

**From Language Ideology to Practice: Teachers' Navigation of Language Ideologies in a
Bilingual Community Education Center**

by

Maya Antonio

December 2023

This senior thesis was submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Bachelor of Arts Degree

Department of Linguistics
Haverford College

Professor Brook Lillehaugen, Linguistics, Advisor

Abstract

Teachers' beliefs about language influence their ability to support linguistically diverse groups of students in utilizing all of their languages, "which may in turn affect students' behavior, motivation, and achievement" (Lew & Siffrin 2019:378). Understanding how teachers are navigating dominant beliefs about language as well as the language policies they are operating under (e.g., school, program, etc.) can help them better support linguistically diverse classrooms through their teaching practices (Wright et. al 2015; Lippi-Green 2011; Henderson 2017). However, while there is a plethora of scholarship on bilingual education, including teachers' language ideologies, in formal schooling contexts, García et. al (2012:4) assert that there has been scarce scholarship on bilingual community education contexts. I help fill this gap by investigating the language ideologies of three teachers in a Latinx bilingual community education center and how their ideologies are (or are not) reflected in their teaching practices. Through an analysis of interviews with and observations of the participants, I find that they possessed a diverse range of ideologies and teaching practices shaped by their identities, past experiences, and current teaching context. Ideological tension, which often manifested in teaching practices contradictory to their beliefs, emerged as teachers' language ideologies conflicted with other priorities in their teaching, particularly a desire to be responsive to students. I find that the increased linguistic and pedagogical freedom of the community center, particularly the opportunity to engage in co-teaching, facilitated opportunities for reflection that helped teachers work through these tensions and develop ideological clarity.

Acknowledgments

This thesis wouldn't have been possible without all of the wonderful people who have supported me throughout this process with their feedback, encouragement, and advice. I would like to first thank my thesis advisor Professor Brook Lillehaugen whose support, both academically and personally, was invaluable to me in writing this thesis and throughout my time in the Linguistics department. Thank you for always believing in me. Thank you to Professor Fuller Medina for your help in sparking my interest in educational linguistics and for your constructive comments on my drafts. Thank you to Nada, my writing partner, for all of your support, both in the writing process and in helping me combat procrastination. Thank you to Alexa, my peer reviewer, for all of your thoughtful and detailed feedback on my drafts. I'd also like to thank my family and friends for sustaining and encouraging me throughout this process. Special thanks to Jacob for your affirmation, support, and willingness to be my thesis accountability buddy, as well as to Juno for all of those late-night work sessions in Park. Finally, thank you to the three teachers who participated in this study; it was a joy working with you, and I thank you for your time and for your willingness to share your stories, passions, challenges, and aspirations.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	5
2 Background	6
2.1 Language Ideologies	6
2.2 Language Ideologies in Education	7
2.2.1 Monoglossic/assimilationist Ideologies	8
2.2.2 Standard Language Ideology	9
2.2.3 Heteroglossic/pluralist Ideologies	10
2.2.4 Translanguaging	11
2.2.6 Raciolinguistic Ideologies	12
2.3 A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the U.S.	13
2.4 Bilingual Community Education	15
3 Methods	16
3.1 Research Questions	16
3.2 Data Collection	17
3.2.2 Participant Recruitment	17
3.2.3 Interview and Observation Procedures	18
3.4 Data Analysis	19
4 Results	20
4.1 Sofia	21
4.1.1 Articulated Language Ideologies	21
4.1.2 Articulated Influences on Language Ideologies	27
4.1.3 Embodied Language Ideologies	28
4.2 Luna	31
4.2.1 Articulated Language Ideologies	31
4.2.2 Articulated Influences on Language Ideologies	34
4.2.3 Embodied Language Ideologies	36
4.3 Andrea	37
4.3.1 Articulated Language Ideologies	38
4.3.2 Articulated Influences on Language Ideologies	43
4.3.3 Embodied Language Ideologies	44

5 Discussion	45
5.1 Transgressing Standard Language Ideologies	47
5.2 Responsiveness to Students	48
5.3 Languagelessness Discourse	49
5.4 The Bilingual Community Education Context	50
5.5 Co-teaching Dynamics	52
6 Conclusion	54
References	56

1 Introduction

Teachers' beliefs about language influence their ability to support bilingual, multilingual, and linguistically diverse groups of students in allowing them to utilize all of their languages, "which may in turn affect students' behavior, motivation, and achievement" (Lew & Siffrin 2019:378). Scholars and educators such as Alim (2005) have called for increased consciousness about and criticality around language attitudes/ideologies to value all students' languages and to equip students with the ability to challenge linguistic hegemony. This is no easy task, however. Henderson (2017) shows that destabilizing hegemonic language ideologies is a serious challenge within school contexts, even within seemingly more progressive programs such as dual language bilingual education. Despite efforts to better support linguistically diverse student populations, non-standard language varieties continue to be marginalized as teachers remain resistant to revising their teaching practices or ignorant, continuing to teach the way they themselves were taught (Weaver 2019; García 2012). Understanding how teachers are navigating dominant beliefs about language as well as the multiple levels of language policy that may be at play (e.g., school, district, etc.) can help them better support linguistically diverse classrooms through their teaching practices (Wright et. al 2015; Lippi-Green 2011; Henderson 2017). This issue may not be just a matter of what teachers believe to be the best practice but also of what they feel is feasible/practical given societal expectations and the language policies they are operating under, potentially resulting in a gap between their held beliefs about language and the kinds of beliefs they're communicating through their teaching.

In this thesis, I investigate the language beliefs of three teachers in a Latinx, bilingual community education center in a large suburban city on the East Coast and how these beliefs are reflected in their use of language in their teaching. I find that the participants possessed a diverse

range of ideologies and classroom language use shaped by their identities, past experiences, and current teaching context. Ideological tension, which often manifested in teaching practices contradictory to their beliefs, emerged as teachers' language ideologies conflicted with other priorities in their teaching, particularly a desire to be responsive to students. I find that the increased linguistic and pedagogical freedom of this community center, particularly the opportunity to engage in co-teaching, helped teachers work through these tensions and develop ideological clarity.

Section 2 explores the theoretical underpinnings of my work, including the relationships between language and identity (§2). Section 3 introduces my methods of data collection and analysis (§3). Section 4 describes my findings, exploring each participant's articulated language ideologies and how these beliefs are (or are not) reflected in their teaching practices and classroom language use (§4). Section 5 discusses overarching themes that emerged across participants (§5). Finally, I describe key takeaways, explain the limitations of this study, and offer potential avenues for further research (§6).

2 Background

In this section I provide an overview of language ideologies, explore a few prominent language ideologies in bilingual education, give a brief history of bilingual education in the United States, and define the bilingual community education context.

2.1 Language Ideologies

I draw upon Weaver's (2019:42) definition of language ideologies as complex, ever-evolving, socially constructed sets of beliefs about language that seek to elevate some language varieties (and thus their speakers) while devaluing others. Language ideologies represent what Errington (2001: 110) describes as expressed or embodied "partially successful"

attempts to rationalize language use, and he asserts that there are many rationalizations, which are dependent on the speaker's context and sociocultural experience. Language ideologies can either rationalize or counter hegemony, and speakers' language beliefs are shaped by their experience as actors within systems of power (Kroskrity 2016). Interestingly, these multiple and sometimes contradictory language ideologies often go unrecognized, but this does not negate the critical importance of people's awareness or lack thereof of their language beliefs (Kroskrity 2004; 2016). These latent beliefs about language become particularly significant in the context of education. Teachers consciously and subconsciously communicate language ideologies through multiple aspects of the classroom experience including the curriculum, their pedagogy, and their modeling of language use, in turn influencing the language beliefs their students hold (Metz 2021).

2.2 Language Ideologies in Education

Teachers, like all language users, may or may not be aware of their language ideologies. Nevertheless, teachers' language ideologies can be implicitly communicated through their teaching which in turn affects the classroom experience (Lew & Siffrin 2019). For example, teachers' language ideologies mediate the language policies they are negotiating through content/curricula, syllabi, and the ways teachers interact and communicate with students (Henderson 2017; Lew & Siffrin 2019). My thesis focuses on the latter because although there is growing scholarship on teaching language variation in schools, there is limited research exploring how language is being used by teachers (Metz 2021:2). It is important to consider not only what teachers are explicitly teaching and saying about language, but also how they're implicitly communicating their beliefs in their usage and modeling of language.

Language ideologies in education have been categorized in a variety of ways under a range of different names including monoglossic, heteroglossic, assimilationist, pluralist, etc. (Wright et al. 2015; Henderson 2017; de Jong 2011). Although each categorization holds its particular nuance, I synthesize these ways of organizing prominent language ideologies in education into three main categories to highlight the similarities across the ideologies that fall within each group:

1. Monoglossic/assimilationist, which includes SLI
2. Heteroglossic/pluralist, which includes translanguaging
3. Critical Language Awareness, which is related to raciolinguistic ideologies

These language attitudes range on a spectrum of less to more accepting of linguistic diversity as well as on a spectrum of less to more critical/power-conscious. The following subsections will detail the language ideologies listed above with a focus on their relevance to bilingual education.

2.2.1 Monoglossic/assimilationist Ideologies

De Jong (2011:101) argues that under assimilationist ideologies, linguistic diversity is “a hindrance and threat” to the formation of a unified national identity, making monolingualism the “desired norm.” Monoglossic/assimilationist ideologies also view language as decontextualized systems and see bilingualism as a form of dual monolingualism in which each language is a discrete entity (Henderson 2017). Monoglossic and assimilationist ideologies manifest in multiple different ways throughout the education system. One manifestation is restrictive English-only policies in programs for English language learners, programs which Menken (2013) argues marginalize emergent bilingual students, hinder them from utilizing the full value of their bilingualism, and limit their future opportunities. Even when educational programs for bilingual

students incorporate both of a student's languages, García and Kleifgen (2018) assert that many are shaped by a monoglossic ideology, leading to a strict separation of languages, such as in programs where one language is exclusively used on alternate days. Perhaps most significantly, monoglossic/assimilationist ideologies define bilingualism through a deficit mindset, ignoring the value and function of bilingualism. Current conceptions of bilingualism, especially in the context of U.S. schools, are largely based on linguistic deficits—the language skills/practices that bilinguals supposedly lack (Callesano 2023).

2.2.2 Standard Language Ideology

Assimilationist ideologies emphasize the importance of having one standard national language to maintain unity and prosperity (de Jong 2011), and in the United States, this is English, particularly Standardized American English (SAE). SAE is the most privileged language variety in the U.S., and this privilege is justified through Standard Language Ideology (SLI) (Weaver 2019:43). SAE is not a static, clearly defined language variant but rather a continually socially constructed and “idealized” form. To ensure students can be successful in a world where standardized language forms (not just SAE) are seen as superior, many teachers teach to SLI, demonstrating “a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions” that is modeled after the language practices of the white and upper-middle class, even if they do not necessarily fully agree with it (Lippi-Green 2011:67). SLI's bias towards white, middle-class language practices reveals the ties between language and other social categories such as race.

This same bias exists towards the academic version of SAE, academic English (González 2008). Many teachers see academic English as a list of empirical linguistic practices entirely distinct from non-academic or non-standardized language even though they share the same basic

linguistic features (Flores 2020; González 2008). Under SLI, academic English is perceived to be superior to multilingual students' home languages and necessary for "effective participation in society" because of its status as the dominant language in government, schooling, and other aspects of public life (de Jong 2011). The dominance of these beliefs holds particular significance for the growing number of linguistically diverse classrooms in which many students speak marginalized languages or varieties of English. Academic achievement is often made dependent on students' fluency in standard, academic English (Davis 2023). Academic English or SAE is considered the 'best' form of language and is believed to be the form schools should concentrate on developing in students in bilingual education programs, rather than attending to their heritage language (González 2008).

2.2.3 Heteroglossic/pluralist Ideologies

Heteroglossic/pluralist ideologies reject the monoglossic/assimilationist prizing of monolingualism and understanding of languages as separate, decontextualized systems. De Jong (2011) defines pluralist ideologies as those that frame linguistic diversity as the norm and as worth sustaining for the good of society. Heteroglossic ideologies also recognize that language is context-dependent and that it indexes or points to one's social position (Henderson 2017; Blackledge & Creese 2019). In educational contexts, heteroglossic/pluralist ideologies encourage the use of one's full linguistic repertoire and view people's language practices as social, dynamic, and fluid (Flores & Rosa 2015). Heteroglossic teaching practices attempt to leverage students' home language practices as much as possible, rather than trying to use and get students to use exclusively "appropriate English" in the classroom (García and Kleifgen 2018:77). One emergent heteroglossic language ideology is translanguaging, which Alvarez & Alvarez (2016) assert recognizes students' fluid movements across and between languages.

2.2.4 Translanguaging

The term *translanguaging* was originally coined by Cen Williams in 1994 and popularized in part by Baker's (2001) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (Lewis et al. 2012). Baker (2011:288) defines translanguaging as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages." This term initially aimed to challenge the idea that bilinguals' (and by extension multilinguals') languages exist as distinct and separate systems that are deployed in close succession, resulting in a process called "code-switching," but translanguaging instead ended up becoming synonymous with code-switching (Otheguy et al. 2015). To ensure a distinction from the code-switching interpretation of translanguaging, I use Otheguy et al.'s (2015:283) definition of translanguaging as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages." From a translanguaging perspective, when bilinguals appear to code-switch or mix two different, distinct linguistic systems, what they are actually doing is selecting features from the same, unified linguistic repertoire. Translanguaging posits that there is no "switch" to code-switching as that implies that bilinguals have two separate, bounded linguistic systems. García et al. (2017) identify three interrelated components of a translanguaging pedagogy: stance, design, and shifts. Teachers who engage in translanguaging pedagogy adopt a translanguaging ideology (stance), create lesson plans that have students utilize and build on the ways they move fluidly through their linguistic repertoire (design), and are able and willing to change things to engage and encourage students' translanguaging (shifts).

2.2.5 Critical Language Awareness

CLA or Critical Multilingual Language Awareness calls for not just the incorporation of students' multilingualism into the classroom but also opportunities for students to critique and actively challenge the current systems of power that delegitimize some languages while privileging others (Alim 2005). Within education, CLA programs develop and deepen "students' understandings of the social, political, and economic struggles surrounding the use of many languages" (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018:84). CLA can be viewed as a power-conscious extension of heteroglossic ideologies in that it is accepting of multilingualism while also considering the intersectionality between language and other axes of identity. Under CLA, language is understood as "socially constructed, and thus socially changeable," and students are encouraged to engage in language activism—challenging and changing the ways language is currently used and understood (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018:84).

2.2.6 Raciolinguistic Ideologies

Closely tied with CLA are raciolinguistic ideologies, which CLA seeks to work against. Flores and Rosa (2015:150) consider the role race plays in how speakers' language practices are perceived in their conception of raciolinguistic ideologies, which "conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices." Thus, even when speaking in language variants with more social value, people of color's linguistic practices are still racialized and perceived as deviant/inferior. Flores (2020) argues that raciolinguistic ideologies also manifest in education through an emphasis on academic language, which frames the home languages of students of color as inherently deficient and in need of remediation and modification through education. Raciolinguistic ideologies also include languagelessness, which Rosa (2019) defines as an ideology that frames racialized bilinguals as incapable of producing legitimate speech in either language. Rosa and Flores (2017) assert that a raciolinguistic

perspective theorizes that language and race have been co-naturalized—socially constructed to work in tandem to support colonialism and white supremacy—and seeks not to change the language practices of communities of color but rather to dismantle colonialism and white supremacy. From a raciolinguistic perspective, encouraging multilingual students to code-switch or giving them access to the dominant language variety is not enough to address the racism that undergirds linguistic hegemony.

2.3 A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the U.S.

Over time, policies and dominant beliefs in the U.S. around multilingual students' rights to a multilingual education have shifted. Although early German communities in the U.S. established their own bilingual schools in the 18th and 19th centuries, the xenophobic sentiment of the early 1900s prohibited the further growth of bilingual schools and education (García 2009). By 1923, 34 of the then 48 U.S. states had laws requiring that the sole language of instruction be English, but Supreme Court decisions in the 1920s, including *Meyer vs. Nebraska*, set a precedent for “affirming the right of citizens to learn and teach their language of preference” (García et al. 2012; Nieto 2009:63). The Supreme Court's more tolerable attitude and the rise of ‘cultural pluralism’ led to the establishment of educational programs by ethnolinguistic communities (García 2009).

In the 1960s, the population of ethnolinguistic communities drastically increased, and given the inaccessibility of education for low-income, non-English-speaking students, Congress passed the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (BEA), otherwise known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Nieto 2009; Wiese & García 1998). BEA offered funding to school districts to develop and implement programs designed for non-English-speaking communities, but it notably did not recommend any particular program of instruction, including

specifying the role of students' native language(s) in instruction (Wiese & García 1998). At the same time, many ethnolinguistic communities and organizations, including the United Latin American Citizens and Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, were fighting for recognition of the cultural and linguistic differences between their communities and those of the 'Anglo-white' mainstream (Nieto 2009). One way this manifested was through the further development of bilingual education programs, with the English-Spanish bilingual program established at Coral Way Elementary School marking the beginning of the "renaissance" of bilingual education in the second half of the 1900s (García et al. 2012:6).

In 1974, the BEA was amended, drawing explicit connections between equal access to educational opportunity and bilingual education, including the usage of a student's native language (Wiese & García 1998). However, while the 1974 BEA did acknowledge the value of a student's native language, it did so by restricting bilingualism to a "transitional goal" in public schools, a means by which to acquire English proficiency (García et al. 2012:7). The significance of bilingual education to ensuring equal opportunity for non-English-speaking students was reinforced in a Supreme Court case decision that same year. In *Lau v. Nichols*, the Court ruled that putting non-English-speaking children in English-speaking classrooms was to provide them with unequal access to education (McGroarty 1992). This decision was made based on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, ruling that language minority status could also be a claim for discrimination (Wiese & García 1998).

Bilingual education faced growing public opposition with the rise of the Official English movement and U.S. Education. Spearheaded by Senator Samuel Hayakawa, the movement attempted to restrict the use of non-English languages, particularly as it related to multilingual education, as well as introduce laws to make English the official language of the U.S. (García et

al. 2012). Although these attempts at the federal level were later abandoned, the Official English movement persisted at the state level (García et al. 2012). In 2002, the Bilingual Education Act was replaced by Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, marking a shift towards English-focused language policy (Johnson 2010). Title III did not ban bilingual education programs, but it did promote English-only instruction through its high-stakes, standardized testing system (Nieto 2009). The assimilationist and monoglossic ideologies behind the Official English movement and Title III have persisted. As of 2016, 32 U.S. states had passed legislation making English the official language (Rosa 2019).

2.4 Bilingual Community Education

Public U.S. bilingual education is dominated by ideologies that rationalize the superiority of white speaking practices, but what about other educational contexts? Do these language ideologies have the same hold? I contribute to the body of literature exploring schoolteachers' language ideologies and language usage by adding data from a different educational context, that of a bilingual community education center. García et. al (2012:3-4) define bilingual community education as “educational spaces shaped and organized by American ethnolinguistic communities for their children,” which develop the community’s bilingualism, not just the maintenance of their home language. The particular bilingual community education context I conducted my data collection in is a Spanish-English bilingual community center in the North East United States created by and for the local Latinx community. The center, which I’ll refer to as Centro Comunitario de Educación (CCE) in this thesis, provides programming for youth and adults around education, culture, the arts, and participatory research. My focus is specifically on teachers of their middle and high school programming. My choice to explore teachers’ language

ideologies and language use in the classroom in a bilingual community education context as opposed to a school/classroom context is significant for two main reasons:

1. García et. al (2012) assert that there has been scarce scholarship around the existence of bilingual community education efforts, including how they have progressed beyond schools' understanding and implementation of bilingual education. I contribute to closing this gap in the literature by adding data on teachers' negotiation of language ideologies in a bilingual community education context.
2. García et. al (2012) also argue that bilingual programs in schools can learn from the strategies employed in bilingual community education contexts. Exploring how bilingual community education teachers are navigating language ideologies and how that is reflected in their teaching practice could provide insight into how to better support the ideological clarity of not just bilingual community education teachers but also those in school contexts.

3 Methods

This study explores the language ideologies, language use/ teaching practices, and sense of ideological clarity of three teachers at a bilingual community education center through two data sources. Teachers' articulated and embodied beliefs were analyzed through interviews and observations of their teaching.

3.1 Research Questions

To investigate the articulated and embodied language ideologies of teachers in bilingual community education settings, this study asks the following research questions:

1. What salient language ideologies are bilingual community education teachers negotiating within themselves and the larger teaching context?

2. How are bilingual community education teachers' expressed beliefs about language reflected in (or contradicted by) their language use in their teaching?
3. What contributes to how prepared bilingual community education teachers feel to support linguistically diverse groups of students? What contributes to their sense of ideological clarity or lack thereof?

3.2 Data Collection

Inspired by works such as Henderson (2017) and Metz (2021) that use data from interviews and observations to compare schoolteachers' expressed beliefs about language to the beliefs reflected in their teaching, my thesis research is a pilot study that uses some of the same data collection methods, namely transcripts and video recordings of participant interviews, classroom artifacts (e.g., handouts, presentation slides, etc.) and my field notes from observing participants' teaching, to explore bilingual community education teachers' language ideologies and language use.

3.2.2 Participant Recruitment

My study participants include three teachers who teach afterschool youth programming at CCE. For my thesis, I reached out to one of the CCE coordinators and asked if she could put me in touch with anyone at CCE who:

1. Is a bilingual teacher
2. Would be teaching bilingual community education programming to youth (aged K-12) during Summer 2023 and/or Fall 2023

And who would be willing to:

3. Be interviewed twice and to have those interviews be recorded and transcribed
4. Have their teaching observed and have notes taken on it for approximately 4-6 hours each

The program coordinator identified three people who fit my recruitment criteria, and I introduced myself, shared a description of the project and a consent form (adapted from Cornell University's Social and Behavioral Research Projects General Consent Form Template), offered to answer any questions they had, and asked if they would be willing to participate. All three agreed.

Criterion (2) included availability in both the summer and fall as I hoped to begin conducting observations in the summer and to finish in the fall. However, since CCE was not conducting any programming in August when I had availability, I instead only conducted an initial interview with each participant in the summer. All observations and the second round of interviews took place in the fall. After the first observation visit, it soon became apparent that the timeframe required for this project would not be enough time to collect and analyze as much data as I originally articulated in Criterion (4). Instead, each teacher was observed from between 1 and 4.5 hours.

3.2.3 Interview and Observation Procedures

For the pre-observation interview, the goal was to elicit data on teachers' identities/positionalities, their expressed beliefs/ideologies around language, and the experiences that have influenced these language ideologies. Questions asked them to share their background/experience in teaching, their beliefs around language and how they feel those are reflected in their teaching, and what experiences they feel have influenced their language beliefs/ideologies. If needed, elicitation of more specific examples of what the participant was sharing was encouraged through questions such as, "Can you tell me about a time when...?" and "Can you give me an example of when you...?" People's beliefs about language are often complex and may conflict/contradict one another, so participants were encouraged to share

anecdotes/“small stories,” as focusing on narratives can help expose ideological nuance (Taylor et al. 2018). Additionally, having specific examples of how participants believe they are thinking about and using language makes it easier to compare their expressed beliefs with their observed practices.

Within the classroom, data collection involved physically visiting CCE on three separate days for a total of approximately 4.5 hours. Building on Henderson (2017), my data collection methods include taking field notes on participants’ language use and behavior and obtaining relevant classroom artifacts such as assignments, handouts, presentation slides, etc. Taking into account classroom artifacts allows me to gain insight into how teachers are expressing/using written language in the classroom, not just spoken language. They also allow me to gain a fuller sense of the context of utterances to better make sense of how participants are using language.

3.4 Data Analysis

After interviews and observations had concluded, I conducted a more in-depth analysis of interview transcripts and field notes. Transcripts were initially generated by Zoom and corrected by me with the aid of the corresponding video recording before I proceeded with the coding of the data. All transcripts were anonymized and video recordings were deleted after the project ended to preserve privacy. My analysis draws on principles and tools from discourse analysis to consider the meaning of utterances both within the context of the interaction/conversation as well as within larger societal discourses around language (Gee 2010). I used a combination of deductive and inductive coding. Deductive coding was used to develop the overarching categories of codes based on the language ideologies identified in Section 2.3 as well as used to determine where inductively derived codes fell within those categories. From there I compared data across my source types to identify larger/overarching patterns.

4 Results

In this section, I explore the language ideologies and teaching practices of Sofia, Luna, and Andrea, three part-time teachers of bilingual youth programming at CCE. For each teacher, I begin by briefly describing their background and current position to help contextualize their roles as teachers at CCE. I then share each participant's language ideologies as expressed in their interview responses. For the ease of the reader, all self-corrections and hesitations (i.e., "uhs, ums, like, well, etc.") have been removed from quoted transcript excerpts unless they were relevant to the content, such as in cases of dilemma or uncertainty. Pseudonyms have been used for the participants themselves as well as all people and places that participants mentioned in their interviews. Additionally, I explore how each teacher felt their identities, experiences, and/or teaching contexts shaped their language ideologies. Finally, I present each teacher's actual or embodied practices to analyze how, as well as the extent to which, their language ideologies were reflected in their teaching practices.

I find that each teacher occupied a different point on the ideological spectrum and engaged in a unique set of language and teaching practices within the classroom. Each teacher also saw language as serving different functions, including a connection to culture and community as well as a way to challenge dominant language ideologies. The teachers' embodied language ideologies generally reflected the ones they articulated in their interviews, except in cases where embodying their language beliefs would hinder their ability to be responsive to students. Teaching in a bilingual community education center that they felt aligned with their language ideologies and which allowed them linguistic and pedagogical freedom gave the teachers the necessary space to reflect on and experiment with their understandings and use of

language. In particular, the kinds of collaborative co-teaching that teachers at CCE engaged in seem to present the potential for developing teachers' ideological clarity.

4.1 Sofia

Sofia self-identified as an English language learner in her youth as well as an activist and teacher. In college in the United States, Sofia majored in Russian Studies and Linguistics and went on to pursue her master's in Russian Studies. While working towards her master's, she regularly volunteered in spaces for mostly Latinx, bilingual youth and got a job as a middle school tutor in dual language bilingual education classrooms. Realizing she wanted to become a teacher, she got a bilingual teaching certification and began working as a bilingual teacher of kindergarten and later second-grade students before returning to school for her PhD. At the time of the study, she was in her second year of pursuing a PhD in Educational Linguistics with a specialty in race and language at a nearby higher education institution. She was first introduced to CCE through one of her professors, who felt she might be interested in participating in some of the center's meetings. She fell in love with the center and the openness of the community right away and volunteered there for a little under a year before becoming a part-time employee. At CCE, she taught a youth participatory action research (YPAR) class, co-taught the High School Group with Luna and another staff member, as well as served as a Senior Counselor for students.

4.1.1 Articulated Language Ideologies

In her interviews, Sofia's responses indicated, explicitly named, and in some aspects even went beyond a translanguaging language ideology. Sofia often voiced disagreement with or a lack of belief in many traditional, assimilationist theories or perceptions of language and how to educate multilingual students, including the value of academic language and notions of appropriateness. Her understandings of language centered around the idea that language and how

it is characterized—whether that be the boundaries between languages or the existence of a clearly defined academic variant of a language and its higher value relative to other variants—is socially constructed. Sofia believed in the power of language to be a tool for communication and reflecting one’s identity but also noted the way language is an equity issue; language has been weaponized to justify the marginalization of speakers of non-standard variants.

Sofia believed that teachers have a significant impact on students in what they model and communicate to students. Recognizing that this applies to her language use as well, she tried to be more conscious about what she was communicating in the classroom. Sofia believed that as a teacher, “every single thing you do is a model for the kids,” even older students like the high schoolers that she was then teaching. For her, this meant ensuring that she was her most authentic self: “I’m going to give myself the space to be who I am linguistically and not try to model a perfect Spanish or a perfect English that doesn’t exist. I’m gonna use contractions and I’m gonna use made-up Spanish words.” Sofia believed in total linguistic freedom, which meant challenging SLI (the idea of “perfect” language) and ideologies around appropriateness (e.g., that informal language like contractions or made-up words shouldn’t be used in educational settings). By engaging in her authentic language practices, she hoped students would feel comfortable doing the same.

Sofia believed in the importance of validating students’ language practices also through acknowledging the lack of empirical support for the superiority of one language variant over another. When asked whether she had any expectations for how her students should use language, Sofia responded that rather than hold expectations, she wanted to teach her students to be able to break free from expectations and ideologies around appropriateness. Sofia shared:

Whatever we say is academic language, we made that up. Whatever we say is Spanish, we made that up. Whatever we say is Spanglish, we decided that. None

of it means anything, right? Because you speak Spanglish doesn't mean you're less than somebody who speaks academic Spanish, because those are all made-up things. [...] If you sat down to think about it, there's not that much that differentiates it, and it's still an impressive cognitive skill.

Sofia saw the boundaries between named languages as arbitrary and socially constructed. Under this belief, judgments about someone's worth based on what languages they do or don't speak are baseless. Although many teachers believe academic language can be linguistically defined as distinct from other variants, there is no clear consensus on what actually constitutes academic language, and Sofia believed this applies to all named language variants, not just academic language (Flores 2020). Sofia argued that linguistic variation is not only normal and natural but also functional; she believed that communicating in any language requires a large amount of cognitive skill.

Part of why Sofia felt drawn to work at CCE was because of their values around supporting students' authentic language practices. Although García et al. (2012) position bilingual community education spaces as being more progressive and transformative than public U.S. bilingual education, Sofia felt that CCE was more unique in this regard because some bilingual afterschool programs still adhere to more monoglossic language ideologies. She said that in some of these programs,

you're using the lesson plans that are like, "Oh, the Spanglish word is *troca* [truck], but remember, it's not actually *troca*, it's *camioneta* [truck]. You have to learn the actual..." But that's a load of fucking barnacles, you know? [...] So there are afterschool programs that do have that sort of ideology around, "Okay, yeah, we'll accept Spanish and English, but [...] there's appropriate academic Spanish that we're trying to enforce. [At CCE] we're not really encouraging kids to Spanglish or anything. We're not encouraging them to translanguage within sentences. That's kind of weird. Nobody's going to understand what they're saying. [...] Then there's places like CCE where it's just a free-for-all, right, and that's the way it should be, the way it is in real life, the way people actually, really, truly play with language in the real world.

Many of Sofia's responses in the interview come back to this idea of creating educational spaces that are encouraging and reflective of how students are already using language, rather than enforcing what she feels to be a prescriptive and artificial expectation for how students should be speaking. While Sofia is accepting of Spanglish and code-switching, forms of language that are deemed lesser under SLI, she doesn't believe in encouraging students to engage in these practices unless they're already doing so.

Sofia's determination to not impose value judgments around how students should be using language also extends to her thoughts on telling students how to think about their language use. For example, when Sofia was a schoolteacher in a bilingual school, she was often asked to go out of her way to protect and prioritize Spanish. Sofia shared her frustration at that experience:

I freaking hated it at my school. In my school district, it'd be like, "Spanish is a total minoritized language! We gotta protect Spanish!" And at the end of the day, these are both colonized languages. These are not anybody's [languages]. If we had been left alone, we wouldn't be in that situation. [...] [These kids]'ve grown up in a world where both of their languages are not fully theirs in different contexts. It's important to [...] not elevate one over the other, or think of one as at risk, because that's not the way they're viewing their language, right? That would be me imposing my ideas about what language is minoritized.

In this excerpt, Sofia references the idea of languagelessness in describing how her students have been racialized as incapable of producing legitimate speech in both Spanish and English (Rosa 2019). Sofia herself shared that she grew up feeling insecure about her bilingualism, feeling like her English wasn't good enough at school but her Spanish wasn't good enough at home. She recognized that this ideology has shaped how she and her students think about their bilingualism and thus feels it's important not to communicate value or risk judgments about language, because most of them aren't viewing language that way, similar to her. Sofia also implicitly challenged

the idea that Spanish fluency is essential to Latinx identity by arguing that because Spanish is a colonized language, it's "not anybody's."

Sofia's openness to language variation often conflicted with the values of the schools she used to teach at. This included not just about whether to "protect" Spanish. Sofia took issue with many of the constraints placed on her and other bilingual schoolteachers. One example is the "time-determined" language allocation strategy (García & Kleifgen 2018:75), which forces teachers to use exclusively one language during half the day or on alternate days/weeks. Sofia struggled with the question of how bilingual teachers should be thinking about and using language because she experienced and saw the way that teachers are not supported in this process. At the time of the study, she had only just left teaching in the school system earlier that summer, so it was still at the forefront of their mind:

Maybe a few years down the line, I will be able to come up with a professional development that I think is helpful for teachers. But right now I'm having a lot of dilemma around what is actually possible for teachers, right? Like what space they are given to just be and what supports they are given.

While studies have shown that teachers can mediate higher-level language policies as well as engage in their own classroom-level language policy creation to support multilingual students, Sofia argued that this is not the norm (Johnson 2010; Henderson 2017); schoolteachers often have very little agency in advancing more progressive language ideologies in their classrooms because of external constraints. Defying or attempting to appropriate policies set by the district or school could cost them their jobs. Sofia shared that her schools' administrations often weaponized teachers' lack of access to the most up-to-date literature on pedagogical practices and bilingual students' development to convince them to stick with ineffective teaching practices or with ones that conflicted with their beliefs. Sofia also cited the excessive labor that many

teachers have to take on as a reason for why teachers may struggle to reflect on their language ideologies and what ideas about language are being communicated in the classroom:

Teachers in schools don't even have time to think about these things sometimes, because they're tasked with so much of a cognitive, emotional, physical load, and so you know the whole point of me going into a PhD program and studying this is so I could take some of that load off, right, and provide resources that would allow you to refocus some of the ideals that bilingual teachers have.

While teachers' language ideologies do affect their ability to support linguistically diverse students by validating and utilizing their linguistic repertoires, Sofia argued that the focus on creating more linguistically progressive spaces should be centered on the actors who implement higher-level (e.g., state, district, and school) language policies, rather than on teachers, who she felt have the least agency in this situation (Lew & Siffrin 2019).

Also at play is what content teachers are teaching. Sofia shared that part of her role at CCE is helping students prepare for college. Recognizing that in filling out college applications, students were being asked to meet certain expectations of language use, Sofia said that she would speak with students about “the way that language can be used against us.” College application essays have to be written such that a monolingual English speaker could understand them, but Sofia also described additional expectations students were expected to conform to, such as

the way that we're being asked to be perceived, asked to present ourselves with certain language. Like there's [a] certain language of applications, language of college essays that we have talked about. [...] But yeah, the power around language and the sort of systemic industries that are created to view us in this way or ask us to present ourselves in this way.

Sofia recognized not just the monolingual expectations of college applications but also the more performative ones and how those often disadvantage the students who attend CCE, the vast majority of whom are not monolingual English speakers and who will have to contend with structures and systems designed for white, wealthy students.

4.1.2 Articulated Influences on Language Ideologies

Throughout her interviews, Sofia referenced and explicitly named language ideologies, theories around educating bilingual students, and prominent scholars/works in the multilingual education field, likely because of her formal training in linguistics as an undergrad and as a then-current doctoral student. However, language had been an important part of who Sofia was even before she began attending higher education. Sofia shared that her language ideologies were shaped predominantly by her experiences growing up as an English language learner—what she described as “a lifetime of feeling inappropriate or feeling insecure—feeling illegitimate in many ways regarding my language use.” The insecurity that resulted from the expectations around her language fluency in the many different spheres of their life, including home, public school, and higher education ultimately led her to a choice of whether she was going to enforce those same expectations and ideologies onto her students when she became a bilingual teacher:

As a bilingual teacher, having the choice there whether I was gonna enact these ideologies onto my students [...] that was kind of a pivotal moment for me in deciding, actually, no, I don't wanna do that. I want the world to be different and this is the first step.

Sofia’s approach to her language use and teaching practices has been guided by the choices she’s made to not recreate the kinds of negative experiences she had as an English language learner.

At the time of this study, Sofia was engaging in teaching both solo and as part of co-teaching teams, sharing responsibility with other teachers in planning and leading instruction. When describing her experience co-teaching, Sofia said, “I also am cognizant that not every one of my co-teachers has the same views on language that I do... I think everyone has different priorities.” For Sofia, co-teaching meant having to recognize and work through differences in beliefs about the use and purpose of language. As a solo teacher, she had more control over how she chose to embody her language ideologies. In co-teaching with Luna, specifically, Sofia

recognized that while they had different levels of training, both of them were making moves towards being more conscious of their language use and the impact it has on youth. Sofia shared: “[Luna’s] developing herself as a teacher at CCE as well. This is something that she's going to desarrollar [develop], right, as she goes forward.” Sofia was cognizant of and wanted to extend grace towards Luna, who was earlier in her ideological development process than Sofia. Rather than try to get Luna to think or act like her, in describing Luna’s current way of thinking about and using language, Sofia affirmed it as authentic to her and as a valuable reflection of the language practices of the local community.

4.1.3 Embodied Language Ideologies

I observed Sofia using both Spanish and English in both oral and written communication. When giving instructions, describing a concept, and creating her classroom materials, she almost always communicated the content both in English and Spanish. These attempts to use both languages roughly equally in all her modes of communication allowed students to engage with her language use however worked best for them (e.g., relying more on her communications in Spanish), reflecting her desire to recognize students’ different fluency and comfort levels with each language and to allow them the freedom to access the material however worked best for them. Sofia also switched up which language she fronted—i.e., which one was said or written first. For example, during her first YPAR class, Sofia had the class try to order a set of papers that each had a step of the research process. Each paper had a step written in Spanish and English (e.g., *Reunir con personas influyentes / Meet with influential people*), but some of the papers listed the English first while others listed the Spanish first. Her switching up which language she “fronted” was reflective of her desire to not impose an idea of how students should understand or

view their bilingualism. She wanted to be responsive to the fact that many of her students don't see their Spanish as at risk and in need of prioritization over English.

Sofia was observed to not expect or desire "correct" language from her students and to be genuinely interested in how students were navigating their bilingualism. For example, Sofia led an activity in which she hung pieces of poster paper around the room. On each paper was one of the words that make up YPAR, written in both Spanish and English. The class was asked to go up to each paper and write or draw what they associated with each word. While writing their responses, a student asked Sofia whether spelling matters, and she answered that spelling doesn't matter because she'll feel the meaning in her heart. A student also asked about Sofia's choice to use *investigación* as the Spanish equivalent for *research*. Sofia said she could see their point but felt that the English *investigation* is a kind of research too. After the students finished writing, Sofia had them discuss their responses. When she saw that one of the students wrote "stepping up to bullies" on the paper for Acción/Action, she asked the class, "How would you say *stepping up to bullies* in Spanish?" A student responded with, "Like, *defend yourself*?" Sofia said, "Oh, I see, *defenderos*." Rather than scolding the student for not responding in Spanish as she asked, Sofia affirmed and built upon their answer in Spanish. Sofia encouraged her students to utilize their full linguistic repertoires to reflect on the (dis)connections they felt between English and Spanish, never passing judgment on how students were navigating that.

When co-teaching the High School Group with Luna, I observed that Sofia seemed to speak more Spanish than she did when I observed her teaching solo. I confirmed with Sofia that this was a reaction to Luna's more frequent use of English. One moment I observed this happening was during a get-to-know-you activity they were leading. Before class, Sofia and Luna had written bilingual instructions for the activity and had planned to model it for students

in class. Luna, who was used to speaking in English with the High School Group, began the model speaking solely in English, and Sofia switched to mainly Spanish (as opposed to her typical half-and-half). Sofia recalled that moment: “I could see what she was doing. And I was like, agh, now I have to be the counterbalance here. That's not something I would normally do. That's something I had to do on the spot, right?” Sofia wanted to be clear that she was not judging Luna for her use of English as she recognized that as the older one and as someone who's had extensive education in both linguistics and education, she'd had a lot more time and opportunity to consider the impact of her language use. Co-teaching with and working alongside teachers who had different language beliefs and practices from her created an opportunity for Sofia to see her language use as flexible and able to adjust to who else was in the room.

Sofia's responsiveness to others in the room also affected her interactions with students. Very recently before our final interview together, Sofia had to navigate a moment of ideological tension in the classroom in real-time: what to do when the ways her students understand language, which she wants to recognize, conflict with her own beliefs around language. Sofia was working with a small group of students in the High School Group when she began speaking in Spanish to them:

And then one student goes, “Why are you speaking in Spanish?” And I was like, “What do you mean, ‘Why am I speaking Spanish?’” He's like, “I understand why you do that with the whole group, but none of us here only speak Spanish, so I don't know why.” And I was like, “What are you talking about? Yeah, none of you only speak Spanish because everyone in this whole building is bilingual. What do you mean? You all have some aspect of English and Spanish, whatever, and even more languages, some of you. So I don't- what do you mean?” He's like, “Yeah, but here, all of us here speak English, so you can just speak English.”

Sofia had never heard something like this from a student before and was taken aback and unsure of how to respond. This tension between what Sofia and her students desired from her language use was brought up again in that same class when another student asked if everyone could stick

to just one language because it was confusing that everyone kept switching back and forth. Sofia felt she couldn't ignore the fact that this student was confused, so she asked the class if they would be comfortable deciding on just one language to use for the rest of the class. This move could be seen as her compromising on her desire for linguistic freedom by making the space an exclusively monolingual one. However, this move could also be seen as an example of Sofia's flexibility in being responsive to students. The choice to shift to a monolingual space was shared between her and her students, not imposed on them by her, and it was done with the explicit intention of ensuring this student was included in the class.

4.2 Luna

Luna self-identified as Hispanic Latino. She grew up in Kettleby as an English language learner and regularly went to CCE as a child up until the latter half of middle school. At the time of this study, Luna was still living in Kettleby while in her fourth year pursuing an undergraduate degree in Early Education. About a year ago, she was asked by CCE to teach there part-time since she still lived in the area and the center knew she believed in its mission and values. The classes she led at the time of the study included an art class and the High School Group, the latter of which she co-taught with Sofia. She also served as a Senior Counselor and high school mentor.

4.2.1 Articulated Language Ideologies

Luna expressed a mix of assimilationist and pluralist language ideologies. Luna felt it was important that students had access to standard/academic language because of its association with professionalism and formality, but she did not demand that students use it with her or in her classes. This was likely because Luna wanted to build deeper connections with students by framing herself as more of a friend and mentor to the students, rather than a teacher, which to her

meant matching the way her students spoke, which was much more informally and typically in English. Luna's more pluralist beliefs related to her acceptance of the linguistic variation in her students and her encouragement of students' bilingualism.

Luna adhered to ideologies of appropriateness and SLI in her belief that it was important to "enforce" what she called "higher value" or "academic" language. While a lot of her students were fairly fluent in everyday English, Luna knew many of them were unfamiliar with "higher value" vocabulary. When asked how she would define "higher value" language, she said:

It's just the sense of knowing certain vocabulary, and how to have an academic, higher value conversation, rather than a normal conversation. [...] It would be like if you're at a school board meeting. You wouldn't just stand up and say, "Yo." You'd stand up and be like, "Oh, can I say something?" [...] There's certain, I guess, ways that you would speak. [...] I guess you could call them dialects in a way—not really—but it's a higher value conversation, higher academic-wise conversations, rather than a normal one-to-one conversation that you'd have with a friend, basically.

Luna's response played into notions of appropriateness and reflected a belief that academic language is a set of empirical linguistic practices entirely distinct from non-academic or non-standardized language (Flores 2020; González 2008). While Luna did say that she never requires certain language practices from students, she did believe in the importance of knowing and thus teaching academic language. Lew & Siffrin (2019) found a similar ideological trend among the English for Speakers of Other Languages pre-service teachers they studied, many of whom said they would promote linguistic diversity and help English learners to see the value in their languages but simultaneously emphasized the importance of teaching "correct" and "proper" language. Although Luna did not ascribe any notions of correctness to what she described as academic language, her choice of descriptor ("higher value") reflects the social prestige Luna saw academic language holding. Even when teachers believe that academic

language isn't objectively more correct, its social prestige often becomes equated with correctness because it is the language that is expected in academic, formal, and professional spaces (Metz & Knight 2021).

While Luna does appreciate when students choose to use their full linguistic repertoire in her classes, she believes more in creating environments in which students feel comfortable communicating with her however works best for them. In her initial interview, when asked about her expectations for how her students will speak in her classes, Luna said, the fact that the students will use both English and Spanish at the center is “a good thing that I feel could be a little standardized? But it's not like it is a huge expectation out of me for them.” Luna also shared that a lot of the students at CCE speak Spanish, so she said that “if they put in a little Spanish, I'll respond to them in Spanish. It's not like I will neglect the fact they speak Spanish, so I'll answer them back in Spanish.” Luna's response implied that she tended to default to English while at the center, but she was attentive to how students were speaking to her and wanted to ensure they felt their bilingualism was validated by her own language use.

In our second interview, Luna described the motivation for her matching of students' language use as also encompassing a desire to build closer relationships with her students. Luna explained the differences between her and the other teachers' language use during the High School Group by saying:

Between all 3 of us—me, Belle [another staff member who supports the High School Group], and Sofia—Sofia tries to tend [putting] a little bit more Spanish in there, just in case. So does Belle. And I'm more of, okay, I can try to see where I could fit in, but for the most part, if they are speaking English to me, then I speak English back to them. [...] I kinda match the way that they're speaking to me, so then they don't feel like, oh, I'm some higher-up person. I'm like a friend. I'm like a mentor. So I'm someone that you can come and speak to, not just at, you know, a professional level, I guess, but as someone that you can count on and actually have a conversation with.

Luna tried to reduce the sense of power imbalance between student and teacher so that students could feel more willing to rely on and be honest with her. By matching her students' language use, Luna engaged in what Metz (2021) describes as “linguistic styling for relationships,” in which a teacher modifies their language use to accommodate the students in their class. By engaging in the same language practices as them, Luna established a kind of linguistic solidarity with her students that she felt allowed them to better connect with her.

4.2.2 Articulated Influences on Language Ideologies

Luna grew up as an English language learner, and her experiences learning and developing a new language through school shaped the way she approached teaching. Luna shared that her experiences as a designated English as a Second Language (ESL) student made her more sensitive to her ESL students:

I'm always very aware of how something may impact a child and the way that I speak to them in a certain language. I only say that because I do find myself in regular classrooms rather than CCE, because [in] CCE there's a lot of Hispanic kids. It's just like we all kind of get each other and stuff. When it's in a school setting and there's like three ESL students, I'm definitely a little bit more sensitive toward them. And I'm like, “Okay, how can I help these students understand a little bit more?” And that's when the differentiation comes in and when I think of myself when I was a kid, and of that age in ESL, I'm always like, “Oh my god, what would I have done for myself?” and I do that. [...] I always try to provide that when I'm teaching or when I'm speaking in Spanish or when I'm trying to translate things in English for them. I always think of ways and tips and tricks that I would have appreciated as a child.

As an Early Childhood Education student, Luna had engaged in fieldwork in school settings (i.e., traditional classrooms) where, unlike in CCE, the majority of students weren't ESL/bilingual students. In those kinds of traditional educational settings, Luna felt more of a need to ensure the ESL students were being supported, since in this context they were minoritized. Although this sensitivity to students' linguistic backgrounds was less at the forefront when she was at CCE, Luna still considered how her experiences as an ESL student could help her better differentiate

her classes to reach all of her students. Additionally, part of why Luna wanted to become a teacher is because she did not see a lot of Hispanics or people of color as teachers, and she felt she could really relate to and connect with students of similar identities, presumably in a way that a white, monolingual teacher couldn't.

A more recent development that Luna felt was shifting her beliefs around language was the fact that she and Sofia were co-teaching the High School Group. Luna felt there was a lot she was learning from Sofia because Sofia was older and more experienced as a teacher. In describing how teaching with Sofia has affected her language ideologies and usage, she shared:

It's definitely been a little bit more enlightening because of the fact that [Sofia] does use a little bit more Spanish than I do, so I'm able to bounce off of that and be able to understand more of the Spanish language, and how that it can impact the community, in a sense. [...] It definitely supports me and gives me a little bit more support and confidence, I would say, because of the fact that she uses it a little bit more than I do.

Co-teaching with Sofia and noticing that she tends to use more Spanish caused Luna to become more aware of her own use of Spanish. Luna shared that she did not feel very fluent in either English or Spanish, and that insecurity likely affected her confidence in speaking Spanish in a space where most of the students were speaking in English.

However, teaching with Sofia helped her feel more supported and confident in exploring what it would be like to increase her use of Spanish. Similarly, Salmerón & Kamphaus (2021) found that being part of a team or community of educators that supports students' dynamic bi/multilingualism can help teachers hold their teaching to a higher standard.

Co-teaching with Sofia also encouraged Luna to reflect on the significance of her language use, recognizing that as teachers and older role models, they have the power to impact community perception of bilingualism.

Luna felt encouraged to reflect on her language use and teaching practices not just by working with Sofia but also through this study's design. Each participant was interviewed twice, once before I began observing them and once after I observed them. In both interviews, they were asked to articulate their beliefs around language and how those beliefs are reflected in their teaching. In the second interview, they were also asked to reflect on what I'd observed. Luna stated that our interviews had a similar effect to co-teaching with Sofia, allowing her to become more aware of and better reflect on her language use and teaching:

I appreciate you coming in and seeing a little bit and analyzing a little bit. The questions that you asked definitely put things in perspective. Like, "Oh, wow, maybe, I don't do this enough. Or maybe, you know, I could work a little bit more on this, or you know, maybe I've been doing a good job with that." You saying that I match their language is something that I was like, "Oh, wow! I did not really think of it that way, but I guess I do do that." And it's great to be able to have that conversation about language, so I really appreciate it.

Luna's experience supports previous research on the value of providing pre-service teachers the explicit opportunity to critically reflect on their language use, something many pre-service teachers are never asked to do, even in programs geared towards preparing them for diverse classrooms (Lew & Siffrin 2019).

4.2.3 Embodied Language Ideologies

Luna saw her language use as a way to position herself more as a friend and mentor to students, reducing the professional distance between her and her students. Luna's "linguistic styling for relationships" manifested in her matching of students' language use (Metz 2021). By matching how students talk, Luna felt she was able to build stronger relationships with students because they saw her as someone they could relate to. When I observed her, Luna almost always responded to her students in the same language that they spoke to her and with one another. With the High School Group, this usually looked like more informal English, including the use of

slang and jokes. Because most of the highschoolers were English-dominant, this also meant that Luna, out of the three participants, was observed to speak the most English relative to Spanish.

Luna felt it was important to help her students gain access to “higher value” language, and one way I observed her try to do this was by having the High School Group class play an online, life skills-themed Jeopardy game. The clues/questions revolved around terms related to applying for and working a job, managing finances, and managing a household. Some of the questions included, “What does it mean to be a supervisor at a job?” and “Some companies allow you to pay just a part of your credit card bill each month. This is called the _____?” and “The apartment says that utilities aren’t included in the rent. What is an example of the utilities?” The game’s questions and answer options were written solely in English, and Luna conducted the game almost entirely in English. Luna allowed students to use Spanish, such as to call out the number of which category their team wanted to try and score points in, but did not respond in Spanish the way she shared she might do to try and acknowledge her students’ Spanish. This was perhaps because the game was focused on assessing and further developing students’ knowledge of specific life skills-related vocabulary in English rather than their knowledge of these concepts more broadly (in which case an ability to name and describe them in either English or Spanish would have sufficed).

4.3 Andrea

Andrea spent most of her childhood in Mexico until she immigrated to the U.S. at age 14. Andrea often volunteered at her high school and often tutored in Spanish and babysat the children of other immigrant parents her parents were close with. At the time of this study, Andrea was in her second year of undergraduate studies at a nearby higher education institution. She was a prospective double major in Art History and Latin American Studies. She was first introduced

to CCE when she took a course that involved community service and partnership. As part of the community service aspect of that course, she visited CCE and conducted college readiness sessions for the students there. At the time of this study, Andrea was volunteering at the center as a teacher of ACT prep and narrative essay writing. She also served as a high school mentor. Although she was not a lead teacher during the High School Group that Sofia and Luna taught, she was usually present.

4.3.1 Articulated Language Ideologies

Andrea expressed the importance of authenticity in her language use, expressing an openness to many different ways teachers can speak in the classroom. When asked how she believed teachers of bilingual youth should use language in their teaching, Andrea shared:

I think they shouldn't strive to be perfect right? Because then it's going to be robotic. And it's going to be this insane kind of expectation. It's just whatever the teacher is comfortable with. [It] of course has to be respectful, and they have to be mindful of what they're saying to the kids, because these are kids, and they're very impressionable. But it's more just showing them that you're comfortable with them as well.

Andrea's belief that it is unreasonable to try and use language perfectly indicates a challenging of standardized language ideology, instead framing the use of standard language varieties as "robotic" and alienating towards students. Previous studies have found that teachers may use standardized language in the classroom to construct and communicate their identity as a teacher, a professional who holds authority over students (Weaver 2019; Metz 2021). However, Andrea believed that the kind of respectful and responsible language that a teacher should use is distinct from and can be achieved without the use of standardized language.

The relationship between communicating one's authority and how one uses language is particularly interesting because Andrea considers strictness/ high structure to be an important part of her teaching. Andrea shared that in her experience as an immigrant child, having a more

structured environment was helpful to her, and she recognized that some of the kids at CCE might be growing up in a similar situation or might similarly benefit. In describing why she felt being more strict was important, she said:

I try not to be too lenient to the point where the kids see me as just another one of them, because when you have 10-year-olds that are your height, they're not going to respect you as much as they would if you were 5'9" or something.

For Andrea, the distinction between her being a teacher and her being “another one of them” was very important. Andrea said she enjoyed building relationships and connections with her students, but felt it was still important to maintain some distance as an authority figure in her students’ lives. Interestingly, this form of discipline/structure seemed to only partially carry into her beliefs around language use in the classroom, both for herself and for her students. When asked whether she had any expectations around how students would speak in class, she said:

As long as they're respectful they can speak Spanish, speak English, speak whatever they want, as long as they're comfortable because I don't want to set any standards. You grow up in different atmospheres, so it's not going to be the same way that I speak.

Andrea stated that she doesn’t have any expectations or standards set around how students should use language with her or in her classes. Andrea’s responses challenged SLI by affirming the naturalness of language variation. She recognized that everyone grows up in different linguistic environments, so she believed it was unreasonable to expect that everyone will or should speak the same, standardized version(s) of language. Andrea recognized that the youth who attend CCE engage in a variety of language practices and shared that she wanted to be accepting of that linguistic diversity as it was.

That said, although she did not frame it as an expectation, Andrea did believe in encouraging students to use more Spanish in general. When discussing why she was drawn to

CCE, she cited one of the reasons as being that the center actively pushed and encouraged students to want to utilize their Spanish more:

[It] tries to prioritize being bilingual, being able to understand Spanish above all. Maybe you can't speak it, but you need to be able to understand it, because it's also a way that they express themselves creatively; like they have a lot of murals that are in Spanish [...] and I think that's just wonderful, because even the founder, [...] I've never once seen him speak English to any of the kids, not even like the kids that are no sabo. So you're pushing these kids to want to be with their roots, to want to learn Spanish, to want to communicate better with their family.

Andrea believed that Spanish was a vehicle for students to be able to communicate and better connect with their families and with their heritage and thus it was important that students be pushed to use their Spanish skills.

In discussing the conversation with the student who asked Sofia why she was speaking in Spanish in their small group, Andrea said that the student's question, while playful, was "implying you're better if you speak English. Like, 'Why are you saying that in Spanish? What's wrong with you?'" One girl in the group became concerned about the idea of not being allowed to speak Spanish, so Andrea and Sofia reassured her that "everyone [here] speaks English. Everyone speaks Spanish. Maybe he just has a preference. [They] just left it at that." This exchange was really strange for Andrea because while she knew on a conscious level that some of the kids prefer English over Spanish, her mind was boggled by the fact that that preference sometimes reached the point where students would speak to their non-English-speaking family members solely in English, in a sense sacrificing their relationship with their family. She shared that that dynamic reminded her of the

dynamic of children of immigrants who want to assimilate so much, or who have assimilated so much and stuck so much to the English language, the American culture, that they see not Spanish as bad, but they see it as a little bit less—as something that you shouldn't be doing or something that is like too out of place.

Andrea references assimilationist ideologies here by describing the way language is associated with national identity. While recognizing that many immigrant youth want to feel a part of the American culture they're growing up surrounded by, she sees prioritizing assimilation as often coming at the expense of maintaining your connection to your family and culture. Andrea believed it was important for students to realize what they were losing in "[sticking] so much to the English language," and saw the center as an important lever in preventing language loss.

It is worth noting the way Andrea talks about language loss. Throughout her interviews, Andrea uses the slang phrase *no sabo* to refer to a Latinx person with little to no Spanish fluency and who thus is prone to making grammatical mistakes like conjugating the Spanish verb *saber* ('to know facts or learned skills') as "yo no sabo" rather than as "yo no sé" (Lamb 2023). Callesano (2023:14) argues that online users of the *no sabo kid* hashtag frame Latinx bilinguals, who supposedly lack proficiency in Spanish and who engage in grammatical blending of Spanish and English, as "index[ing] an inauthentic ethnicity." Thus, a person who is unable to speak Spanish fluently is seen as less Latinx. Delgadillo (2022) argues that Spanish fluency is often used to gatekeep Latinidad, even though the language was brought to Latin America as a result of colonialism and is not the only language spoken in Latin America. *No sabo* is a manifestation of a belief that one's language(s) are a reflection of one's ethnic identity. Andrea's use of *no sabo* suggests that she sees bilingualism as necessary to being bicultural, hence the value she places on ensuring students sustain their Spanish.

Although Andrea wanted to help further create an environment in which students were pushed to utilize and further develop their Spanish, she did not necessarily believe she should be engaging in the practices other teachers were using to do so—namely speaking solely in Spanish:

I personally don't like only speaking Spanish to the kids, because I would feel bad. For example, my brother, he speaks fluent Spanish, but there's some words

that he doesn't know because he grew up more in the U.S. than in Mexico. So if it was him, I would want him to understand what I'm saying, and it's the same way that I act with the kids. Like if I say something in Spanish, and they don't understand, I translate it. [...] I also wouldn't want to isolate anyone by only speaking one language.

Andrea believed in the importance of encouraging the students to sustain and further develop their Spanish fluency to maintain their ability to connect with their family, heritage, culture, and community. However, this desire was mediated by her desire to create spaces in which all students felt included linguistically. She recognizes that language loss isn't students' fault; being constantly surrounded by English and learning academics solely in English in school have made the majority of them more comfortable speaking and learning in English. Rather than try to set rules or expectations around increasing their Spanish use, she decided it was better to ensure students had older role models at the center—particularly the American-born ones—who take pride in and actively use their Spanish and bilingualism.

The content Andrea teaches centers around ACT test preparation and college essay writing, both of which are monolingual English assessments. Bilingual teachers who express support for the bilingual development of their students can feel constrained by the language policies surrounding monolingual standardized testing (Henderson 2017). However, Andrea did not express an ideological tension between her expressed belief in the importance of encouraging bilingualism and the fact that she was teaching to monolingual assessments. When asked about what it was like to teach and talk with students about the language barriers around standardized testing and college applications, she said, “We never really address it like, ‘Oh, you're gonna have a big disadvantage.’ No, it's just we can try to work around this and it's fine.” Because there is not currently any alternative to these kinds of monolingual English pre-college assessments, there was not much else Andrea felt she could do aside from helping students' increase their language fluency in the ways assessments like the ACT expected of them. Still, she made no

value judgment around English's value compared to Spanish or non-standard forms of English outside of this context, nor did she express the belief that students' lack of knowledge of ACT language was a hindrance or deficit.

4.3.2 Articulated Influences on Language Ideologies

Andrea's focus on language as an important part of sustaining one's connection to their culture and family/community likely stemmed from her own experiences growing up in an immigrant community. For Andrea, Spanish was necessary for communicating with and maintaining relationships with adults in her hometown in the Southern United States. Her earliest teaching experiences also revolved around preventing Spanish language loss. While she was in high school, Andrea often babysat and tutored the kids of her parents' immigrant friends, who hoped that she could help prevent their kids from becoming "no sabo kids." At the same time, Andrea was attending a school adhering to a more assimilationist ideology; all of her classes and clubs were entirely in English and the teachers/staff would get mad at her for speaking Spanish. Because of this, she found herself thinking and operating more in English.

This continued when Andrea first moved to a new city for university, where she was again met with a negative perception of Spanish by most of her school community. This time, though, she had less of a connection to her cultural and linguistic community than she had in her hometown. Andrea shared that on campus, "they look[ed] at you real ugly sometimes if you [spoke] Spanish." Andrea experienced a more pluralist shift in mindset while taking the course that first introduced her to CCE. As part of that course, she was partnered with a classmate to give a tour of their university to the students and their families at CCE. She recalled that her classmate wasn't as fluent in Spanish, so a lot of the parents, who only spoke Spanish, did not understand what the classmate was saying. At that moment, Andrea had a flashback to living in

her hometown, where it was very hard to find adults who knew English, so all of her interactions with an adult were in Spanish. Andrea realized that the families at CCE reminded her of her hometown community. She remembered thinking:

Oh, my God! This is really my community. I love this. Let me switch gears, and actually speak Spanish and be proud of it—be proud of the fact that I can speak Spanish specifically in this community. [...] I feel it made me think of language as something key to culture, which I had internalized, but it was more just I hadn't found it here. I hadn't found an example of it in [this city], in [this state].

Andrea experienced firsthand the kind of conditions that lead Spanish-English bilingual youth to become English-dominant, but her work with CCE helped her see the power and pride in being bilingual and in being able to speak Spanish. Leading this tour helped her realize that even in this new city, her bilingualism was still an essential part of her identity, culture, and community.

4.3.3 Embodied Language Ideologies

Andrea's prioritization of comprehension and inclusivity was reflected in the ways she decided what kind of language(s) to use with her students. Andrea had a habit of asking people whether they preferred speaking in Spanish or English with her and which language would allow them to best understand her and convey their own thoughts. I observed her do this during the first meeting of the High School Group. Each of the teachers present that night had gathered to describe to the students the class(es) they would be teaching in the fall/winter so that students could better decide which classes they wanted to take. When it was Andrea's turn, she first confirmed in English whether everyone in the room understood Spanish before giving an overview of her ACT prep and language tutoring class entirely in Spanish. While I wasn't able to observe her first ACT prep and language tutoring class, she shared that she had a discussion with her students about when it would be most helpful for her to use Spanish vs. English.

Although Andrea emphasized the importance of strictness and respect in her personal teaching philosophy, she often engaged in more nonstandard and informal language practices with the students. I observed her sometimes engaging in light-hearted joking and banter with the students in both Spanish and English. For example, after doubting a student who claimed to have already finished the journaling activity students were working on, Andrea joked, “Show me your journal or I’ll kick you out.” In this way, Andrea seemed to be demonstrating a form of dynamic bilingualism that encompassed not just shifting between Spanish and English, but also shifting between registers, such as standard and non-standard language variants (Henderson 2017). She leaned into the more joking, teasing tone and non-standard language practices like slang that the students often used with one another while still maintaining that she was the authority in the room.

At the time of this study, Andrea had recently reached out to one of the senior leadership team members to brainstorm ways to have certain portions of her lessons be centered around English or Spanish, such as doing one class all in Spanish, one class half in English and half in Spanish, and so on. Essentially she hoped to be more explicit about having students draw upon different parts of their linguistic repertoires and to focus more on trying to build students’ academic competency in both languages rather than just the one a student is more comfortable in. Andrea also talked about trying to help students see the interesting connections and disconnections between English and Spanish, such as what words share a common Latin root and what words do not have an equivalent translation in the other language.

5 Discussion

Using interview and observation data, this study explores the language ideologies and classroom language use of three teachers in a bilingual community education center. This section

will explore overarching patterns and points of divergence across the three participants. Each participant’s language ideologies and embodied practices are summarized in Table 1. Within the Articulated Language Ideologies section, the overarching language ideologies the participants expressed are bolded, followed by the specific beliefs within those ideologies that were identified in the data. The Embodied Language Ideologies includes a brief description of each participant’s observed language and teaching practices for each of their articulated language ideologies.

Table 1

Summary of study participants

Name	Articulated Language Ideologies	Embodied Language Ideologies
Sofia	<p>Heteroglossic: Language variation as normal and functional. The boundaries between named languages as socially constructed. Lack of belief in SLI and notions of appropriateness. Translanguaging.</p> <p>Critical Language Awareness: Language as an equity issue. Had a raciolinguistic perspective.</p> <p>Language for social action</p>	<p>Heteroglossic: She tended to use Spanish and English in about equal amounts in both oral and written communication so students could access content in whatever language(s) worked better for them. She explicitly encouraged students to draw upon their full linguistic repertoires.</p> <p>Critical Language Awareness/Language for social action: She had conversations with students about the way their language use is perceived societally.</p>
Luna	<p>Monoglossic: Ideologies of appropriateness and SLI.</p> <p>Heteroglossic: Language variation as normal.</p> <p>Language for relationship-building: “Linguistic styling” for relationships (Metz 2021).</p>	<p>Monoglossic: She hoped to equip students with the “higher value” language she felt was appropriate in more formal spaces.</p> <p>Heteroglossic: She was accepting of students’ authentic language practices in her class. Some lesson materials were in both Spanish and English.</p> <p>Language for relationship-building: She most often matched students’ language practices to make them feel more comfortable with her.</p>
Andrea	<p>Monoglossic: Languagelessness</p> <p>Heteroglossic: Language variation as normal and functional. Resisted SLI.</p> <p>Language for sustaining culture and</p>	<p>Monoglossic: Not observed.</p> <p>Heteroglossic: She recognized the linguistic diversity of students by confirming with students what languages</p>

community

they were comfortable learning and communicating in. She allowed herself to engage in non-standard language practices and felt “perfect” language was an unrealistic and alienating expectation. She was brainstorming ways to more explicitly encourage students to draw upon their full linguistic repertoires.
Language for sustaining culture and community: Not observed.

5.1 Transgressing Standard Language Ideologies

All three teachers recognized the diversity of their students’ language practices as “normal and functional” (Henderson 2017:30). However, the extent to which they saw these language practices as equally valuable as traditionally privileged ones, such as academic Spanish or SAE, varied. This was partially because part of their role as teachers was to support students in succeeding in an education system that bases academic achievement on one’s fluency in academic English (Davis 2023). For example, Luna shared that one of the past classes she taught at CCE was a book club class designed to help students reach their grade level’s standard of fluency in English. Additionally, the High School Group that all three participants supported included college readiness training. Sofia and Andrea specifically highlighted the monolingual and performative expectations around language use in standardized testing and essay writing for college applications. In that sense, although all three of them shared heteroglossic/pluralist conceptions of language, their classes were not entirely free from more assimilationist ideologies.

Each teacher navigated the conflict between their own ideologies and the educational expectations they were working within in different ways. Andrea, despite teaching most explicitly to monolingual assessment, did not make any value judgment on the kind of standardized American English required on the ACT or (implicitly) in college essay writing.

English happened to be the language of these assessments, but for her, that did not make it any more valuable to her students outside that context. Luna encouraged students to use whatever language they were comfortable with within the center but emphasized the importance of equipping students with the “higher value” language necessary for more formal contexts in the U.S., playing into notions of appropriateness. Sofia believed in being upfront about and discussing with students the language expectations of college applications. When it came to “incorrect” speech, all three shared that they thought bilingual teachers should be more flexible in their acceptance of how students speak. Luna emphasized a distinction between being an “assistor” vs. a “corrector” as a teacher. Sofia and Andrea both felt that as long as language was respectful and able to be understood, it was acceptable.

5.2 Responsiveness to Students

All three participants expressed a desire to be responsive to their students, and sometimes this conflicted with their beliefs about how they should use language in the classroom. Responsiveness to students looked different for each participant. Both Andrea and Sofia saw students' ability to understand them as incredibly important. Additionally, Sofia alternated between fronting Spanish and fronting English to avoid framing Spanish as endangered, a way of thinking she felt students didn't relate to. For Luna, her desire to make students feel comfortable with her often led to her matching students' language practices. Interestingly, in cases of ideological tension, responsiveness to students was often prioritized over personal language beliefs. Andrea wanted to encourage students to utilize more Spanish and appreciated the teachers/staff who communicated with students solely in Spanish. However, she did not want to speak only Spanish with the students because it would hinder their ability to understand her, in turn isolating them. When a student shared that hearing people constantly moving between

English and Spanish was confusing, Sofia had the class speak exclusively in one language, despite believing in spaces of total linguistic freedom. Despite wanting to “standardize” or encourage students to utilize their full bilingualism, Luna matched students’ language practices even when that resulted in English-dominant spaces. Overall, the teachers seemed to view responsiveness to students as paramount.

5.3 Languagelessness Discourse

For each participant, their reasons for why they hoped their students would use or think about language in a particular way were informed by their beliefs around languagelessness. All three participants’ touched on the raciolinguistic ideology of languagelessness in their interviews. Both Sofia and Luna’s interview responses indicated they felt insecure about their English and Spanish fluencies, an experience many racialized bilinguals share because of the prevalence of languagelessness ideologies (Rosa 2019). Although Andrea did not describe feeling like she lacked proficiency in either language, her use of the term *no sabo* suggested she had internalized a languagelessness ideology.

Both Sofia and Luna talked about their bilingualism in ways that indicated a sense of linguistic insecurity—a feeling of deficiency in both Spanish and English. Sofia shared that growing up, she felt like her language practices were “illegitimate” and never good enough, including in educational spaces. Luna described herself as only “somewhat fluent” and sometimes unable to speak in either language. Their experiences are reflective of the “ideological double bind” that many Latinx bilinguals in the U.S. face—racialized as not being proficient enough in English or Spanish through a languagelessness ideology (Callesano 2023:2). Bilingual students, particularly students of color, can come to feel languageless by having their language practices repeatedly stigmatized through SLI, such as in schools where one’s knowledge of and

ability to use standardized forms is what determines one's proficiency in a language (Rosa 2019). Sofia and Luna's experiences with linguistic insecurity likely influenced their own values around validating their students' authentic language practices. Sofia believed in creating linguistic "free for all" spaces and expressed displeasure at the idea of expecting a certain kind of speaking. Although she believed, for example, in translanguaging, she did not feel it was right to set that as an expectation for the students. Luna also felt it was important to recognize and affirm students' bilingualism.

All three tied linguistic identity to ethnic identity, but the strength and characteristics of those ties differed for each participant. Interestingly, Sofia and Andrea's understanding of the relationship between race/ethnicity and language were in stark contrast. For Sofia, Spanish was less central to a Latinx identity, namely because she felt that as a colonized language, Spanish was "not anybody's." Sofia also acknowledged that Spanish isn't the only Latin American language spoken by her students. Sofia disagreed with the notion of framing Spanish as "at risk" in her teaching, so she regularly switched between fronting Spanish and English, rather than trying to center Spanish. Andrea, on the other hand, saw Spanish as integral to her and her students' ability to connect to their history, culture, and community, and believed in the importance of preventing the increase of "no sabo kids." Thus, she felt CCE was serving an important purpose in promoting the use of Spanish. Andrea felt Spanish was essential, not just to her own identity but also to those of her students.

5.4 The Bilingual Community Education Context

For the participants, CCE stood out because of how it valued and supported students' bilingualism, aligning with their own language ideologies. For Sofia in particular, CCE presented a stark contrast to the schools at which she had previously been employed. It was a space free

from many of the constraints that, when she was a schoolteacher, had hindered her and her colleagues from engaging in the more progressive language and teaching practices they wanted to. Because CCE's program was an informal, afterschool, educational space, it was not required to adhere to the same kinds of monoglossic, higher-level (e.g., city, state, or program) policies that schools do (Rosa 2019). None of the participants described feeling constrained in their language use or teaching practices by the center. Rather, they were able to experiment with and explore their language use and teaching practices in a supportive environment.

Although all three teachers experienced some degree of tension between their language beliefs and teaching priorities, their experiences with and at CCE gave them opportunities to reflect on their beliefs and begin engaging in practices that better aligned with their ideologies. This was particularly true for Luna and Andrea. Both expressed a desire to encourage students to more fully utilize their bilingualism but in their embodied practices, tended to prioritize ensuring students could use the language practices they were most comfortable with. While students' comfort and comprehension remained important priorities to them, through their work at CCE, they were both making moves towards finding ways to balance those priorities with their language beliefs. Luna's experience working with the other teachers at CCE helped her feel more confident to use more of and to see the value in her Spanish. Andrea's work with CCE helped her feel more confident in explicitly encouraging students to draw upon and explore their full linguistic repertoires, and at the time of this study, she had begun brainstorming with leadership how she could better incorporate this into her lessons.

García et al. (2012) assert that common struggles of bilingual community education centers include poor pedagogy, limited access to professional development, and unqualified teachers, many of whom teach as they were taught, in a very different time and sociopolitical

context. However, I found that all of the teachers were utilizing more progressive and inclusive teaching practices, many of which were in stark contrast to the educational experiences they had grown up with. That said, the participants I worked with are younger and have access to more recent scholarship on bilingual education through their attendance at higher education institutions and/or through professional development provided by the community center. Still, many of these teachers are utilizing their own experiences in the education system, not to recreate those teaching practices but rather to actively challenge and reimagine them. All three participants grew up as multilingual students and as English language learners in the U.S. education system and have reflected on what teaching practices have or have not been effective for them, using that to inform their teaching of students of similar backgrounds.

5.5 Co-teaching Dynamics

One particular aspect of teaching at CCE that allowed participants to further explore and reflect on their language and teaching practices was the opportunity to engage in co-teaching. Coincidentally, two of the participants, Sofia and Luna, were co-teaching the High School Group together. Sofia and Luna differ in age and the amount of training and experience they've had in their respective educational journeys, and the different ways they've had to navigate their different language ideologies and teaching styles have influenced their approaches to the High School Group, including their language use and the way they understand their pedagogy. To understand Sofia and Luna's co-teaching relationship, it is helpful to first clarify what co-teaching entails. The term *co-teaching* often refers to when a general education teacher and a special education teacher or other specialist work together to teach a diverse student population (Friend 2008:9). Co-teaching is one of the most frequently implemented supports for disabled students in general education classrooms (Rufo & Causton 2021). However, co-teaching is not

limited solely to partnerships between general education teachers and specialists. Co-teachers combine their unique skillsets, resources, and knowledge, creating a classroom environment that neither could produce on their own. Co-teaching has also been put forth as a more collaborative and potentially more effective model for having pre-service teachers engage in student teaching (Bacharach et al. 2010). In a co-teaching model of student teaching, the mentor and pre-service teacher teach together; share responsibility for their classroom/students; and collaborate on the planning, instruction, and assessment processes (Bacharach et al. 2010).

Neither Sofia nor Luna were serving official mentor teacher or student teacher roles at CCE, but they seemed to be engaging in a similar experience to that of a co-teaching model of student teaching. Sofia, as the older and more experienced teacher, served as a sort of mentor and role model to Luna, who was a pre-service teacher. Sofia had her teaching certification and had multiple years of experience teaching full-time in schools, whereas Luna was working towards her teaching certification. Despite the differences in their experience, level of training, and backgrounds, both teachers shared that co-teaching with the other helped further develop their own teaching. This study supports prior research on the reciprocal learning that can occur in caring and responsive mentor and candidate/pre-service teacher relationships (Rabin 2020; Rytivaara & Kershner 2012). Luna expressed that teaching with Sofia helped her become more cognizant of her teaching practices, particularly her use of and valuing of Spanish. Although Sofia served as the “mentor,” she too expressed learning from co-teaching with Luna. There is limited data on the agency of co-teachers in bilingual education (Schwarz & Gorgatt 2018), but the results of this study suggest that collaborative co-teaching relationships like the one between Sofia and Luna could serve as an effective tool to help teachers, both experienced and pre-service ones, better reflect on and achieve ideological clarity.

6 Conclusion

The primary goal of this study was to examine the articulated and embodied language ideologies of teachers in a bilingual community center context. While most of the literature on the language ideologies navigated by bilingual teachers focuses on those working in a formal school setting, this study instead explored the language ideologies of three teachers in a bilingual community education setting, investigating the ways these ideologies were (or were not) reflected in their teaching practices, and what contributed to teachers' ideological tension and/or clarity. All three participants' language ideologies and teaching practices were influenced by their identities, experiences, and current teaching context, with each of them expressing a unique set of beliefs across the ideological spectrum as well as engaging in a unique set of practices for carrying out those beliefs.

This study highlights the complexity of teachers' navigation of dominant societal ideologies, the ideologies of the center they worked at, and their personal beliefs. Further complexity was added by participants' language ideologies at times conflicting with their teaching philosophy, particularly their desire to be responsive to students. Findings suggest that one potential opportunity for increasing teachers' ideological clarity is to create spaces in which teachers feel comfortable exploring, reflecting on, and experimenting with their language and teaching practices, namely through co-teaching. Co-teaching could also help teachers practice navigating spaces of conflicting language ideologies. Future studies could explore co-teaching as a strategy for supporting teachers' alignment of their articulated and embodied language ideologies.

There are a few limitations of this study that need to be addressed. Since this study was limited to a case study of only three teachers, all of whom taught in the same community center,

my findings may not be easily generalizable. As Sofia mentioned in one of her interviews, the language ideologies of CCE and its members are not reflective of bilingual community education as a whole. Additionally, although CCE is a community organization run and staffed by many Kettlesby community members, only one of the three participants was part of the local community. All three were also students at the time of the study, unlike many of the other teachers and staff members. Future studies might explore the way teachers' positionalities, particularly their age and relationship with the community, might affect their language ideologies and teaching practices/language use. Additionally, this study's scope did not include the question of how students received the teachers' language ideologies and teaching practices.

In conclusion, this study suggests that bilingual community education teachers are actively wrestling with a range of competing language ideologies and pedagogical priorities. It offers increased opportunities for reflection, particularly through co-teaching, as a potential strategy for helping teachers address their ideological tension. Future research is called for to add to the limited data on the language ideologies and teaching practices of teachers in bilingual community education settings as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of co-teaching as a way to develop ideological clarity in bilingual teachers.

References

- Alim, H. Samy. 2005. Critical language awareness in the United States: revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher*. [American Educational Research Association, Sage Publications, Inc.] 34(7). 24–31.
- Alvarez, Steven & Sara P. Alvarez. 2016. “La biblioteca es importante”: A case study of an emergent bilingual public library in the Nuevo U.S. South. *Equity & Excellence in Education*. Routledge 49(4). 403–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2016.1226092>.
- Bacharach, Nancy, Teresa Washut Heck & Kathryn Dahlberg. 2010. Changing the face of student teaching through co-teaching. *Action in Teacher Education* 32(1). 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2010.10463538>.
- Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese. 2019. Heteroglossia. In *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Ethnography*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315675824-8>.
- Callesano, Salvatore. 2023. Mediated bricolage and the sociolinguistic co-construction of no sabo kids. *Languages*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute 8(3). 206. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030206>.
- Davis, Leah. 2023. Ideological Foundations, Curricular Models, and the Path of Bilingual Education. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*. Charlotte, United States: Information Age Publishing 25(1/2). 203-216,340.
- Delgadillo, Jacqueline. 2022. We’re redefining what it means to be a “no sabo” kid. *Refinery29*. <https://www.refinery29.com/en-us/2022/05/10971837/no-sabo-kid-meaning-new-definition>.
- Errington, Joseph. 2001. Ideology. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Key terms in language and*

- culture*, 110–112. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Flores, Nelson. 2020. From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory Into Practice*. Routledge 59(1). 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411>.
- Flores, Nelson & Jonathan Rosa. 2015. Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2). 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>.
- Friend, Marilyn. 2008. Co-teaching: A simple solution that isn't simple after all. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction* 2(2). 164. <https://doi.org/10.3776/joci.2008.v2n2p9-19>.
- García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, Ofelia & Jo Anne Kleifgen. 2018. *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners* (Language and Literacy Series). Second edition. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, Ofelia, Susana Ibarra Johnson & Kate Seltzer. 2017. *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. *The translanguaging classroom : leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Caslon, Inc.
- García, Ofelia, Zeena Zakharia & Bahar Otcu-Grillman. 2012. *Bilingual Community Education and Multilingualism: Beyond Heritage Languages in a Global City* (Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 89). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gee, James Paul. 2010. *How to do Discourse Analysis: A Toolkit*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203850992>.
- González, Josué. 2008. *Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education*. 2 vols. Thousand Oaks, California.

<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963985>.

Henderson, Kathryn I. 2017. Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education* 42. 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.08.003>.

Johnson, David Cassels. 2010. Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Routledge 13(1). 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902780706>.

Jong, Ester J. de. 2013. Policy discourses and U.S. language in education policies. *Peabody Journal of Education*. Taylor & Francis, Ltd. 88(1). 98–111.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2004. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (Blackwell Companions to Anthropology 1), 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2016. Language ideologies and language attitudes. *Oxford Bibliographies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0122>.

Lamb, Matt. 2023. Confessions of a Pocho Professor: Teaching Latinx Politics When No One Knows What That Means. *APSA Educate*. <https://educate.apsanet.org/confessions-of-a-pocho-professor-teaching-latinx-politics-when-no-one-knows-what-that-means>.

Lew, Shim & Nicole E. Siffrinn. 2019. Exploring language ideologies and preparing preservice teachers for multilingual and multicultural classrooms. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*. SAGE Publications Inc 68(1). 375–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336919870281>.

Lewis, Gwyn, Bryn Jones & Colin Baker. 2012. Translanguaging: origins and development from

- school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*. Routledge 18(7). 641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 2011. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802>.
- McGroarty, Mary. 1992. The societal context of bilingual education. *Educational Researcher*. [American Educational Research Association, Sage Publications, Inc.] 21(2). 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1176573>.
- Menken, Kate. 2013. (Dis)citizenship or opportunity? The importance of language education policy for access and full participation of emergent bilinguals in the United States. In Vaidehi Ramanathan (ed.), *Language Policies and (Dis)Citizenship: Rights, Access, Pedagogies*, 209–230. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/doi:10.21832/9781783090204-012>.
- Metz, Mike. 2021. Ideology, identity, and pedagogy in English language arts teachers' linguistic styling in U.S. classrooms. *Linguistics and Education* 64. 100942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100942>.
- Metz, Mike & Heather Knight. 2021. The dominant school language narrative: Unpacking English teachers' language ideologies. *Language*. Linguistic Society of America 97(3). e238–e256. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0041>.
- Nieto, David. 2009. A brief history of bilingual education in the United States. *Perspectives on Urban Education* 61–72.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*. De Gruyter Mouton 6(3). 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>.

- Rabin, Colette. 2020. Co-Teaching: Collaborative and Caring Teacher Preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*. SAGE Publications Inc 71(1). 135–147.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119872696>.
- Rosa, Jonathan. 2019. “They’re bilingual . . . that means they don’t know the language”: The ideology of languagelessness in practice, policy, and theory. In Jonathan Rosa (ed.), *Looking like a Language, Sounding like a Race: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and the Learning of Latinidad*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190634728.003.0005>.
- Rosa, Jonathan & Nelson Flores. 2017. Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*. Cambridge University Press 46(5). 621–647.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>.
- Rufo, Jenna Mancini & Julie Causton. 2021. *Reimagining Special Education: Using Inclusion As a Framework to Build Equity and Support All Students*. Newburyport, United States: Brookes Publishing.
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/brynmawr/detail.action?docID=6727441>.
- Rymes, Betsy. 2015. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool For Critical Reflection*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775630>.
- Rytivaara, Anna & Ruth Kershner. 2012. Co-teaching as a context for teachers’ professional learning and joint knowledge construction. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28(7). 999–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.006>.
- Salmerón, Cori & Jessica Kamphaus. 2021. Fostering critical translingual writing in an elementary English dominant classroom. *Language Arts*. Urbana, United States: National Council of Teachers of English 99(2). 87–98.

- Schwarz, Mila & Naomi Gorgatt. 2018. "Fortunately, I found a home here that allows me personal expression": Co-teaching in the bilingual Hebrew-Arabic-speaking preschool in Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 71. 46–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.006>.
- Taylor, Laura A., Saba Khan Vlach & Melissa Mosley Wetzel. 2018. Observing, resisting, and problem-posing language and power: Possibilities for small stories in inservice teacher education. *Linguistics and Education* 46. 23–32.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.05.006>.
- Weaver, Megan M. 2019. "I still think there's a need for proper, academic, Standard English": Examining a teacher's negotiation of multiple language ideologies. *Linguistics and Education* 49. 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.12.005>.
- Wiese, Ann-Marie & Eugene E. García. 1998. The Bilingual Education Act: Language minority students and equal educational opportunity. *Bilingual Research Journal* 22(1). 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1998.10668670>.
- Wright, Wayne E., Sovicheth Boun & Ofelia García. 2015. *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Hoboken, United States: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/haverford/detail.action?docID=1895479>.