

Texas Education Review

Language Ideologies in Bilingual Education Policy and Practice

Mileidis Gort, Ed.D.

University of Colorado, Boulder

Volume 5, Issue 1, pp. 67-75 (2017)

Available online at www.txedrev.org

Language Ideologies in Bilingual Education Policy and Practice

Mileidis Gort, Ed.D.

University of Colorado, Boulder

Bilingual education and bilingualism cannot be understood in all their complexities without thoughtful consideration of the role of language ideologies and politics in schooling. This is because ideological assumptions about the nature and value of bilingualism, bilingual education, minoritized languages and cultures, and the linguistic capital of emergent bilinguals¹ from language minority communities undergird bilingual education policy, programs, practice, and public discourse.

Ideologies are systems of ideas held as truths. Rooted in one's social position, history, and experiences, ideologies operate on the basis of implicit values, beliefs, and attitudes—or unexamined and often unconscious assumptions—that fundamentally determine how human beings interpret events (Tollefson, 2007). While ideologies permeate all forms of social policy making, they are not inherently problematic. Ideologies become problematic when they result in policies and practices that ignore or counter the research evidence, or when the evidence is distorted to conform to particular ideological assumptions.

Language ideologies, in turn, are “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979, p. 193). These beliefs can be explicitly stated and/or revealed in practice (Kroskrity, 2004). In other words, while speakers often articulate ideologies about language/s overtly, these can also be “read from actual use” (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 505). For example, in her exploration of language ideologies among Nahuatl speakers in central Mexico, Hill (1985) illustrated how notions of linguistic purism articulated by speakers sometimes contrasted sharply with the syncretic nature of those speakers' everyday language use. Similarly, Martínez, Hikida, and Durán (2015) found that teachers' perspectives on bilingual language use sometimes echoed ideologies of linguistic purism that emphasize language separation, while also reflecting counterhegemonic ideologies that privilege Spanish and promote bilingualism. That is, teachers' everyday language use and instructional practices both reflected and contrasted with their stated ideologies. Studies such as these illustrate how language ideologies are intimately linked with cultural identities and understandings, as well as group and national politics (Anzaldúa, 1987).

The privileging of some languages or language varieties (including dialects, registers, and styles) at the expense of others is what Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) calls *linguicism*, or “the ideologies and structures which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups which are defined on the basis of languages (on the basis of their mother tongues)” (p. 13). Consequently, the attitudes, values, and beliefs that come into play in bilingual education debates and program implementation are those that relate language to broader social issues such as the aims of education, the roles of language/s in society, views on cultural identity and linguistic diversity, and the nature and value of bilingualism itself.

Unpacking Ideologies in the Interpretation and Implementation of Language Education Policy for Emergent Bilinguals

Richard Ruiz's (1984) classic language orientations framework offers an effective heuristic for exploring how top-down language education policies, localized practices, and

ideologies interact and intersect. Ruiz distinguishes three orientations to language that are at the root of the politics of bilingualism and bilingual education: language as problem, language as right, language as resource. Ruiz defined these three basic perspectives as “*a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society*.” These dispositions may be largely unconscious and pre-rational because they are at the most fundamental level of arguments about language” (p.16, emphasis in original). Thus, while the three dispositions may be conscious reflections of teachers’, school administrators’, and policy makers’ ideological stances toward language(s), they may also be embedded in their subconscious assumptions.

A *language as problem* orientation is associated with the treatment of linguistic diversity and minoritized languages—and their speakers—as problems to be fixed. It views multilingualism as a negative force in need of remedying in order to ensure social and political cohesion with the nation-state (Wiley & Lukes, 1996) and, in the context of the United States, the maintenance of low-status, minoritized languages as an impediment to learning English. This orientation influenced the remedial and compensatory nature of bilingual education in the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and subsequent policy discussions, and continues to dominate and overshadow the debate on the schooling of emergent bilinguals. The term *limited English proficient*, for example, reflects this orientation, as do short-term transitional bilingual education programs that use students’ home language only as a temporary bridge to English proficiency.

A *language as right* orientation locates linguistic issues related to bilingualism and bilingual education within the realm of civil and human rights. That is, language is regarded as a basic human right that deserves protection from discrimination. Extending across voting and employment services, personal freedom of expression and enjoyment, conduct of business, and education, language rights have been defined as “the rights of a people to learn, to keep and use its language in all manner of public and private business” (Hernández-Chávez, 1988, p. 45). This orientation guides the design and implementation of language revitalization and maintenance programs for indigenous and minoritized languages, as well as bilingual education programs designed to provide equal educational opportunities for emergent bilingual learners.

The third orientation frames *language as a resource* for individuals, communities, nation-states, and society in general (Ruiz, 1984). Linguistic resources and bilingualism are seen as individual and collective assets to be developed, supported, and preserved, and language-minority communities are positioned “as important sources of expertise” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 28). In the United States, the idea of language as a resource not only refers to the development of bilingualism for emergent bilinguals from language minoritized backgrounds, but also to the development and promotion of languages other than English for English-speaking populations. Heritage language programs and dual language immersion programs, for example, are informed by this orientation.

The Intersection of Language Ideologies and Education Policy Implementation

Historically, there has been space for educators to appropriate top-down education policies while engaging in their own local language policy creation, regardless of the ideological roots of the policy. Analyses of national and local language education policy interpretation and implementation illuminate the influence of educators’ language ideologies on the social construction of policy in practice. A poignant example is Johnson’s (2010) examination of one large urban U.S. school district’s policy development and appropriation of new federal education

policy—in this case, Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—for bilingual learners. Title III replaced Title VII, or the Bilingual Education Act, in 2002. While the new policy clearly shifts focus away from bilingualism toward English proficiency via English language education, there is implementational space within the policy text for different types of bilingual education. Taking advantage of Title III’s espoused flexibility and building on the focal district’s efforts to support multilingualism through bilingual programming, a group of teachers, principals, and administrators from different levels of institutional authority who actively promoted developmental bilingual education programs collaborated on the development of the district’s new language education policy. The language policy began with a mission statement promoting three key shared understandings about language diversity and bilingual education: (1) that schools are advantaged by their linguistic and cultural diversity; (2) that a pedagogy that takes advantage of this diversity is best served by incorporating members of the community; and (3) that the ultimate goal is educational equality for all students. The ideological space created by the group, and sustained through the development of the district’s language policy, was resistant to Title III’s English-only discourse and guided the flexible implementation of quality education programs for emergent bilingual students. This case reveals local educators’ agency in interpreting federal and state language policy to foster ideological and implementational spaces in which multilingualism is advocated and linguistic diversity championed as a resource, even within seemingly restrictive language education policies.

Also in 2002, Massachusetts voters passed a referendum known as *Question 2*, or the “English for the Children Act,” effectively replacing bilingual education with structured English immersion (SEI) programs. Prior to 2002, the state’s bilingual education law—Chapter 71A—required districts with 20 or more pupils from the same language background to implement a full-time transitional bilingual education (TBE) program with instruction in the students’ home language and English in all subject areas in a self-contained setting. However, the 30 year old TBE law had never been without its critics. The traditional debate between bilingual versus English-only proponents was replayed on an annual basis. Proponents of bilingual education argued that the TBE law did not go far enough by not promoting or requiring maintenance or late-exit bilingual programs. Opponents proposed legislation to replace the law with English-only programs virtually every year for two decades. While the latter efforts were defeated by committed bilingual educators and legislators, a growing awareness developed that the TBE law needed to change. First, the law’s mandate for TBE was said to be impractical given the demographic differences among and within districts. It did not allow for sufficient flexibility and avoided program accountability. Second, the criterion of 20 students or more from the same language background excluded a formal state-monitoring process of services for low-incidence language groups, even though these students were entitled to such services under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Finally, the law was said not to encompass many of the reforms set out by the Massachusetts 1993 Educational Reform Act. (For a more detailed analysis of Chapter 71A and Question 2 in Massachusetts, see deJong, Gort, & Cobb, 2005.)

As presented to voters, the rationale for Question 2 was based on five assumptions: (a) English is the language of opportunity because of its dominance in science, business, and technology; (b) immigrant language-minority parents are eager to have their children learn English; (c) schools have a moral obligation to teach English, given its importance; (d) for the past two decades schools have performed poorly in educating immigrant children [via bilingual education programs], as indicated by their higher rates of dropping out of school; and (e) young immigrant children acquire second languages easily (Wiley & Wright, 2004). While advocates of

bilingual education and parents of school age emergent bilingual children generally agree with the first three assumptions regarding the importance of English and the need to learn it, the majority also indicate that they want their children to become bilingual and to attain a quality education. The fourth and fifth assumptions, are groundless, i.e., not supported by research, as they fail to examine actual participation rates of language minority students in bilingual education and the social and educational contexts of, and opportunities for, second language learning in school. Unfortunately, the media gave more attention to anecdotal opinions of pundits opposed to bilingual education than to educational research findings in the public debates regarding Question 2. The ideological underpinnings of “language[s other than English] as a problem” inherent to Question 2 and the related English-only movement prevailed.

Like its predecessors in California and Arizona, Question 2 offers little choice in instructional programming for emergent bilingual learners, particularly for young children in elementary schools. Under the new law, children who are in the process of learning English must be instructed in English in SEI or general education, English-medium classes with nearly complete prohibition of native language instruction. Waivers from participation in SEI programs can be requested under very limited circumstances, and require the signatures of the principal and superintendent of schools as well as annual renewal. The only alternative to the SEI/English-only requirement is participation in two-way immersion (TWI) education², which is exempted from the law. The TWI waiver was granted in response to teachers, parents, and advocates representing schools with longstanding and well-known TWI programs demonstrating positive outcomes for all of their students (Diez & Karp, 2013).

However, like the study described above, an examination of initial responses to the new law in three historically pro-bilingual education districts illustrates how each resisted Question 2’s “language as problem” ideology and limited flexibility, uniquely defining and structuring the SEI mandate according to the specific implementational context’s history and district leaders’ “language as resource” and “language as right” ideological orientations (Gort, de Jong, & Cobb, 2008). In the three focal districts, leaders leveraged their commitment to promoting their students’ bilingual development and academic achievement through flexible, high quality education programs. One district conceptualized and implemented SEI as improved continued practice for low incidence populations, another weaved SEI into a transitional bilingual program sequence (TBE→SEI→general education), and yet another envisioned SEI through a bilingual perspective. This involved thoughtful consideration of the important role of the home language in teaching and learning, the strategic and systematic hiring and assignment of bilingual SEI teachers, and the intentional grouping of children from the same language backgrounds in order to maximize resources and opportunities for home language use. For example, in the course of the first implementation year, district and school leadership advocated and provided guidance for the purposeful, pedagogical use of children’s home language in the SEI classrooms, sending a clear message to teachers that the native language can and should be used in any way that would support the students. Thus, rather than complacent acceptance of a seemingly rigid English-only directive, bilingual directors and administrators in the focal districts positioned SEI within the intersection of the language orientations reflected by the law, district past policy, and their own beliefs about the value of bilingualism, the rights of children to learn in their home language, and the nature of quality education for emergent bilinguals.

Language Ideologies in Bilingual Education Program Design and Instructional Practice

Decisions about how to teach emergent bilinguals are not based solely on the research evidence for cultivating bilingualism or learning through multiple languages. Monoglossic language ideologies positioning monolingualism as the norm and framing bilingualism from a monolingual perspective have historically guided bilingual education program design and instructional practice (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García, 2009; Heller, 2006). Monoglossic ideologies are reproduced in bilingual education programs—which by definition use two languages for instruction—as these programs generally are (a) based on the conceptualization of bilingualism as “double monolingualism” in two distinct, standardized national languages (Heller, 2006) and (b) organized around diglossic arrangements that separate languages and language use by physical space or time. That is, bilingualism in bilingual education programs has been traditionally understood and promoted only in relation to idealized monolingual norms where bilingual individuals are seen as two monolinguals in one. Despite a deliberate and explicit focus on cultivating bilingualism, the emphasis on language separation (including expectations of monolingual language use by teachers and students alike) within most bilingual education programs reflects some of the same ideologies of linguistic purism that undergird monolingual instructional models. That is, bilingualism in bilingual education historically has been and continues to be defined and approached as mastery of two separate and distinct languages and measured against the languaging practices and sociolinguistic realities of monolinguals, ignoring the complex and fluid discursive practices in which bilinguals engage to learn, to teach, and to make meaning.

The Bilingual Ideological Turn: Translanguaging as a Normative Expression of Bilingualism

Recent research examining the fluid and dynamic languaging practices of bilingual communities has begun to challenge the positioning of monolingualism as the norm, supporting the theorizing of bilinguals’ fluid and dynamic language practices in their full complexity through heteroglossic perspectives (e.g., Hornberger & Link, 2012; Martínez, 2010; Reyes, 2012; Reynolds & Orellana, 2009; Sánchez, 2007; Zentella, 1997). Within a heteroglossic, dynamic conceptualization of bilingualism, translanguaging—the complex discursive practices in which emergent bilinguals engage to make meaning and communicate in the many cultural and sociolinguistic contexts in which they live—is recognized as a normative expression of bilingualism (García, 2011; García & Wei, 2014). Challenging traditional notions of bilingualism that posit separate/autonomous or even interrelated linguistic systems, translanguaging denotes one linguistic system with features that are integrated throughout.

A growing research base illuminates the nuanced, multiple ways bilingual teachers and students from varied linguistic and cultural backgrounds contest and resist monoglossic language ideologies to accomplish their communicative and learning goals by drawing flexibly on their bilingual repertoires (e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Esquinca, Araujo, & de la Piedra, 2014; Flores & García, 2013; García, Flores, & Woodley, 2012; Gort, 2012; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Martin-Beltrán, 2014; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014). Through translanguaging, students figure out word meanings and academic concepts; display comprehension and developing expertise; develop and maintain dual language competence and, by extension, their bicultural identity; build sophisticated understandings of text and language; as well as participate in identity performances with their classmates that socialize them as competent group members (Martínez, 2013; Sayer, 2013; Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, &

Peterson, 2013). For example, Martin-Beltrán's (2014) study of emergent bilingual adolescents' collaborative attempts to solve linguistic problems and co-construct knowledge about language and literacy explored how students mobilized their diverse linguistic funds of knowledge as tools for learning in a linguistically flexible lunchtime and afterschool learning space. Students demonstrated multilingual competence and expanded their learning opportunities throughout their interactions and collaborative writing work through their dynamic use of Spanish and English. Translanguaging served as a discursive resource for students as they grappled with complex linguistic problems, considered multiple perspectives, and reflected upon, compared, and defended their linguistic choices bilingually. As Martin-Beltrán (2014) argues, "Engaging in translanguaging may hold transformative power to shift students' and teachers' dominant monolingual ideologies toward more pluralist understandings of the wider linguistic repertoire students bring to literacy practices and beyond" (p. 226).

As a pedagogic resource, bilingual teachers draw on translanguaging to expand language boundaries; to create multiple opportunities for language learning; to represent authentic situations that reflect the multilingual communities within and outside the classroom; to transmit information; to model and scaffold comprehension, vocabulary, and metalinguistic strategies; and to perform identities using the linguistic signs at their disposal (García, 2013; Nichols & Colón, 2000; Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson, 2013). Concrete examples of translanguaging pedagogies in action include Gort & Sembiente's (2015) analysis of the affordances of translanguaging pedagogies in support of young, emergent bilingual children's performance of the academic discourse of "Show and Tell" activity in a preschool bilingual program. In partnership, the Spanish language model and English language model teachers' translanguaging practices included collaborative bilingual recasting, language brokering, and concurrent translation of each other's activity-related directions and commentary. These practices fulfilled various discursive functions including managing the activity and involving and giving voice to the children. The resulting discursive patterns were characteristic of a collaborative bilingual pedagogy whereby one teacher articulated something related to the structure or organization of activity in Spanish, for example, and the partner teacher recast, repeated, or revoiced the information in English. The teachers' translanguaging practices also included recasting, sometimes bilingually, of children's performances in the focal learning activity. These bilingual languaging practices often involved more than just repetition or translation of children's contributions, as teachers offered additional information (e.g., contextualization, connections to school- or home-based experiences), prompted further elaborations from children, scaffolded children's descriptions, or expanded children's elaborations in ways that more closely resembled the common language brokering practices of young bilinguals. However, the research also reveals the many structural challenges bilinguals face in enacting these normative languaging practices and developing these implementational spaces (Flores & Schissel, 2014), as they continue to confront expectations of monolingual norms for linguistic behavior in schools, media, and elsewhere. Bilingual pre- and in-service educators themselves hold complex, nuanced, and sometimes conflicting views on their own and their students' bilingualism, reflecting the dynamic tensions and contradictions that emerge from the societal, institutional, and policy contexts of ideological contestation in which they are situated (Martínez, Hikida, & Durán, 2015; Martínez-Roldán, 2015).

Conclusion

Because educational policies and decisions are never immune from ideological and sociopolitical dimensions that serve as the basis for the positions developed in their support or opposition, these dimensions warrant examination, naming, and understanding in order to make apparent underlying values, attitudes, and beliefs. Questions about who gets to determine the public value of the symbolic assets of ethnolinguistic communities are at the root of ideological conflicts, debates over bilingual education policy and practice, the nature and worth of bilingualism and minoritized languages, and the recognition of bilinguals' linguistic capital. The ideological dimensions of debates over bilingual education policy and practice, thus, need to be addressed in the public discourse so that unexamined assumptions implicated in discussions of bilingual education can be challenged, and the differences between bilingual education that is rooted in monolingual ideology and that which embraces and promotes authentic and dynamic expressions of bilingualism can be discerned and made visible.

Mileidis Gort is Associate Professor in the Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity graduate program in the School of Education at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Her research explores the complex and varied ways in which emergent bilingual children use their dynamic linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge to learn and interact with teachers and peers in dual language schooling contexts. She is co-editor (with Eurydice Bouchereau Bauer) of *Early Biliteracy Development: Exploring Young Learners' Use of their Linguistic Resources* (2012, Routledge).

References

- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.
- Diez, V., & Karp, F. (2013). *Two-way bilingual education in Boston Public Schools: Required features, guidelines and recommendations*. Gastón Institute Publications. Paper 180. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/gaston_pubs/180
- deJong, E. J., Gort, M., & Cobb, C. D. (2005). Bilingual education within the context of English-only policies: Three districts' responses to Question 2 in Massachusetts. *Educational Policy*, 19(4), 595-620.
- Esquinca, A., Araujo, B., & de la Piedra, M. T. (2014). Meaning making and translanguaging in a two-way dual-language program on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(2), 164–181.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers' translanguaging across the bilingual continuum. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Key issues and some responses* (pp. 243–256). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454–479.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

- García, O. (2011). Educating New York's bilingual children: Constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14, 133–153.
- García, O. (2013). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism, and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface and hybridity* (pp. 100–118). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education* (pp. 45–75). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gort, M. (2012). Codeswitching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44(1), 45–75.
- Gort, M., de Jong, E. J., & Cobb, C. D. (2008). SEeIng through a bilingual lens: Structural and ideological contexts of structured English immersion in three Massachusetts districts. *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 8(2), 41–67.
- Gort, M., & Pontier, R. W. (2013). Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27, 223–245.
- Gort, M., & Sembiente, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25.
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic minorities and modernity*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Hernández-Chávez, E. (1988). Language policy and language rights in the United States: Issues in bilingualism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 45–56). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Hill, J. H. (1985). The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar. *American Ethnologist*, 12(4), 725–737.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 239–247.
- Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 61–79.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). “What do you want to say?” How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8, 208–230.
- Martínez, R. A. (2010). Spanglish as a literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(2), 124–149.
- Martínez, R. A. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics & Education*, 24, 276–288.
- Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 9(1), 26–42.

- Martínez-Roldán, C. M. (2015). Translanguaging practices as mobilization of linguistic resources in a Spanish/English bilingual after-school program: An analysis of contradictions. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 9(1), 43-58.
- Nichols, P. C., & Colón, M. (2000). Spanish literacy and the academic success of Latino high school students: Codeswitching as a classroom resource. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, 498-511.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757-772.
- Reyes, M. L. (2012). Spontaneous biliteracy: Examining Latino students' untapped potential. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 248-255.
- Reynolds, J., & Orellana, M. F. (2009). New immigrant youth interpreting in white public space. *American Anthropologist*, 111, 211-223.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Sánchez, P. (2007). Urban immigrant students: How transnationalism shapes their world learning. *The Urban Review*, 39, 489-517.
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63-88.
- Siverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 45-56). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2007). Ideology, language varieties, and ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching. Volume 1* (pp. 25-36). New York: Springer.
- Wiley, T. G., & Wright, W. E. (2004). Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the "Age of Accountability." *Educational Policy*, 18, 142-168.
- Wiley, T., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 511-535.
- Worthy, J., Durán, L., Hikida, M., Pruitt, A., & Peterson, K. (2013). Spaces for dynamic bilingualism in read-aloud discussions: Developing and strengthening bilingual and academic skills. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 311-328.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

¹ The term *emergent bilinguals* is used here to describe children who are growing up with two languages and are in the dynamic process of developing bilingual and biliterate competencies with the support of their families, schools, and communities.

²TWI is an enrichment bilingual education program model that integrates children from English-speaking homes and English learners with the goals of developing bilingualism, biliteracy, academic achievement, and positive cross-cultural understanding for both groups of students.