilingual beliefs and their justifications for beliefs were rooted in their own experiences. We also found that while teachers had negative comments about DLE, these comments did not express pro-monolingual beliefs, but rather, were about specific, concrete concerns and almost always tied to the adults involved in DLE implementation, rather than the children. These findings were true for teachers who were well on their way to implementing the full 50/50 DL model, as well as those teachers who were just beginning to use Spanish in the classroom or not yet incorporating Spanish in their daily lessons. We discuss these findings in turn below.

Finding 1: teachers' reasons for concern about the dual language programing were practical not ideological

At first, as we read the focus groups transcripts, we were surprised to find so many negative comments. We had just completed our quantitative analysis and learned that, on the whole, this group of teachers was strongly pro-multilingual in their beliefs. We wondered what the difference was between what the teachers had expressed just an hour before on the survey and what they now were discussing in focus groups. As we engaged in iterations of coding and close discourse analysis, we found, however, that 100% of negative comments toward DLE or toward multilingualism were associated with specific, practical concerns. For example, one teacher offered, 'What makes it difficult is that we don't have the books in English and Spanish.' Another cautioned that, '[...] not all teaching assistants are at ease at taking command of the classroom.' A third teacher said,

You're asking one classroom para [assistant], who doesn't even have a proficient fluency level, to be the Spanish model, be the Spanish in the classroom and if you don't have the skills or the knowledge to be the Spanish person, then it's really hard.

Of course, not all comments about the practical and day-to-day work of DL implementation were negative. Some teachers reported positive experiences and outcomes with using Spanish and English in their classrooms. But while not all of their comments about practice were concerns, all of their concerns were practical.

The opposite was true for comments that were *positive* toward DLE or multilingualism: While not all of the teachers' positive comments were ideological (some were about day-to-day successes and experiences), all of their ideological comments (comments about the benefits of DLE and multilingualism in general) were positive, or at least neutral. One teacher, for instance, discussed the benefit of DLE for Spanish-speaking children: 'I'm just excited about the kids getting that opportunity to not

only learn in English, but learn in Spanish, because it's their first language, and they can relate to it.' Another discussed how happy parents of English speakers would be as well: 'Parents, they're going to be, "Wow, I love this because my kid is learning two languages," [...] they can say, "My kids are bilingual and they have more opportunity now".'

Importantly, these patterns do not contradict what we found from the ideologies survey. They instead nuance them by highlighting the tension the teachers felt between pro-multilingual ideologies and practical concerns about the implementation of multilingual education in their classrooms.

Finding 2: practical concerns were about adults, not children

When we examined the nature of teachers' practical concerns, we found they were rarely about children – how they would handle the transition and what their learning would be. Instead, teachers' concerns were about adults, both in the classroom and district. These concerns fell into three types: teachers' language proficiency, paraprofessionals' capacity to teach, and communication with the district.

The most common concern was teachers' own Spanish language proficiency levels, and thus, their ability to teach in Spanish. For instance, one Spanish speaking teacher confessed: 'I'm not as fluent as I think I am, especially when listening to our kiddos trying to communicate, like, "I really need to look up these terms because I just, I don't know them".' Many teachers saw their (lack of) professional or academic Spanish as a barrier to successfully implementing dual language models in their classroom. Some, who only spoke English, also realized that implementation of DLE would mean they would not understand what was happening in *their* classroom for half the day. These concerns about control of the classroom were augmented by a second type of worry: about the paraprofessionals' capacities to act as teachers for half the day rather than assistants. As one teacher put it:

Our Spanish speakers are not teachers [...] I'm responsible for these students, I'm responsible for their assessments and I can't not know what people are saying or what's going on in my classrooms. There's huge challenges of how to make a monolingual English-speaking teacher comfortable, or even make the teaching assistants comfortable being the teacher in the classroom.

These concerns about changing roles also came from the paraprofessionals:

I don't want to be commander of a class that I'm not responsible for. I'm a teaching assistant, that's my position. My position is not being a teacher. I'm not certified for that, I did not go to school for that, so I don't know what I'm doing.

The third concern was about communication with the school district. One version of this concern was about the tension teachers felt between implementing dual language and other priorities the district had previously emphasized for them:

We're spending a lot of time, because improving our Star Rating⁴ is our number one goal, so making that change and then trying to add Spanish in it, has been super challenging for teachers, super frustrating and sometimes they feel like, "I can't do it, I can't do it." So, supports really need to be in place to make this happen for us to meet our program goal of improving our Star Rating. Speaking Spanish in the classroom doesn't improve our Star Rating; it's how we provide instruction and questioning techniques and how we, you know, the pacing of the day, all of that stuff, and *that's* the goal.

Several teachers nodded and echoed this concern with competing priorities. Some teachers also expressed a sense of having been duped or given a bait-and-switch by the district: 'I'm not a dual-language teacher and I wasn't hired for that. It never was said you're going to do 50/50.[...] I think it was misrepresented to us. I feel like we were misrepresented on what we thought we were getting.' Others felt that they were not getting needed support in terms of materials or training.

Thus, the teachers' concerns were not for the children or their learning in a dual language program, but for how the dual language program was to be implemented in the first place given the conditions created by the adults in the classroom and district. This finding supports the

quantitative finding that teachers generally felt positive toward multilingual education and to children becoming multilingual, but it provides insight into some of the potential barriers to that outcome.

Finding 3: teachers' past experiences provide justification for pro-multilingual and pro-DL opinions and beliefs

As we analyzed teachers' talk about language, we noted several instances of teachers recounting past experiences from earlier in their lives. We wondered what function these stories served in the ongoing talk. On closer analysis, we found that in all cases, teachers were using stories to provide justification for their current beliefs ('This is how I know what I know'). We also found that in all cases but one, the beliefs being justified were pro-multilingual or pro-DLE.⁵ These justifications through experience took a variety of forms: Some Spanish-speaking teachers justified their support for DLE by sharing how DLE (or the lack of it) shaped their early schooling experiences. Others justified support for the preservation of first languages by recounting how there are some things, like praying, that only feel right in the language in which you first learned them. Still others emphasized bilingualism as useful and desirable: 'My mom and dad only speak Spanish, and I could translate for them, and I helped them get access to things that otherwise they might not get and they were very proud, very proud.' Teachers therefore used past experiences to lend support to current ideological positions in favor of DLE in general and multilingualism in general.

Teachers, both Spanish and English-speaking, also recounted more *recent* experiences – ones that occurred in the first few weeks of school. Unlike their past narratives, which justified general, ideological positions, these recent narratives served as justification for specific practices related to implementing dual language teaching. For instance, one teacher told us: 'They'll listen to *Elmo's World* or *Peppa Pig* in Spanish on YouTube [...] even our kids that don't really know Spanish, they're very engaged in it. We noticed them acting out a lot of dramatic play of what they watch.' Another said:

I am playing the stories in Spanish and they look so interested in the stories. They are like, "Oooh!" [...] And they repeat everything I say and they are learning Spanish. They are so excited and they are like, "Oh wow!" They like Spanish.

Interestingly, no experiences were recounted – either past or present – that cast DLE or multilingualism in a negative light. One hundred percent of experiences that were recounted served the conversational purpose of supporting either pro-multilingual ideologies or current dual-language practices.

This finding becomes even more meaningful when examined in contrast to the concerns discussed under qualitative finding #2. In sorting through and finding commonalities in teachers' concerns, we noted that in addition to being about adults and not children, the majority were concerns about the unknown: *Am I proficient enough to teach in Spanish? Is my para going to be able to handle teaching? How can I be in charge of the class if I don't know what is going on? How do I balance our Star Rating with dual language?* Indeed, nearly all negative comments centered on uncertainty. As one teacher said:

I think it would help once we have an idea of what's the dual language that you want to see in our classroom, because right now I don't think any of us know exactly what is involved in this dual language that we've all signed up for. So, once we get the framework, maybe we'll be more at ease, but it's not knowing what we're supposed to do.

Thus, the certainty that comes with a personal experience, whether in the past as a learner/speaker or now as a teacher, was associated with a positive stance toward multilingualism and multilingual classroom practices, while lack of experience and its accompanying unknowing were associated with concerns or outright resistance. Indeed, not a single teacher who was *trying* to implement dual language at the time of the focus group had a negative comment about it; all negative comments were from

those teachers who had found the practical barriers insurmountable and were not yet trying to use Spanish in class.

Discussion: qualitative findings from focus groups

The findings from our analysis of teachers' talk during focus groups both nuance and complicate our quantitative findings. In our quantitative analysis, we found that teachers' language learning experiences predicted pro-multilingual beliefs, but that more experience teaching in general did not. In our qualitative analysis, we saw a similar pattern: Teachers' experiences were used as important justifiers for pro-multilingual beliefs, but only certain kinds of experiences were important. For example, when teaching experiences were invoked, they were not general teaching experiences, but specific instances of recently implementing DL approaches. Other researchers have found similar patterns (Blake and Cutler 2003; Fitzsimmons-Doolan 2014; Flores 2001; Karabenick and Noda 2004; Shin and Krashen 1996). As Flores (2001) wrote: 'Professional [bilingual] teaching experiences are powerful because these experiences provide the evidence that certain approaches are effective. As many bilingual teachers unequivocally state, "because I have seen the evidence in my kids".' (288).

Additionally, teachers invoked positive *past* experiences with bilingualism – as students in DLE; as bilingual children translating for parents; as bilingual adults making sure their own children stayed bilingual – in support of bilingual education and pro-multilingual beliefs. While much research has taken teachers' bilingualism into account in explaining their current ideologies (Flores and Smith 2009; Lee and Oxelson 2006; Rader-Brown and Howley 2014), one implication of our findings is that future work should probe further into the *kinds* of experiences teachers have as bilinguals. A more detailed look at experience types may be particularly relevant in a state like Arizona, where younger teachers from Spanish-dominant homes have grown up in the post-Prop 203 era, and although they may indeed be bilingual, they may never have experienced bilingual classrooms (Lillie 2016), may have internalized assimilationist ideologies (Fredricks and Warriner 2016; Garrity et al. 2016), and may have ambiguous feelings about their own bilingualism and heritage (Bailey 2017; Gándara and Orfield 2012).

Our qualitative work, particularly when taken in conjunction with our quantitative findings, also suggests that teachers' opposition to implementing DLE was largely practical, rather than ideological. Shin and Krashen (1996) presented a similar finding more than 20 years ago: 'Clearly, when teachers say they oppose bilingual education, we must ask why: Our results show it is not because of a disagreement with the underlying philosophy' (52). Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Palmer, and Henderson's recent (2017) mixed-methods study found a similar pattern with Texas teachers in a top-down DLE implementation, and other work has shown how material constraints, such as imbalances of resources across languages (Amrein and Peña 2000), assessment procedures (Lindholm-Leary 2012), and standardized state testing (Palmer and Lynch 2008), can undermine teachers' and programs' goals of equity between languages (Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017). Research also suggests that when teachers feel constrained by time or resources in planning and teaching both content *and* language, language instruction falls by the wayside (Cammarata and Tedick 2012; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll 2005). Thus, even when teachers hold pro-multilingual ideologies, practical concerns may cause them to implement practices that do not align with those ideologies.

Implications

Our work has several implications. First, our findings support the suggestion of other researchers (Amrein and Peña 2000; Cammarata and Tedick 2012; Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll 2005; Lindholm-Leary 2012; Palmer and Lynch 2008) that when schools, districts, and states ask teachers to implement multilingual approaches, they should also inventory the materials and practices teachers are already being asked to use and ascertain ideological alignment of materials with DLE. This alignment is particularly important when programs seek to counter

hegemonic language ideologies dominant at local and societal levels. Even for pro-multilingual teachers, creating true equity between languages in the face of linguistic power imbalances is a challenge (Bekerman 2005; Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017; Freeman 1996; Palmer and Lynch 2008 Rajuan and Beckerman 2011), and reducing material and practical constraints may mitigate this difficulty (Cervantes-Soon et al. 2017).

A second implication is that when it comes to language policy, we cannot consider ideology and practice separately. In our work, practices and ideologies were intimately connected. Teachers who were attempting dual language practices only had positive things to say, while teachers not yet engaged in trying these practices had more concerns. García and Menken (2015) found a related phenomenon: when a school made changes to how they identified students' home languages, how they displayed languages other than English in the school, and how they ceased to enforce separation of home and school languages, these practical changes fostered changes in the staff's beliefs about home languages and language learning. A path to ideological change might therefore consist of practical change.

Conclusion

This study examined the language ideologies of 28 preschool educators working in new dual language classrooms. We found that some but not all of teachers' experiences were statistically associated with pro-multilingual ideologies: Experience with learning a language, for instance, was related, while teachers' first languages and their general teaching experiences were not. Focus group results showed that teachers also drew on their own experiences, both in and out of the classroom, to provide supporting evidence for pro-multilingual views and pro-DL practices. We also found that the concerns teachers expressed about DLE implementation stemmed from practical matters particular to teaching, such as competing district priorities and teacher-assistant dynamics.

In general, the teachers who participated in this study, all beginning a year in two languages with little training and mostly without academic proficiency in both languages, are an important group to understand. In Arizona, these teachers represent the case of most teachers. Even new teachers in Arizona who speak Spanish as a home language have now likely been educated through Arizona's English-only system and thus have neither experienced a dual language approach first-hand nor had the chance to develop academic language in Spanish (Guerrero 1997; Lillie 2016). If districts in states like Arizona seek to grow their multilingual programs, they need multilingual – and *pro*-multilingual – teachers. As the present study and past work indicate, teachers' pro-multilingual stances connect to particular kinds of experiences: personal experience with language learning; higher educational experiences, preferably in dual language or bilingual methods; and teaching experience in classrooms geared toward language development, preferably in dual language classrooms. In order to grow pro-multilingual teachers in Arizona, therefore, districts, universities, and state policy-makers should take a hard look at what kinds of experiences are possible for the Arizona children who will become Arizona teachers.

Notes

1. Preschool = year(s) preceding kindergarten, the start of formal education in the US. Pre-kindergarten children are usually ages 3.0–4.11.
2. In Arizona preschool classrooms, the maximum legal ratio of adults to children is 1:13 in classes with 3-year-olds, so teachers usually work in teams, typically composed of one credentialed teacher and one teaching assistant (paraprofessional).
3. In this paper, we use 'bilingual' to talk about individuals and 'dual language' to talk about the classrooms, programs, and curricula.

4. Star Ratings are a preschool program quality rating system, implemented as part of Quality First, a signature program of First Things First (www.firstthingsfirst.org) in Arizona. Quality First partners with child care and preschool providers to improve the quality of early learning across the state.
5. In the outlier comment, the teacher used her experiences to justify a belief about what best strategies best support second language learning.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the support of Helios Education Foundation Grant No. 9659174. The ideas presented in this paper are those of the authors and no endorsement from the funding agency should be inferred. We also thank Shannon Fitzsimmons-Doolan for the use of her survey. Thank you, too, to the early childhood educators who participated in this study and to our partner districts.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

We acknowledge the support of Helios Education Foundation [grant number 9659174].

Notes on contributors

Katie A. Bernstein is assistant professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. An applied linguist and early childhood researcher, Katie studies the processes and contexts of young children's second learning language. Her recent work can be found in the *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *TESOL Quarterly*, and *Linguistics and Education*.

Sultan Kilinc is a postdoctoral scholar in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research focuses on inclusive education policy and practices for diverse groups of students (i.e. students with dis/abilities, linguistic, ethnic, racial minorities, and girls), who are marginalized and excluded from educational opportunities.

Megan Troxel Deeg is a doctoral student in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research interests include educational practices for diverse learners in pre-k-12 settings, emergent bilingual content development, and the use of dramatic approaches for content and literacy development.

Scott C. Marley is an associate professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. His research examines the efficacy of cognitive theory-based learning strategies.

Kathleen M. Farrand is an assistant professor in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research examines inclusive settings found along the least restrictive environment continuum, with a focus on the use of active and dramatic approaches for learning.

Michael F. Kelley is an associate professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. His research interests lie in understanding the structural and process features related to high quality professional development experiences for early childhood teachers that effectively impact child outcomes.

ORCID

Katie A. Bernstein  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2816-6112>

Sultan Kilinc  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1842-5600>

References

- Allard, E., K. Mortimer, S. Gallo, H. Link, and S. Wortham. 2014. "Immigrant Spanish as Liability or Asset? Generational Diversity in Language Ideologies at School." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 13: 335–353.
- Amrein, A., and R. A. Peña. 2000. "Asymmetry in Dual Language Practice." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 8: 8. doi:10.14507/epaa.v8n8.2000.
- Arizona Secretary of State. 2006. "State of Arizona Official Canvas - General Election Nov 7 2006." <http://apps.azsos.gov/election/2006/General/Canvass2006GE.pdf>.

- Auerbach, E. R. 1993. "Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom." *TESOL Quarterly* 27 (1): 9–32. doi:10.2307/3586949.
- Bailey, B. 2017. "English Only: Millennials Reflect on Growing Up Latino in Arizona Schools." *Arizona Public Media*, November 28. <https://www.azpm.org/p/home-articles-news/2017/11/28/120569-english-only-millennials-reflect-on-growing-up-latino-in-arizona-schools/>.
- Bekerman, Z. 2005. "Complex Contexts and Ideologies: Bilingual Education in Conflict-ridden Areas." *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 4 (1): 1–20. doi:10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_1.
- Blake, R., and C. Cutler. 2003. "AAE and Variation in Teachers' Attitudes: A Question of School Philosophy?" *Linguistics and Education* 14 (2): 163–194.
- Bloome, D., S. P. Carter, B. M. Christian, S. Madrid, S. Otto, N. Shuart-Faris, and M. Smith. 2008. *On Discourse Analysis in Classrooms: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research*. New York, NY: Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College.
- Byrnes, D. A., G. Kiger, and L. Manning. 1996. "Social Psychological Correlates of Teachers' Language Attitudes." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 26 (5): 455–467. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb01859.x.
- Cammarata, L., and D. J. Tedick. 2012. "Balancing Content and Language in Instruction: The Experience of Immersion Teachers." *The Modern Language Journal* 96 (2): 251–269. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01330.x.
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., L. Dorner, D. Palmer, D. Heiman, R. Schwerdtfeger, and J. Choi. 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. doi:10.3102/0091732X17690120.
- Combs, M. C., C. Evans, T. Fletcher, E. Parra, and A. Jiménez. 2005. "Bilingualism for the Children: Implementing a Dual-language Program in an English-only State." *Educational Policy* 19 (5): 701–728.
- Combs, M. C., N. González, and L. Moll. 2011. "US Latinos and the Learning of English: The Metonymy of Language Policy." In *Ethnography and Language Policy*, edited by T. McCarty, 185–204. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cross, F. 2017. *Teacher Shortage Areas (TSA) Nationwide Listing for 1990–1991 Through 2017–2018*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html#list>.
- de Jong, E. 2013. "Policy Discourses and U.S. Language in Education Policies." *Peabody Journal of Education* 88 (1): 98–111. doi:10.1080/0161956X.2013.752310.
- Ellis, E. M. 2006. "Language Learning Experience as a Contributor to ESOL Teacher Cognition." *TESL-EJ* 10 (1): 1.
- English, B., and M. M. Varghese. 2010. "Enacting Language Policy Through the Facilitator Model in a Monolingual Policy Context in the United States." In *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*, edited by K. Menken, and O. García, 107–122. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Erickson, F. 1992. "Ethnographic Microanalysis of Interaction." In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, edited by M. D. LeCompte, W. I. Milroy, and J. Preissle, 201–225. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Fang, Z. 1996. "A Review of Research on Teacher Beliefs and Practices." *Educational Research* 38 (1): 47–65. doi:10.1080/0013188960380104.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. 2011. "Language Ideology Dimensions of Politically Active Arizona Voters: An Exploratory Study." *Language Awareness* 20 (4): 295–314.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. 2014. "Language Ideologies of Arizona Voters, Language Managers, and Teachers." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 13 (1): 34–52.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. 2018. "Language Ideology Change Over Time: Lessons for Language Policy in the U.S. State of Arizona and Beyond." *TESOL Quarterly* 52 (1): 34–61.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., D. Palmer, and K. Henderson. 2017. "Educator Language Ideologies and a Top-down Dual Language Program." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20 (6): 704–721.
- Flores, B. B. 2001. "Bilingual Education Teachers' Beliefs and their Relation to Self-reported Practices." *Bilingual Research Journal* 25 (3): 275–299. doi:10.1080/15235882.2001.10162795.
- Flores, B. B., and H. L. Smith. 2009. "Teachers' Characteristics and Attitudinal Beliefs About Linguistic and Cultural Diversity." *Bilingual Research Journal* 31 (1–2): 323–358. doi:10.1080/15235880802640789.
- Fredricks, D. E., and D. S. Warriner. 2016. "'We Speak English in Here and English Only!': Teacher and ELL Youth Perspectives on Restrictive Language Education." *Bilingual Research Journal* 39 (3–4): 309–323. doi:10.1080/15235882.2016.1230565.
- Freeman, R. D. 1996. "Dual-language Planning at Oyster Bilingual School: 'It's Much More Than Language.'" *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3): 557–582. doi:10.2307/3587698.
- Gándara, P., and K. Escamilla. 2017. "Bilingual Education in the United States." In *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, edited by O. García, A. Lin, and S. May, 1–14. Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_33-2.
- Gándara, P., J. Maxwell-Jolly, and A. Driscoll. 2005. *Listening to Teachers of English Language Learners: A Survey of California Teachers' Challenges, Experiences, and Professional Development Needs*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. <https://scholarship.org/uc/item/6430628z#main>.
- Gándara, P., and G. Orfield. 2012. "Segregating Arizona's English Learners: A Return to the 'Mexican Room?'" *Teachers College Record* 114 (9): 1–27.

- García, O., and K. Menken. 2015. "Cultivating an Ecology of Multilingualism in Schools." In *Challenges for Language Education and Policy: Making Space for People*, edited by B. Spolsky, O. Inbar-Lourie, and M. Tannenbaum, 95–108. New York, NY: Routledge.
- García-Nevarez, A. G., M. E. Stafford, and B. Arias. 2005. "Arizona Elementary Teachers' Attitudes Toward English Language Learners and the use of Spanish in Classroom Instruction." *Bilingual Research Journal* 29 (2): 295–317. doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162837.
- Garrity, S., C. R. Aquino-Sterling, C. V. Liew, and A. Day. 2016. "Beliefs About Bilingualism, Bilingual Education, and Dual Language Development of Early Childhood Preservice Teachers Raised in a Prop 227 Environment." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*: 1–18. doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1148113.
- Garrity, S., and A. W. Guerra. 2015. "A Cultural Communities Approach to Understanding Head Start Teachers' Beliefs about Language Use with Dual Language Learners: Implications for Practice." *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16 (3): 241–256. doi:10.1177/1463949115600027.
- Gkaintartzi, A., A. Kiliari, and R. Tsokalidou. 2015. "'Invisible' Bilingualism – 'Invisible' Language Ideologies: Greek Teachers' Attitudes Towards Immigrant Pupils' Heritage Languages." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18 (1): 60–72.
- González, R. D. 2001. "Introduction." In *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the English Only Movement*, edited by R. D. González, xxv–liii. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gurrero, M. D. 1997. "Spanish Academic Language Proficiency: The Case of Bilingual Education Teachers in the US." *Bilingual Research Journal* 21 (1): 65–84. doi:10.1080/15235882.1997.10815602.
- Haukås, Å. 2016. "Teachers' Beliefs about Multilingualism and a Multilingual Pedagogical Approach." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13 (1): 1–18. doi:10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960.
- Heineke, A. J. 2015. "Negotiating Language Policy and Practice: Teachers of English Learners in an Arizona Study Group." *Educational Policy* 29 (6): 843–878.
- Hêlot, C. 2010. "Tu Sais Bien Parler Maitresse!": Negotiating Languages Other Than French in the Primary School Classroom in France." In *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*, edited by K. Menken, and O. García, 52–71. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hopkins, M. 2013. "Building on our Teaching Assets: The Unique Pedagogical Contributions of Bilingual Educators." *Bilingual Research Journal* 36 (3): 350–370. doi:10.1080/15235882.2013.845116.
- Irvine, J. 1989. "When Talk isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy." *American Ethnologist* 16: 248–267.
- Jimenez-Silva, M., Katie A. B., and Evelyn B. 2016. "An Analysis of How Restrictive Language Policies are Interpreted by Arizona's Department of Education and Three Individual School Districts' Websites." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 24: 105. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2291.
- Johnson, C. J. 2010. "Implementational and Ideological Spaces in Bilingual Education Language Policy." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 13 (1): 61–79.
- Johnson, D. C. 2013. "Positioning the Language Policy Arbiter: Governmentality and Footing in the School District of Philadelphia." In *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*, edited by J. W. Tollefson, 2nd ed., Vol. 1, 116–136. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Karabennick, S. A., and P. A. C. Noda. 2004. "Professional Development Implications of Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes Toward English Language Learners." *Bilingual Research Journal* 28 (1): 55–75.
- Karathanos, K. 2009. "Exploring US Mainstream Teachers' Perspectives on Use of the Native Language in Instruction with English Language Learner Students." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12 (6): 615–633.
- King, K. A. 2000. "Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3 (3): 167–184.
- Kroskrity, P. 2004. "Language Ideology." In *Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by A. Duranti, 496–517. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lee, J. S., and E. Oxelson. 2006. "'It's Not My Job': K–12 Teacher Attitudes Toward Students' Heritage Language Maintenance." *Bilingual Research Journal* 30 (2): 453–477. doi:10.1080/15235882.2006.10162885.
- Lillie, K. E. 2016. "The Lost Generation: Students of Arizona's Structured English Immersion." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19 (4): 408–425. doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1006162.
- Lillie, K. E., A. Markos, M. B. Arias, and T. G. Wiley. 2012. "Separate and Not Equal: The Implementation of Structured English Immersion in Arizona's Classrooms." *Teachers College Record* 114 (9): 1–33.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. 2012. "Success and Challenges in Dual Language Education." *Theory Into Practice* 51 (4): 256–262. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.726053.
- Martínez, R. A., M. Hikida, and L. Durán. 2015. "Unpacking Ideologies of Linguistic Purism: How Dual Language Teachers Make Sense of Everyday Translanguaging." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 9 (1): 26–42. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.977712.
- McCarty, T., eds. 2011. *Ethnography and Language Policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Menken, K., and O. García. 2010a. "Introduction." In *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*, edited by K. Menken, and O. García, 1–10. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Menken, K., and O. García, eds. 2010b. *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Merritt, S. 2011. *Conflicting Ideologies about Using and Learning Spanish Across the School Years: From Two-way Immersion to World Language Pedagogy* (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley.
- Moore, S. C. K. 2014. *Language Policy Processes and Consequences: Arizona Case Studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Newcomer, S. N., and K. Puzio. 2016. "Cultivando Confianza: A Bilingual Community of Practice Negotiates Restrictive Language Policies." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19 (4): 347–369. doi:10.1080/13670050.2014.983043.
- Palmer, D. 2011. "The Discourse of Transition: Teachers' Language Ideologies within Transitional Bilingual Education Programs." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 5: 103–122.
- Palmer, D., and A. W. Lynch. 2008. "A Bilingual Education for a Monolingual Test? The Pressure to Prepare for TAKS and Its Influence on Choices for Language of Instruction in Texas Elementary Bilingual Classrooms." *Language Policy* 7 (3): 217–235. doi:10.1007/s10993-008-9100-0.
- Pettit, S. K. 2011. "Teachers' Beliefs about English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom: A Review of the Literature." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 5 (2): 123–147. doi:10.1080/19313152.2011.594357.
- Pontier, R., and M. Gort. 2016. "Coordinated Translanguaging Pedagogy as Distributed Cognition: A Case Study of Two Dual Language Bilingual Education Preschool Coteachers' Language Practices During Shared Book Readings." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 10 (2): 89–106. doi:10.1080/19313152.2016.1150732.
- Proposition 203. 2000. "Sec. 1, Findings and Declarations." Online. <http://apps.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/english/prop203.htm>.
- Pulinx, R., P. Van Avermaet, and O. Agirdag. 2017. "Silencing Linguistic Diversity: The Extent, the Determinant and Consequences of the Monolingual Beliefs of Flemish Teachers." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20 (5): 542–556. doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860.
- Rader-Brown, L., and A. Howley. 2014. "Predictors of the Instructional Strategies That Elementary School Teachers Use with English Language Learners." *Teachers College Record* 116 (5): 1–34.
- Rajuan, M., and Z. Beckerman. 2011. "Teachers 'Inside' Reports on Language Instruction in the Palestinian-Jewish Schools in Israel." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 32 (5): 465–479.
- Ramanathan, V. 2005. "Rethinking Language Planning and Policy from the Ground Up: Refashioning Institutional Realities and Human Lives." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6 (2): 89–101. doi:10.1080/14664200508668275.
- Razfar, A., and J. C. Rumenapp. 2012. "Language Ideologies in English Learner Classrooms: Critical Reflections and the Role of Explicit Awareness." *Language Awareness* 21 (4): 347–368.
- Ricento, T. K., and N. H. Hornberger. 1996. "Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional." *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3): 401–427.
- Ruiz v. Hull. 191 Ariz. 4401. (1998). <http://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/23/pdf1998/cv960493.pdf>.
- Saldaña, J. 2012. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE.
- Shin, F. H., and S. Krashen. 1996. "Teacher Attitudes Toward the Principles of Bilingual Education and Toward Students' Participation in Bilingual Programs: Same or Different?" *Bilingual Research Journal* 20 (1): 45–53.
- Shohamy, E. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and new Approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In P. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Spolsky, B. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge/New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stritikus, T. T. 2003. "The Interrelationship of Beliefs, Context, and Learning: The Case of a Teacher Reacting to Language Policy." *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 2 (1): 29–52. doi:10.1207/S15327701JLIE0201_2.
- Volk, D., and M. Angelova. 2007. "Language Ideology and the Mediation of Language Choice in Peer Interactions in a Dual-language First Grade." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 6 (3): 177–199.
- Wiley, T. G., and M. Lukes. 1996. "English-only and Standard English Ideologies in the U.S." *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3): 511–535. doi:10.2307/3587696.
- Youngs, C. S., and G. A. Youngs Jr. 2001. "Predictors of Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Toward ESL Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 35 (1): 97–120.

Appendices

Appendix A. Teacher Demographic Data Pseudonym Instructions

All information will be treated as confidential. You will create a reproducible pseudonym to link study measures, while maintaining your confidentiality. Please use the following to create your pseudonym: use the first three letters of your mother's first name and the last four digits of your phone number (for example, Jane and 123-4567 = JAN4567). The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used. Results will be shared in the aggregate form. Once this information is entered into our database, this form will be shredded to protect your identity.

3b. On a scale of 1–9, 1 being not proficient at all and 9 being very proficient, circle the number that best represents how **confident** you feel at:

speaking in English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
writing in English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
reading in English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
understanding spoken English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

4a. On a scale of 1–9, 1 being not proficient at all and 9 being very proficient, circle the number that best represents how **proficient** you are at:

speaking in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
writing in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
reading in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
understanding spoken Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

4b. On a scale of 1–9, 1 being not proficient at all and 9 being very proficient, circle the number that best represents how **confident** you feel at:

speaking in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
writing in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
reading in Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
understanding spoken Spanish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

5. Please complete the following statements about learning or speaking a language. Choose a phrase, expression, or metaphor that best captures your experience.

Learning a language is like ...

Speaking English is like ...

Speaking Spanish is like ...

Appendix D. Test of Knowledge – Dual Language Terminology

Directions: You will have 20 minutes to complete this section of the test. For **each** dual language learning term in the left column, **write on the line next to the term** the alphabetic character of the definition in the right column that best defines the term. The definitions for the terms are found on the same page as the terms. Thus, you will **not** need to flip the pages back and forth. Please note that there are more definitions than terms on each page.

Dual language terminology	Definitions of the terms in random order
1. Silent period _____	A. The range of what a person can understand (listening/reading) in a language
2. Recast _____	B. An explicit support to help students use the second language (ex: key words; sentence stems; pictures)
3. Language Objectives _____	C. An alternative to explicit correction; acknowledging the content of a student's response while modeling the correct form
4. Classroom language model, or classroom language allocations _____	D. Language that is at, or just above, the level that a student can understand. A necessary ingredient for learning.
5. Cognate _____	E. A punctuation mark at the end of a sentence that is not pronounced
6. Productive language _____	F. Words that sound similar across languages, but do not have similar meaning (ex: <i>ropa</i> and <i>rope</i>)
7. Comprehensible input _____	G. Goals for what students should be able to do or know at the end of a lesson or activity
8. Content Objectives _____	H. Thinking about language
9. Receptive language _____	I. Often a beginning stage of second language acquisition when a learner is listening, but not yet speaking
10. Linguistic 'false friend' _____	J. Goals for the language students should be using/learning during a lesson or activity
11. Metalinguistic talk _____	K. The range of what a person can convey speaking/writing) in a language
12. Non-dominant or heritage language _____	L. A plan for how language will be used in instruction (ex: 50-50, alternating days)
	M. Words that are similar in two languages (ex: <i>temperatura</i> and <i>temperatura</i>) in sound and meaning

(Continued)

Continued.

Dual language terminology	Definitions of the terms in random order
13. Translanguaging_____	N. A language of prestige in the city and country where a school is located. Teachers will not have to convince parents and students of this language's value.
14. Sequential Bilingual_____	O. Chunks of language that learners may use without knowing how to use individual parts (Ex: 'I wanna go.' 'I wanna go milk.' 'I wanna go sand table.')
15. Additive bilingualism_____	P. The classroom language that is being taught, learned, and used during a given time period.
16. Formulaic language_____	Q. Talk that is simplified for language learners
17. Biliteracy_____	R. Talk about how language works
18. Dominant or Societal Language_____	S. Being able to read and write in two languages and having the cultural competence to make meaning across languages
19. Simultaneous Bilingual_____	T. A bilingual person who learned both languages from birth. A strict separation of languages may not help this person.
20. Target language_____	U. The skilled ability of a bilingual person to use all the languages she knows, and to move in and between both languages. Codeswitching, or switching languages for social effect, is part of this.
	V. Language that is practiced
	W. Learning a second language without replacing or forgetting the first
	X. A language that is not the language of prestige where the school is located. Teachers will have to promote and defend the status of this language and the importance of learning it for all children.
	Y. Translating for someone else
	Z. A bilingual person who has learned one language from birth and a second language later. A strict separation of languages may help these students most.