

5-10-2022

“Subestimamos las habilidades de los estudiantes:” Bilingual teacher candidates building on multilingual assets

Allison Briceño
San Jose State University, allison.briceno@sjsu.edu

Emily Zoeller
Edgewood College

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/faculty_rsca

Recommended Citation

Allison Briceño and Emily Zoeller. ““Subestimamos las habilidades de los estudiantes:” Bilingual teacher candidates building on multilingual assets” *Bilingual Research Journal* (2022): 8-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2022.2065382>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

“Subestimamos las Habilidades de los Estudiantes:”

Bilingual Teacher Candidates Building on Multilingual Assets

Allison Briceño and Emily Zoeller

Corresponding author:
Allison Briceño, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
San José State University
1 Washington Square, SH305
San José, CA, 95192-0074
allison.briceno@sjsu.edu
650.346.2585

**“Subestimamos las Habilidades de los Estudiantes:”
Bilingual Teacher Candidates Building on Multilingual Assets**

Bilingual education programs are often defined by ideologies, practices, and policies that are rooted in the preservation and promotion of standardized language practices and White, monoglossic norms rather than in students’ diverse cultures and languaging practices (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Valdés, 2018). Many bilingual programs claim to develop biliteracy but instead enact parallel monolingualism, separating instruction and assessment by language, holding monolingual expectations, and limiting students’ access to their full linguistic repertoire (Fitts, 2006; Heller, 2001; Hopewell & Escamilla, 2014). This language dichotomy inadvertently devalues multilingual students’ linguistic assets (Caragarajah, 2013; García, 2020; Hopewell & Butvilofsky, 2016).

In order to change the type of teaching multilingual students receive, we must shift teachers’ ideology and pedagogy (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001; Hernández, 2017), however there is a dearth of empirical research evidencing how bilingual teacher preparation programs implement that goal (exceptions include Alfaro, 2018; Author 1, 2019, 2020; Collins & España, 2019; Ostorga, & Farruggio, 2014). The purpose of this study was to explore how a specific instructional approach –Transliteracy (Williams, 1994)– shaped bilingual teacher candidates’ (BTCs’) pedagogy and ideology. We selected Transliteracy to deconstruct existing monoglossic ideologies and to support bilingual teachers in employing dynamic writing instruction using an asset-based, holistic biliteracy (Escamilla et al., 2014) approach that views language as practice (García & Kleifgen, 2020; García & Li, 2014).

This study adds to the literature on preparing critical, ideologically and pedagogically clear bilingual teachers. It asks, *how does using a Transliteracy approach to writing instruction*

shape BTCs' ideology and pedagogy? In the theoretical framework we discuss the Transliteracy model and its conceptual underpinnings, including holistic biliteracy and identifying and leveraging multilingual students' linguistic capital. We then review the limited literature on the development of ideological and pedagogical clarity in BTCs. The methods of inquiry and data analysis are next, followed by findings with analysis, and we conclude with a discussion about bilingual teacher preparation.

A Transliteracy Model for BTC Preparation

According to Baker (2003)¹, Williams (1994) coined the term *Transliteracy* along with translanguaging in his research on Welsh/English bilingual education. Baker (2003) explained, "In translanguaging, the input (reading or listening) will be in one language, and the output (speaking or writing) in the other language" (p. 82). The term Transliteracy was used when reading and writing were required. Contrary to the critique that translanguaging limits growth in the minoritized language, Williams (1994, in Baker, 2003) found that transliteracy helped students develop competence in their less dominant language. We revive the term Transliteracy to describe a flexible biliterate pedagogy for multilingual students. Like Williams (1994), we refer to a particular practice that highlights a student's strength in one political language and asks them to apply it to the other language.

Insert Figure 1 here

Figure 1 shows the theoretical foundations of this study's Transliteracy model, including honoring students' linguistic capital (Yosso, 2005) through holistic biliteracy (Escamilla et al., 2014, vertex A) and the use of formative assessments to identify students' strengths (Butvilofksy et al., 2020, vertex B). Instruction (vertex C) is linguistically responsive, cross-linguistic, and

¹ We rely on Baker (2003) rather than citing Williams directly because Williams' (1994) dissertation was written in Gaelic, which we cannot read.

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

asset-based (Escamilla, et al., 2014) and incorporates critical reflection (Alfaro, 2019). The integration of these tenets is intended to develop BTCs' ideological and pedagogical clarity as they intentionally look for and teach to students' linguistic strengths. (See Authors [2022] for a more detailed explanation of the Transliteracy model). We next discuss the components of the Transliteracy model.

Ideologies: Holistic Biliteracy and Identifying Multilingual Students' Linguistic Capital

Many bilingual education spaces separate languages either by default or with intention, hoping to preserve a safe space for the minoritized language, especially in the U.S. where English is the language of power (Ballinger et al., 2017; Gómez et al., 2005; Lyster & Sato, 2013; Potowski, 2004). However, a growing body of scholarship argues that language separation promotes monolingualism as the unspoken expectation for bilingualism and neglects to honor the totality of the bilingual experience (Dworin, 2003; García & Li, 2014; Hamman-Ortiz, 2019; Ortega, 2014). Holistic biliteracy shares theoretical underpinnings with translingual (Caragarajah, 2013) and translanguaging (García & Li, 2014) scholarship, viewing bilingual language practices as stemming from a single linguistic repertoire and valuing bilinguals' use of all their linguistic resources when languaging and processing text. A holistic view of biliteracy challenges the literacy learning binary and offers a frame for understanding the dynamic literacy and languaging practices of multilinguals (Escamilla et al., 2014; García & Kleifgen, 2020).

In addition to getting to know students and their families personally (Reyes et al., 2016), teachers must learn about each child's multilingual language repertoire (Domke & Cárdenas Curiel, 2021) and linguistic capital (Yosso, 2005). Linguistic capital is defined as, "The intellectual and social skills attained through communication experiences in more than one language and/or style" (Yosso, 2005, p. 78). Identifying and leveraging multilingual students'

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

linguistic assets calls for a deliberate approach, as they are rarely valued in schools, even in bilingual classrooms (Author 1, 2018b). Previous research has shown that instruction can be more effective and personalized when teachers build upon students' linguistic assets using holistic biliteracy assessment and pedagogy (Ascenzi-Moreno, 2018; Domke & Cárdenas Curiel, 2021), thus they are core concepts in the Transliteracy model.

Using Formative Assessment to Identify Student Strengths

Unlike traditional assessments that compare bilingual students to a monolingual norm and consequently underestimate knowledge and abilities, formative assessment through a holistic biliteracy lens unveils what multilingual students know and can do across political languages in reading (Ascenzi-Moreno, 2016, 2018; Authors, 2021; Author 1, 2018a) and writing (Butvilofsky et al., 2020; Escamilla et al., 2018; Escamilla et al., 2019) using quotidian classroom observation as well as formal assessments (Escamilla et al., 1996, Escamilla et al., 2014). Further, holistic assessment does not reduce student literacy knowledge to one language or the other, but encompasses the full repertoire of understandings that the student brings to literacy learning, offering an alternative paradigm that can shift teachers' deficit notions about multilingual students (Ascenzi-Moreno, 2016, 2018; Butvilofsky et al., 2017; Hopewell & Butvilofsky, 2016; Soltero-González et al., 2012; Sparrow et al., 2014). Holistic bilingual assessment is a core concept in the Transliteracy model because it illuminates multilingual students' linguistic capital and enables educators to validate the language and writing knowledge students bring from home (Soltero-González & Butvilofsky, 2016). Identifying and leveraging students' linguistic assets can be a stepping stone toward developing BTCs' ideological and pedagogical clarity, as honoring minoritized students' assets requires a critical analysis of the larger sociocultural and political realities and a teacher's role in them (Bartolomé, 1994).

Linguistically Responsive, Cross-linguistic, Asset-Based Teaching

The third component of the Transliteracy model is linguistically responsive, cross-linguistic, asset-based biliteracy pedagogy. Such instruction can validate the bilingual's way of knowing by surfacing and honoring their existing strengths in either or both political languages (Escamilla et al., 2018; García & Kleifgen, 2020). Cross-linguistic instruction enables multilingual learners to draw upon their full language repertoire (e.g., Soltero-González et al., 2016; Sparrow et al., 2014; Velasco & García, 2014). A recent six-year longitudinal study showed the efficacy of a holistic biliteracy approach, with students making significant gains in both Spanish and English language and literacy (Sparrow et al., 2021). Explicitly teaching cross-linguistically has also been found to foster a student-centered stance (García et al., 2017; García et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2019).

Writing pedagogy for multilinguals should recognize students' home languages and literacies and intentionally make space for them in instruction (Williams & Lowrance-Faulhaber, 2018). Such practices would support multilingual students, as they are already transanguaging across all stages of the writing process to self-regulate and problem solve (Velasco & García, 2014). As in Williams' (1994) original work, the field is calling for intentional, strategic, and deliberate use of Transliteracy and transanguaging practices (García et al., 2017; Poza, 2018) to actualize a humanizing agenda that empowers historically minoritized bilinguals by validating and cultivating dynamic language practices (García & Kleifgen, 2020; García & Li, 2014). The current study examines how Transliteracy develops BTCs' ideological and pedagogical clarity.

Developing BTCs' Ideological and Pedagogical Clarity

Alfaro (2019) encourages teacher education faculty to prepare bilingual teachers who can unapologetically and unambiguously work to counteract current power dynamics, linguistic,

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

and hegemonic beliefs that are harmful to multilingual students. Since teaching and learning are primarily mediated through language and literacy, it is critical that BTCs gain an understanding of how language and culture influence, and are influenced by, literacy practices in schools, homes, and communities (Valenzuela, 2016). We can support BTCs in this process by reorienting teacher education courses to embrace a critical perspective (Alfaro, 2018; Author 1, 2019, 2020). Failing to prepare ideologically clear BTCs results in minoritized students continuing to risk subjugation (Zúñiga, 2016). Alfaro (2019) identifies five key aspects of bilingual teacher professional learning, including: ideological clarity, advocacy, agency, sociocultural and linguistic funds of identity, and pedagogical clarity. This paper focuses on ideological and pedagogical clarity, or the connection between theory and practice.

Ideological clarity is defined as the development of critical consciousness and the ability to identify students' linguistic and cultural assets in order to honor and build on those assets (Alfaro, 2019). Pedagogical clarity is the classroom implementation of that work: interrupting deficit views, working against linguisticism that honors English over Spanish, engaging in cultural wealth approaches, and recognizing multilingual students as linguistic geniuses (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2018; Valenzuela, 2016). Alfaro (2019) explains that ideological clarity informs one's pedagogy, and "A teacher's pedagogical clarity that stems from an asset-based perspective centers on the belief that students and teachers construct knowledge together based on the cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge (assets) students bring to the classroom" (p. 199). She argues for ideology and pedagogy that build on students' linguistic and cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005) to engage in critical pedagogy (Freire & Macedo, 2005). In practice, this includes cross-linguistic instruction that spans students' linguistic repertoires (Butvilofsky et al., 2020)

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

and intentional opportunities for translanguaging, including the rejection of idealized notions of language and corresponding hierarchies (García & Kleifgen 2020; García & Li, 2014).

Studies in teacher preparation not specific to bilingual candidates show that criticality -- including an analysis of power and privilege-- supports ideological and pedagogical clarity. Allen and colleagues (2017) provide a critical framework for integrating culturally relevant pedagogy into teacher preparation programs that includes cultural competence, critical consciousness, and academic achievement, with critical reflection throughout. A recent study adds pedagogical content knowledge to critical reflection to significantly strengthen candidates' ideological and pedagogical clarity (Blevins et al., 2020). Finally, Liu and Ball (2019) examine how generativity, or the generation of new or novel behavior in problem solving, can couple actionable classroom practices with critical reflection to promote transformative teacher education for diverse students.

Empirical examples of implementation in BTC preparation are few. Relevant studies point to how pedagogy can be developed through translanguaging and use of both Spanish and English across the curriculum, as well as critical reflection of language ideologies, raciolinguistics, pedagogies that practice critical conversations using vignettes, reflective journals, in-class activities such as Theater of the Oppressed (Boal, 1979), and specific readings (Alfaro, 2018; Author 1, 2019, 2020; Collins & España, 2019). Additionally BTCs' lived experiences can be integrated into the curriculum (Author 1, 2019, 2020; Collins & España, 2019; Ostorga & Farruggio, 2014). A study at the U.S./Mexico border by Ostorga & Farruggio (2014) developed *cariño*, *familia*, and students' criticality in a bilingual teacher preparation program, thereby aligning with Fránquiz and Salazar's (2004) humanizing pedagogy. Alfaro (2018) summarizes how one university's bilingual teacher program prepared ideologically clear

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

and critically conscious bilingual teachers by emphasizing biliteracy across the content areas, family and community engagement, critical literacy, and inclusive learning environments. These studies provide examples of bilingual programs intentionally enacting counterhegemonic, plurilingual, cross-cultural practices to develop critically conscious, ideologically clear BTCs. The current study examines how a particular approach to writing instruction –Transliteracy– develops BTCs’ ideological and pedagogical clarity.

Methods

This qualitative study sought to understand how the Transliteracy approach shaped BTCs’ ideology and pedagogy through practice-oriented, self-study research in which teacher educators initiate innovations and intentionally and systematically examine their practice in order to improve it (Vanassche & Keltcherman, 2015). Used in social justice teacher education research (LaBoskey, 2009), self-study design fits our intent of understanding how pedagogy and ideology develop within particular contexts, acknowledging both practice and moral purpose (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Below we share the efforts we made to counter the issue of self-examination limiting honest critique (Loughran, 2007). Self-study can clarify pedagogical reasoning, offering accessible insights to other teacher educators (Loughran, 2007).

Context and Participants

This study occurred in a large, urban, public university in a western state. Participants were part of a post-baccalaureate bilingual elementary teacher preparation program in which they were simultaneously pursuing a bilingual authorization and their preliminary teaching credential. We studied a Transliteracy assignment in a one-semester Biliteracy Methods course; instruction was in both Spanish and English. Both authors co-developed the Transliteracy assignment under study and participated in data collection and analysis. Author 1 played the dual role of instructor

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

and researcher. We applied purposive sampling (Merriam, 2009) to the population of 21 BTCs in the course. Participants were recruited after course grades were submitted. The seven BTCs who chose to participate in the study were Latinx females who were heritage or home language Spanish speakers, proficient in Spanish and English, held a B.A., and were in their first semester of student teaching at local elementary schools in urban and suburban settings (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 here

Instructional Approach Under Study: Transliteracy

BTCs selected a multilingual focus student from their bilingual field placement and implemented the Transliteracy process detailed in Figure 2. They completed a holistic writing observation, analyzed the student's Spanish and English writing using an observation framework adapted from Escamilla and colleagues (2014), and reflected on considerations of oral language development, language demands, and cross-linguistic teaching opportunities. The BTCs identified a writing strength the student evidenced in one language but not the other, and developed a mini lesson using a Transliteracy prompting model that contained five teaching moves: honor the writing strength in one language, share that it can be applied in the other language, demonstrate how, address nuances in the language, and invite the student to implement the lesson focus. The BTCs received feedback on the lesson plan from the instructor, taught the lesson, and composed a written reflection of their experience using their language of choice. The multi-step assignment description is available in Appendix A.

Insert Figure 2 here

Implementation was complicated by the monoglossic perspectives and strict language separation rules in many of the bilingual schools in which the BTCs were student teaching. Some BTCs expressed concern that they would not be allowed to implement cross-linguistic teaching

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

because it contradicted language policy. After navigating their school's linguistic context and norms, the BTCs implemented a Transliteracy lesson in their student teaching placement, with the exception of Yolanda, who worked with a neighborhood child outside the school context.

Data Sources and Analysis

This study incorporated multiple data sources that were integrated to produce holistic findings (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Data sources included the Transliteracy assignments (discussion board posts, observation framework, prompting model, and a written reflection) and semi-structured interviews (Yin, 2017), which lasted 45-60 minutes and were conducted within three weeks of course completion. Data was bilingual (Spanish/English) as students were able to submit all assignments and interview using either or both languages. To minimize bias, Author 2 invited students to participate in the study after Author 1 submitted course grades, BTCs could choose to interview with either researcher, we completed member checks with four participants, and we used journal and memo writing to capture researcher reactions and perceptions and separate them from the data analysis process. Triangulation of the data provided a comprehensive picture of participants' pedagogical and ideological development.

Data analysis was iterative. First, researchers conducted a preliminary exploratory analysis, reviewing the data for each participant in their entirety to understand the essence of participants' stories (Saldaña, 2016). Secondly, interviews were analyzed deductively, focusing on "the language and words of participants" (Creswell & Creswell, 2019, p. 188), and using codes for ideological and pedagogical clarity (e.g., Alfaro, 2019). Course assignments were analyzed to unveil aspects of teacher knowledge about pedagogy as well as biliterate writing practices (e.g., Butvilofsky et al., 2020). Using recursive inquiry (Heath & Street, 2008), the emerging relationship between developing ideologies and pedagogies drove subsequent rounds

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

of coding. The third round of coding was inductive (Merriam, 2009), deepening the connection between ideology and pedagogy as we connected ideological statements to what BTCs said about their practice. All data was coded by both authors; each author was the first coder for half the data and the second coder for the other half. Where discrepancies in codes appeared, researchers discussed, acting as “critical friends” (Hamilton et al., 2008, p. 21) per self-study design, until conclusions were reached. Following the stages of coding, we graphically organized the codes into a conceptual map from which our themes emerged (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Researcher positionality is relevant to developing participant trust and the subjectivity of data analysis. Researchers must deeply understand ourselves, our role in the research process, and our privilege, as our positionalities impact our work (Lather, 1993). We both have over 15 years of experience in bilingual public schools as classroom teachers, biliteracy specialists, and in leadership roles. Both authors are female sequential bilingual speakers who were born in the U.S., grew up speaking English, and developed Spanish as an additional language. We recognize the privilege we hold as light-skinned, language-majority speakers and how these factors, coupled with our roles as professors, may impact the research process. To mitigate potential biases, significant precaution was taken to develop authentic relationships during the research process, triangulate data, and complete member checks. We highlight the voices of female Latinx BTCs, centering their experiences with multilingual students, and studying how they engage with, critique, and navigate monoglossic language policies in bilingual spaces.

Findings

In this section we share our findings to the research question, *How does using a Transliteracy approach to writing instruction shape BTCs’ ideological and pedagogical clarity?*

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

Findings include three main themes: (1) BTCs were able to enact asset-based observation and teaching, leading to a generative observe-instruct cycle that deepened pedagogical understandings; (2) BTCs developed beliefs and practices that countered monoglossic norms, including the development of BTCs' own identities as bilinguals; and (3) BTCs demonstrated the ability to align their ideology and pedagogy in ways that supported equity for their students.

Pedagogy: Enacting Asset-based Observation and Instruction

Observation as formative assessment is critical for a teacher's ability to leverage students' strengths (Butvilofsky et al., 2017). The Transliteracy process enabled the BTCs to identify and honor students' strengths in a mini-lesson. Leticia, a Latina who grew up speaking primarily English, identified for her English-dominant second grader that he provided reasons for his claim in English, but had not done so in Spanish, and she brainstormed with him sample language in Spanish he could use. She shared, "Focusing on one skill across the two languages gave him a better understanding of the connection between the two." She identified benefits of teaching based on close observation, explaining, "I found it beneficial to have the lesson be personalized as I was able to teach him according to his level, and was able to use his own writing." Leticia identified the cross-linguistic nature of the mini-lesson and its foundation in strengths-based formative assessment as keys to its success.

The Transliteracy process also helped BTCs reflect on how they could better honor students' linguistic and cultural assets in the future. For instance, Kristina explained, "En retrospectiva, debería hacer más preguntas que se relacionen más con su experiencia personal de aprendizaje, ver anime y pasar tiempo con su abuela" [In retrospect, I should have asked more questions that relate more to her personal learning experience, watching anime, and spending time with her grandmother]. The observation, instruction, and reflection in the Transliteracy

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

process led teachers to make explicit connections between their ideology (e.g., wanting to connect learning to students' home experiences) and their developing practice; this self-reflection is a critical part of developing ideological and pedagogical clarity (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017). Observation and reflection led to a generative cycle supporting BTCs' ability to build on students' assets and deepening their understanding of biliteracy teaching.

A Generative Observe-Instruct Cycle Deepened Pedagogical Understandings

The Transliteracy process enabled the BTCs to develop an observation-instruction cycle as they noticed students' learning when taught using a cross-linguistic, strengths-based approach. Observation was iterative; they conducted an initial formative assessment, observed student responses *during* the lesson, and reflected on future areas of inquiry. For instance, Raya, a Mexican-American BTC, detailed her fourth grader's response to a mini-lesson that honored the child's sentence variation in Spanish and taught her to do it in English:

When I honored her writing abilities in Spanish, she was smiling from ear to ear ... It also set up the transition to my demonstration perfectly. Switching to English to explain what she could improve in her writing allowed her to fully comprehend the objective of the lesson, which was evidenced by her work.

Working with the student one-on-one enabled Raya to immediately assess the child's reaction to her teaching and observe evidence of learning in the child's writing. While this study sought to examine teacher experiences and not necessarily student learning, BTCs mentioned students' engagement and pride upon having their work honored, and they shared evidence of student learning from the mini-lessons in reflections and interviews. The students' learning supported the BTCs' developing pedagogical clarity.

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

Delfina, who shared with her student the experience of being a young newcomer from Mexico, identified that the student knew the *-ción* suffix in Spanish and leveraged that strength by showing him the *-tion* suffix and other affixes that Spanish and English share. The close observation enabled Delfina to identify the student's strengths and leverage one of those strengths to support the student's writing across languages. For Delfina, Transliteracy solidified an understanding of making language connections, a pedagogical shift she described:

Al usar el método de Transliteracy para ayudar a mi alumno pude apreciar la creación de redes semánticas de un idioma a otro y viceversa. Además, las asociaciones lingüísticas fueron mucho más fáciles de ser vinculadas porque el estudiante estaba creando esquemas con base a información ya aprendida en español. Al usar estas tácticas de aprendizaje lingüístico, los alumnos ejecutaron con mayor facilidad las destrezas instruidas y de aplicarlas por sí solos. [By using the Transliteracy method to help my student I was able to appreciate the creation of semantic networks from one language to another and vice versa. Furthermore, language associations were much easier to be linked because the student was creating schemas based on information already learned in Spanish. By using these language learning tactics, students more easily executed the skills taught and applied them on their own.]

Delfina identified that Transliteracy enabled students to build cross-linguistic “semantic networks,” “language associations,” and “schema” that she had not observed using a monolingual paradigm and practices. She noticed how supporting her students to build on the known—in this case, their linguistic capital—grew their learning (Yosso, 2005).

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

Observing the student's learning and developing independence during the lesson reinforced Delfina's holistic biliteracy lens. She explicitly contrasted Transliteracy with the monoglossic paradigm in her student teaching placement, stating:

Por lo contrario, antes de utilizar estrategias de aprendizaje de Transliteracy, a mis estudiantes les era mucho más complicado reutilizar conocimientos previos para crear asociaciones. Les instruí información nueva sin crear ningún tipo de base en la que pudieran cementificarla, lo cual creó confusión y una enseñanza mediocre. [In contrast, before using Transliteracy learning strategies, it was much more difficult for my students to re-use previous knowledge to create associations. I instructed them with new information without creating any kind of base on which they could cement it, which created confusion and mediocre teaching.]

Delfina described her former approach as “mediocre teaching,” as it inhibited students and teachers from associating new learning with what is known in the other language of instruction, resulting in challenges and confusion. Enacting Transliteracy led Delfina to reflect on former practice, problematize it, and replace it with an alternative that she believed built on students' linguistic assets and therefore fostered greater student learning.

The learning and observations the BTCs made during the Transliteracy lesson clarified holistic bilingualism and cross-linguistic teaching for them. Yolanda, who moved to the U.S. from Mexico in high school, observed that her student used transition words in English but not in Spanish. She explained that this writing skill could be used in both languages and shared examples of Spanish transition words. Yolanda stated:

En nuestra sesión de intervención de escritura tan íntima, vi a Luna florecer como escritora. Ella misma apuntó la repetición de sus frases y tomó la iniciativa de cambiar

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

la estructura ... Observé los beneficios que consigue al incrementar la conciencia metalingüística en la estudiante. Presentar las habilidades transferibles de idioma a idioma, empodera al emergente bilingüe a utilizar sus repertorios lingüísticos al máximo. [In our intimate writing intervention session, I saw Luna flourish as a writer. She herself noted the repetition of her phrases and took the initiative to change the structure ... I observed the benefits it achieves by increasing the metalinguistic awareness in the student. Presenting skills that are transferable language-to-language empowers the emerging bilingual to utilize their linguistic repertoires to the fullest.]

Yolanda observed how her Transliteracy lesson supported the student's cross-linguistic learning. Making children aware of their ability to translanguage during literacy practices is critical, as cross-linguistic awareness is supportive of multilingual students' literacy development (García & Kleifgen, 2020; Jiménez et al., 1995, 1996). The observation-instruction cycle positioned teachers to recognize students' bilingual languaging abilities that could be leveraged through holistic Transliteracy teaching.

Ideology: Countering Monolingual Beliefs and Practices

The BTCs perceived Transliteracy as a counterhegemonic practice that challenged the implicit monoglossic norms in their student teaching settings. A Latina who speaks English at home, Linda explained, "This approach stands in contrast to the approach taken in the English/Spanish dual immersion classroom in which I was a student teacher. At this school, the two languages are taught separately." Asking the BTCs to enact a lesson that countered monoglossic practices helped them to question the status quo. Raya shared her reflections:

Through this process I learned so much about teaching and assessing students' writing, specifically when working with bilingual students. My greatest take away is so simple

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

and yet incredibly powerful, we have to stop comparing the writing (and every other literacy skill) of bilingual and monolingual students. This act is not only erroneous, but also incredibly unjust and damaging to our students. Traditional views of literacy development have never been representative of marginalized youth and do not serve multilingual youth. As future educators it is imperative that we understand the need for a curriculum that honors, values and teaches bilingualism and biliteracy holistically.

Raya clearly articulated an explicit holistic biliteracy lens and a focus on equitable practices for multilingual and historically minoritized students. She experienced a monoglossic paradigm in her student teaching placement, where multilingual students were assessed through a monolingual lens. The Transliteracy experience offered her an alternative practice and the chance to develop a counternarrative to her student teaching experience.

Claudia, a Mexican-American who began learning English upon entering kindergarten, expressed a similar counterhegemonic perspective by explicitly connecting her ideology to the Transliteracy pedagogy. She stated, “I also think it's a way of giving importance to both languages rather than choosing one over the other. I will continue to use Transliteracy in my classroom.” Claudia views the Transliteracy process as a partial solution to the issue of language equity, as the hegemony of English often results in English dominance in bilingual settings (Palmer, 2010, 2017; Potowski, 2007). The Transliteracy process helped the BTCs, as novices, identify their beliefs and recognize how to implement those beliefs in classroom practice.

Supporting BTCs' Own Identities as Bilinguals

Significantly, the Transliteracy process honored the Latinx bilingual teachers' personal languaging practices and enabled them to bring their language and identity into their teaching (Bartolomé, 1994; Collins & España, 2019). A home Spanish speaker, Raya explained, “Using

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

the Transliteracy model with my student Emerald felt liberating and enlightening. Just like Emerald, I too felt freed from strict language norms. I was able to teach in the way I naturally speak, which made me feel more comfortable.” The separation of languages in many bilingual settings inhibits bilinguals’ natural languaging practices (Palmer et al., 2014; Sánchez et al., 2018). The freedom to use language as she normally would made Raya feel she was able to bring her whole self to the classroom.

Similarly, Claudia contrasted the Transliteracy approach to the parallel monolingualism model she experienced as a student, which she felt devalued her knowledge. She said:

I like the concept of using strengths and developed skills from one language to apply to the other language. Personally, it was frustrating when my teachers would stop me from using one language simply because it was “not time for that.” There is a sense of validation and acknowledgment when we get to make linguistic connections. To me, it's similar to applying funds of knowledge to our curriculum, in the sense of having them use both languages to answer and expand their learning and application capabilities.

Claudia identified the significance of building on students’ linguistic capital, calling it “validation and acknowledgement;” her explicit connection to Moll and colleagues’ (1992) funds of knowledge shows she recognized the importance of leveraging students’ home language and culture. The Transliteracy process validated Claudia and Raya’s personal languaging practices and enabled them to make the classroom –normally a White, English-speaking space (Milne, 2020)– accepting of themselves as well as their students.

Aligning Ideology and Pedagogy

The Transliteracy assignment provided an example of an alternative to the monoglossic paradigm in the local schools, proving that options to the status quo are available to teachers

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

whose ideologies align elsewhere. Delfina contrasted Transliteracy with a monolingual approach, saying:

Lo que aprendí de este modelo es que muchas veces los maestros subestimamos las habilidades de los estudiantes. Al usar Transliteracy, una lección de unos cuantos minutos ayudó bastante a los alumnos, tanto para aprender como para aplicarla por sí mismos. Estas estrategias otorgan equidad a los alumnos que están aprendiendo un idioma. [What I learned from this model is that teachers often underestimate students' abilities. Using Transliteracy, a lesson of a few minutes helped the students a lot, both to learn and to apply it on their own. These strategies provide equity to language learners.]

Unlike monolingual approaches that veil students' abilities, Transliteracy offered an approach to assessment that highlighted students' writing strengths across languages. The holistic biliteracy lens allowed for a greater focus on students' linguistic assets.

According to Delfina, her pedagogy developed through the integration of theory and practice:

Me impresioné al observar que los alumnos desarrollaron una destreza en cuestión de segundos, porque leer teoría es una cosa, pero ver cómo se desarrolla y transforma en el aula es totalmente diferente. Por lo general, a uno como alumna solo tiene la oportunidad de leer teorías de aprendizajes sin poder llegar a la aplicación de cómo funciona esta, que fue lo que me agradó de este proyecto. [I was struck to see that students developed a skill in a matter of seconds, because reading theory is one thing, but seeing how it is developed and transformed in the classroom is totally different. Usually, one as a student only has the opportunity to read learning theories without being able to get to the application of how this works, which was what I liked about this

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

project.]

By connecting the theory to the practice, or the ideology to the pedagogy, Delfina developed the clarity that can help teachers defend their practice when it runs counter to schools' norms. Similarly, after honoring her student's sentence variation in Spanish writing and showing him how to use the same strategy in his English writing, Raya reflected on what it means for her as a bilingual educator to enact culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris & Alim, 2014, 2017):

The Transliteracy model is a culturally sustaining practice that I will absolutely employ in my future classroom. As a bilingual, biliterate educator I know that to create equitable learning experiences for racialized and minoritized youth ... We start this process by freeing multilingual learners from the oppressive practices that govern their language use and restrict them from using their full socio-cultural and linguistic repertoires in their learning ... These practices include the strict separation of language use in the classroom, deficit perspectives of multilingual youth based on erroneous comparisons to White middle-class monolingual students, and the over-policing of language.

Raya went on to describe literacy development as a “transformative act.” She explicitly connects actionable practices –such as de-policing language and supporting students to use their full linguistic repertoire (García & Li, 2014)– with her developing biliteracy ideology.

The Transliteracy assignment provided the BTCs with an alternative that challenged the monoglossic paradigm they were experiencing as student teachers. The experiential nature of the assignment and the success they found through the Transliteracy process became practical grounding on which they could base counterhegemonic perspectives. The theory the BTCs were learning was no longer just theory, as they experienced their own liberation of languaging alongside their students' success and independence in learning. A generative observation-

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

instruction cycle developed, as the BTCs again noticed students' strengths while teaching. The effectiveness of the approach reinforced their belief in it; their pedagogy and ideology co-developed through the Transliteracy process.

Conclusion

In sum, this study describes how the Transliteracy process developed in BTCs a holistic biliteracy perspective and pedagogy that ultimately challenged the rigid monoglossic practices that exist in many bilingual settings. We revive Williams' (1994) concept of Transliteracy and respond to the call for research that uses translanguaging with intentional purpose (Garcia, et al., 2017; Poza, 2019). Like others, (e.g., Sparrow et al., 2014; Sparrow et al., 2021; Soltero-Gonzalez et al., 2016), we extend the scholarship on holistic biliteracy practices by exploring a new, actionable teaching protocol. This study also contributes to the field by integrating the literature on BTCs' ideological clarity (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017) with the separate scholarship on holistic biliteracy practices, including asset-based formative assessment (e.g., Escamilla et al., 2014; Soltero-González et al., 2016).

This study proposes use of the Transliteracy model (Figure 1) and process (Figure 2) in bilingual teacher education to bridge the gap between BTCs' beliefs and practices. Like Alfaro (2018) and Collins and España (2019), we seek to prepare ideologically and pedagogically clear bilingual teachers and to counter repressive linguistic norms. Transliteracy helped BTCs connect theory to practice, enact their developing ideology, and deepen their understanding of holistic, asset-based biliteracy assessment and cross-linguistic, responsive pedagogy that honors bilingualism and biliteracy. The strength of the Transliteracy model lies in the integration of holistic biliteracy instructional practices, an assets orientation, observation as formative assessment, and reflection. The practical nature of the assignment solidified connections between

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

theory and practices, as the iterative cycle of identifying students' strengths, teaching to those strengths, and observing students' learning supported the BTCs' developing ideological and pedagogical clarity.

Both multilingual learners and BTCs deserve access to humanizing pedagogy that builds upon their full repertoire of linguistic and cultural strengths and fosters a bilingual identity (Fránquiz, 2012; Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Salazar, 2013). The BTCs felt their bilingual identities were supported using the Transliteracy model, as it reflected their own languaging practices. As Raya said, she felt, “freed from strict language norms” and “able to teach in the way I naturally speak, which made me feel more comfortable.” We suggest that bilingual teacher education support BTCs in reflecting upon their own cultural and linguistic assets and provide opportunities to practice holistic, cross-linguistic pedagogy that builds on those assets. Efforts to recruit and prepare bilingual educators are critical, especially during a national bilingual educator shortage, and warrant adoption of approaches like Transliteracy that honor BTCs' languages and identities.

Supporting BTCs to navigate and overcome the barriers they will likely face in schools when trying to implement counter-hegemonic practices is another important but under-emphasized aspect of bilingual teacher preparation. In a study of teachers in dual language programs, Babino and Stewart (2018) stated, “It is particularly crucial to consistently name and address tensions in teacher preparation courses so they understand the maelstrom they are entering before they arrive” (p. 289). Initially, due to strict language separation policies, some BTCs were not allowed to teach a Transliteracy lesson in their classrooms because of its cross-linguistic nature. However, with instructor support, all but one of the BTCs navigated their school's system and implemented Transliteracy; Yolanda implemented it outside of her student

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

teaching placement. The Transliteracy approach supported BTCs in reflecting on challenges common in many bilingual settings: rigid separation of languages, an absence of useful formative writing assessments, and instruction based on deficits instead of strengths. BTCs noted the systemic issues that resulted in some of these practices despite the positive intentions of their mentor teachers. The practice-oriented nature of the Transliteracy assignment enabled the BTCs to experience first hand some of the tensions bilingual teachers face.

Insights from this study can also shape preparation of educators in English-medium classes to value and support multilingualism, which is essential since most multilingual students do not have access to bilingual education (García & Kleifgen, 2020; García et al., 2017). Course work that asks teacher candidates to self-reflect and learn about students' multilingual and cultural assets are a beginning, but a connection to practice –for example, asking students to teach to a strength that might not be typically valued in an English monolingual classroom– is a critical and often overlooked component in teacher preparation.

Limitations

We recognize this study's limitations, such as its exploratory nature, the small sample size, self-reported data, and student achievement being outside the scope of this project. Data in this study were primarily BTC-reported. While we recognize that teacher perceptions do not provide a full data picture, they can be a meaningful starting point for further exploration. Finally, while it is unrealistic to expect BTCs to shift entire systems, preparing them to maneuver through school systems is a critical skill for advocacy. Future research could provide additional information about the efficacy of the Transliteracy process for both BTCs and their students, including longitudinal student outcomes. Additional studies that integrate classroom practice and

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

teacher preparation would be effective in closing the theory to practice gap that pervades teacher preparation (Ribaeus et al., 2020).

Final Thoughts

Transliteracy illustrates an approach through which teacher preparation can equip educators to identify harmful monoglossic norms and replace them with holistic practices. Equitable teaching for multilingual learners requires us to reconsider what counts as knowledge and the approaches used to uncover knowledge to support learning (Author 2, 2022). To dismantle monoglossic paradigms, practices, and norms, we must work unapologetically to develop ideological and pedagogical clarity in bilingual educators.

References

- Alfaro, C. (2018). The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past, present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 413-427.
- Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 194-203.
- Alfaro, C., & Bartolomé, L. (2017). La claridad ideológica del maestro bilingüe: Un reto en la educación bilingüe de calidad. In M. D. Guerrero, M. C. Guerrero, L. Soltero-González, & Escamilla, K. (Eds.), *Abriendo brecha: Antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble inmersión* (pp. 95-117). Fuente Press.
- Allen, A., Hancock, S., Starker-Glass, T., & Lewis, C. (2017). Mapping culturally relevant pedagogy into teacher education programs: A critical framework. *Teachers College Record*, 119(1), 1-26.
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L. (2016). An exploration of elementary teachers' views of informal reading inventories in dual language bilingual programs. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 55(4), 285-308.
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L. (2018). Translanguaging and responsive assessment adaptations: Emergent bilingual readers through the lens of possibility. *Language Arts*, 95(6), 355-369.
- Author 1. (2018a).
- Author 1. (2018b).
- Author 1. (2019).
- Author 1. (2020).
- Authors. (2022).
- Author 2. (2022).
- Babino, A. & Stewart, M. A. (2018) Remodeling dual language programs: Teachers enact agency as critically conscious language policy makers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(3), 272-297. DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2018.1489313
- Baker, C. (2003). Bilingualism and Transliteration in Wales: Language Planning and the Welsh National Curriculum. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 71-90). Multilingual Matters.
- Ballinger, S., Lyster, R., Sterzuk, A., & Genesee, F. (2017). Context-appropriate crosslinguistic

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

- pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 51(1), 30–57.
- Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 173-195.
- Bartolomé, L., & Balderrama, M. (2001). The need for educators with political and ideological clarity: Providing our children with “the best.” In M. Reyes & J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students*. Teachers College.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544.
- Blevins, B., Magill, K., & Salinas, C. (2020). Critical historical inquiry: The intersection of ideological clarity and pedagogical content knowledge. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 44(1), 35-50.
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the oppressed*. Theatre Communications Group.
- Butvilofsky, S. A., Escamilla, K., Gumina, D., & Silva Diaz, E. (2020). Beyond monolingual reading assessments for emerging bilingual learners: expanding the understanding of biliteracy assessment through writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 53-70.
- Butvilofsky, S. A., Hopewell, S., Escamilla, K., & Sparrow, W. (2017). Shifting deficit paradigms of Latino emerging bilingual students’ literacy achievement: Documenting biliterate trajectories. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 16(2), 85-97.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*. Routledge.
- 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.
- Collins, B. A., & España, C. (2019). Sustaining and developing teachers’ dynamic bilingualism in a re-designed bilingual teacher preparation program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Online pre-published version. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1610354
- Creswell, J. D., Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th edition. SAGE Publications.
- Domke, L. M., & Cárdenas Curiel, L. (2021). There’s No One Way to Be Bilingual: Knowing Students’ Language Practices. *The Reading Teacher*, 74(4), 451-455.
- Dworin, J. (2003). Insights into biliteracy development: Toward a bidirectional theory of

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

- bilingual pedagogy. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2(2), 171–186.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192702250621>
- Escamilla, K., Andrade, A. M., Basurto, A. G., Ruiz, O. A., & Clay, M. M. (1996). *Instrumento de Observación de Los Logros de la Lecto-Escritura Inicial: Spanish Reconstruction of an Observation Survey-A Bilingual Text*. Heinemann.
- Escamilla, K., Butvilofsky, S., & Hopewell, S. (2018). What gets lost when English-only writing assessment is used to assess writing proficiency in Spanish-English Emerging Bilingual learners? *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 12(4), 221-236.
- Escamilla, K., Fine, C., & Hopewell, S. (2019). Enhancing Writing Outcomes in Spanish/English Bilingual Programs. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, 34(1), 77-96.
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O. & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy Squared in Action*. Caslon.
- Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30, 337-366.
- Fránquiz, M. E. (2012). Key concepts in bilingual education: Identity texts, cultural citizenship, and humanizing pedagogy. *New England Reading Association Journal*, 48(1), 32-42.
- Franquiz, M. E., & del Carmen Salazar, M. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *The High School Journal*, 36-53.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (2005). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Routledge.
- García, O. (2020). Translanguaging and Latinx bilingual readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 73(5), 557-562.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., Seltzer, K., & Valdés, G. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J., (2020). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4), 553-571.
- García, O., Seltzer, K., & Witt, D. (2018). Disrupting linguistic inequalities in US urban classrooms: The role of translanguaging. In P. Van Avermaet, S. Slembrouck, K. Van Gorp, S. Sierens, & K. Maryns (Eds.), *The Multilingual Edge of Education* (pp. 41–66). Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave.
- Gómez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50–50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 145–164.

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

- Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2008). Fitting the methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and auto-ethnography. *Studying Teacher Education*, 4(1), 17-28.
- Hamman-Ortiz, L. (2019). Troubling the “two” in two-way bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(4), 387-407.
- Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research. Language & Literacy (NCRL)*. Teachers College Press.
- Heller, M. (2001). Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: Ideology and categorization in a linguistic minority school. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics and social theory* (pp. 261-296). Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- Hernández, A. M. (2017). Reflective and transformative practice in bilingual teacher preparation: Examining cross-cultural and linguistic equity. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 67-86.
- Hopewell, S., & Butvilofsky, S. (2016). Privileging bilingualism: Using biliterate writing outcomes to understand emerging bilingual learners’ literacy achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 324-338.
- Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2014). Struggling reader or emerging biliterate student? Reevaluating the criteria for labeling emerging bilingual students as low achieving. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 46(1), 68–89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X13504869>
- Jiménez, R., García, G., & Pearson, D. P. (1995). Three children, two languages, and strategic reading: Case studies in bilingual/monolingual reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 67–97.
- Jiménez, R., García, G., & Pearson, D. P. (1996). The reading strategies of Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(1), 90–112.
- Johnson, S. I., García, O., & Seltzer, K. (2019). Biliteracy and translanguaging in dual-language bilingual education. In *Dual language education: Teaching and leading in two languages* (pp. 119-132). Springer, Cham.
- LaBoskey, V. K. (2009). “Name It and Claim It”: The Methodology of Self-Study as Social Justice Teacher Education. In *Research methods for the self-study of practice* (pp. 73-82). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(4), 673-693.

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

- Liu, K., & Ball, A. F. (2019). Critical reflection and generativity: Toward a framework of transformative teacher education for diverse learners. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 68-105.
- Loughran, J. (2007). Researching teacher education practices: Responding to the challenges, demands and expectations of self-study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 12-20
- Lyster, R., & Sato, M. (2013). Skill acquisition theory and the role of practice in L2 development. In P. García Mayo, M. Gutierrez-Mangado, & M. Martínez Adrián (Eds.), *Contemporary approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 71–92). John Benjamins.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossy Bass.
- Milne, A. (2020). Colouring in the White Spaces: The Warrior-Researchers of Kia Aroha College. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 40(1), 87-91.
- Moll, L. C., 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.
- Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–52). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Ostorga, A. N., & Farruggio, P. (2014). Discovering best practices for bilingual teacher preparation: A pedagogy for the border. In (Eds.) Y. Freeman & D. Freeman) *Research on preparing preservice teachers to work effectively with emergent bilinguals* (pp. 113-136). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual language “strand” program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 94-114.
- Palmer, D. K. (2017). Why aren't we speaking Spanish? Promoting minoritized languages in the two-way dual language classroom. In G. C. Gonzales, E. Barbian, & P. Mejía (Eds.), *Rethinking Bilingual Education* (pp. 170–176). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- 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.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757-772.
- Paris, D. & Alim, H.S. (2014). “What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy: A loving critique forward.” *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85–100.

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Pinnegar, S. & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research*. Dordrecht: Springer
- Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 75–101. doi:10.1111/modl.2004.88.issue-1
- Potowski, K. (2007). Characteristics of the Spanish grammar and sociolinguistic proficiency of dual immersion graduates. *Spanish in Context*, 4(2), 187-216.
- Poza, L. E. (2018). The language of ciencia: Translanguaging and learning in a bilingual science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Reyes, I., Da Silva Iddings, A. C., & Feller, N. (2016). Building relationships with diverse students and families: A funds of knowledge perspective. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 16(1), 8-33.
- Ribaeus, K., Enochsson, A. B., & Löfdahl Hultman, A. (2020). Student teachers' professional development: early practice and horizontal networks as ways to bridge the theory-practice gap. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 43(1), 2-16.
- Salazar, M. d. C. (2013). A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 121-148.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Sánchez, M. T., García, O., & Solorza, C. (2018). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(1), 37-51.
- Soltero-González, L., & Butvilofsky, S. (2016). The early Spanish and English writing development of simultaneous bilingual preschoolers. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 16(4), 473-497.
- Soltero-González, L., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2012). Changing teachers' perceptions about the writing abilities of emerging bilingual students: Towards a holistic bilingual perspective on writing assessment. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 71-94.
- Soltero-González, L., Sparrow, W., Butvilofsky, S., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2016). Effects of a paired literacy program on emerging bilingual children's biliteracy outcomes in third grade. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 48(1), 80–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16653842>

BUILDING ON LINGUISTIC ASSETS

- Sparrow, W., Butvilofsky, S., Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., & Tolento, T. (2014). Examining the longitudinal biliterate trajectory of emerging bilingual learners in a paired literacy instructional model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 24–42.
- Sparrow, W., Schepers, O. C., & Escamilla, K. (2021). A six year trajectory toward better biliteracy: Results of a paired literacy program for emerging bilingual students. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1-18.
- Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 388-412.
- Valenzuela, A. (Ed.). (2016). *Growing critically conscious teachers: A social justice curriculum for educators of Latino/a youth*. Teachers College Press.
- Vanassche, E. and Keltcherman, G. (2015). The state of art in self-study of teacher education practices: A systematic review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 47 (4), 508-528
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 6-23.
- Williams, C. (1994). Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
- Williams, C., & Lowrance-Faulhaber, E. (2018). Writing in young bilingual children: Review of research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 42, 58-69.
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications* (6th ed.). SAGE.
- 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.
- Zúñiga, C. E. (2016). Between language as problem and resource: Examining teachers' language orientations in dual-language programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 339-353.