Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology
volume 1 | issue 1 | 2023
pp. 56–85

Research Article

"We Want Them All to Speak in English … So, no Spanish": Preservice Teachers' Language Ideologies Towards Emergent Bilinguals

Marwa Elshafie *
University of Houston

Mikel W. Cole
University of Houston

Jie Zhang
University of Houston

Received: March 2, 2023
Accepted: June 29, 2023
Published: September 20, 2023
doi: 10.5281/zenodo.8365030

The number of emergent bilingual (EB) students is expanding very quickly in U.S. schools. They are expected to enter an idealized mainstream classroom that does not make use of their cultural and linguistic diversity (Reeves, 2004). There is a lack of preparation for teachers to meet the needs of the increasingly diverse student population. Prior research has also shown that preservice teachers do not feel well-prepared to teach EBs (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010). Language ideologies are beliefs about the superiority or inferiority of specific languages, how languages are acquired, and language contact and multilingualism (Kroskrity, 2004). Many of the challenges that educators face in teaching minority students may not be due to technical or methodological issues. Rather, they are rooted in "unacknowledged discriminatory ideologies and practices" (Bartolomé, 2008, p. ix). This study employs a basic qualitative research design to explore elementary EC-6 generalist preservice teachers' (PSTs) language ideologies and the factors influencing them. Using data collected from semi-structured interviews and student work from a Second Language Methodology course, this study utilizes Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-process thematic analysis to identify themes; Ruíz's (1984, 2010) three language orientations framework to assess PSTs' ideological perspectives; and Bacon's (2020) trajectory of language ideologies framework to investigate underlying factors. The findings demonstrate that PSTs generally had conflicts between seeing student home languages as a problem and a resource. Pedagogical implications for teacher education programs and teaching practices are discussed.

Keywords: basic qualitative study; elementary preservice teacher education; emergent bilinguals; language ideology; teacher beliefs

1. INTRODUCTION

Multilingual students are the fastest growing group of students in U.S. schools, with emergent bilinguals accounting for one in four students by 2025 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022). In this paper, we use the term "emergent bilingual" (EB) because it does not carry the same negative connotations as terms like "limited English proficient" (LEP) or "English(language) learner" (EL or ELL) and because it emphasizes the benefits of bilingualism (García, 2009a). EBs are expected to enter an idealized

* Marwa Elshafie, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Houston, 3657 Cullen Blvd., Stephen Power Farish Hall RM 236, Houston, TX 77204, the U.S.A., melshafi@central.uh.edu

mainstream classroom that does not make use of their cultural and linguistic strengths (Reeves, 2004). They suffer from "pervasive messages of silence" that discourage the use of their linguistic repertoires and cultures as learning resources (Cole, 2012, p. 3). Research indicates that both preservice and in-service teachers in the U.S. context feel unprepared to teach emergent bilinguals in their classrooms (Correll, 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2002), creating an urgent call for teacher education programs to better prepare preservice teachers (PSTs) to work with increasingly diverse students in U.S. classrooms (Figlio et al., 2021).

One way to achieve this aim is by examining PSTs' beliefs, a vital subject of research due to their strong effects on teachers' interactions with students (Pappamihiel, 2007; Van Hook, 2002). In this study, we focus specifically on language ideologies, which are systems of beliefs and attitudes about language and discourse revolving around the role of language in society and how languages should be learned and used (Kroskrity, 2004). Most teachers in the U.S. context are taught in educational programs that support assimilationist and deficit views of non-white students (Bartolomé, 2008). Language ideologies influence how teachers view their role in teaching and their instructional choices; thus, understanding PSTs' language ideologies is crucial to better prepare future teachers to work with EBs (Wei, 2006).

When teachers hold language ideologies that emphasize standard forms of language and marginalize non-standard English, they can compromise literacy and language outcomes for EBs by limiting the possibility of them drawing from their full linguistic repertoire (García, 2009b; Palmer, 2009) which refers to all the linguistic varieties, such as dialects and accents existing in a community or within an individual (Moody et al., 2020). In addition, they can lower their students' self-esteem, self-confidence, and motivation to learn (Dooly, 2005; Reaser & Adger, 2008). By contrast, teachers who adopt an asset view of language will make use of students' home languages and cultural practices to support their students' success (García, 2009b). Research suggests that appropriate training and development can give PSTs the opportunity and ability to scrutinize, understand, and reform any language ideologies they may have that can marginalize and impair diverse students' language practices (Martínez et al., 2015). The present qualitative research explores PSTs' language ideologies and the factors shaping them.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

We first define language ideologies, and then discuss the two frameworks that guided the current study. Ruíz's (1984; 2010) three language orientations framework (i.e., language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource) was used to explore the nature of PSTs' language ideologies. To understand the influencing factors of PSTs' language ideologies, this study adopted Bacon's (2020) framework: —a trajectory of language ideologies.

2.1 Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are beliefs about the superiority or inferiority of specific languages, how languages are acquired, and language contact and multilingualism (Kroskrity, 2004). The study of language ideologies tends to rely on three types of data: language in use, talk about language or language in use, and implicit metapragmatic (i.e., self-reflective linguistic practice) (Woolard, 1998). Bartolomé (2008) stressed that ideology is not just an abstract term; these ideologies have real impacts on everyday life, including discriminatory practices in the classroom.

A variety of language ideologies have been identified in the teacher education literature. For instance, monoglossic ideologies privilege a single, dominant language, whereas heteroglossic ideologies value multiple languages, usages, and identities. In a monoglossic language ideology, language diversity is seen as "imported" (Wiley & Lukes, 1996, p. 519), and only the language of the mainstream group is idealized (Flores, 2013). By contrast, teachers who adopt a heteroglossic view of language understand that bilinguals' languages are interactive, complimentary, and dependent upon each other, and they accordingly provide a multilingual space for these students to succeed (García, 2009b). Standardized language ideologies hold that only standard forms of the language are acceptable in education (Flores & Rosa, 2015). When teachers hold language ideologies that emphasize standard forms of language and marginalize non-standard English, they can, inadvertently or otherwise, compromise literacy and language outcomes for EBs.

2.2 Ruíz's (1984; 2010) Three Language Orientations

In this paper, we utilize Ruíz's three "orientations for language planning" (1984; 2010). This often-cited framework suggests that language policies tend to support one of three distinct orientations: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. A language-as-problem orientation sees language diversity as a problem to be solved, values monolingualism, and views language education as a transition to dominant language learning. In a language-as-problem orientation, specific types of language use or language users are considered to be problems that pose an issue or need to be fixed. Policies that uphold this mindset consider minority languages and minority language users to be an obstacle or hindrance and to address this supposed problem. They seek to transition students away from their "problematic" native languages to the dominant language of choice, namely English. This othering practice often results in an undervaluing and underappreciation of these students' languages and language skills (Hult, 2014).

A language-as-right orientation emphasizes that students have the right to use their native languages (Ruíz, 2010). Within this orientation, there are two approaches, non-dominant language tolerance, and promotion-oriented rights, both corresponding to

weak forms of bilingual education (McNelly, 2015). While the tolerance-oriented approach uses the non-dominant language to strengthen the more powerful language, the promotion-oriented approach goes further and stresses the right to use non-dominant languages without constraints as a civic right (Baker, 2011); however, it does not necessarily address the use of non-dominant languages in the classrooms.

Finally, a language-as-resource orientation supports the use of the minority language to acquire biliteracy and bilingualism (Hult & Hornberger, 2016; Ruíz, 2010). It rejects deficit views of languages and corresponds to strong forms of bilingual education where both non-dominant and dominant languages are valued and used inside the classroom. Although both language as a right and as a resource are needed, Ruíz favored the latter as it supported strong forms of bilingualism without the political conflicts of language as a right. It is also worth noting that in order to celebrate bilingualism, adopting a language-as-resource orientation should go hand in hand with a critical examination of the "linguistic power imbalances rooted in monoglossic ideologies" (Kaveh, 2023, p. 6).

Ruíz's (1984, 2010) three orientations informed the interview protocol and data analysis used in this study. Following Zúñiga (2016), who used these orientations to examine the language practices of in-service teachers, we extended Ruíz's three orientations from their initial focus on language policies to include individual educators' orientations to language diversity within their classrooms.

2.3 Bacon's (2020) Framework: A Trajectory of Language Ideologies

Bacon's (2020) trajectory of language ideologies framework highlights the importance of prior language experiences in shaping PSTs' ideologies and pedagogical orientations. Bacon analyzed his participants' language autobiographies to frame their experiences with language, coursework, and teaching as lived ontologies that provide a window into the development of language ideologies. Bacon viewed "lived ontologies" (p. 175) as personal experiences with language, coursework, and teaching that can shed light on language ideology development. Using pre- and post-course survey data analysis, he proposed three pedagogical orientations—pedagogical confidence, agency, and language resource validation— that he argued are shaped by lived ontologies.

In this study, we defined pedagogical orientations as the PST participants' instructional choices with EBs. Using this framework, the PSTs survey helped us select participants with different language ideologies, and an analysis of their vlogs entries and the interviews shed light on how their language ideologies developed.

3. REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

3.1 Inservice Teachers' Language Ideologies

Previous research on teachers' language ideologies in the United States has largely explored inservice teachers' ideologies either in dual language settings or during their student teaching practice as PSTs. Multiple research designs have been used to explore the phenomena, such as case study research designs (e.g., Lew & Siffrinn, 2019; Nuñez & Espinoza, 2019; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016) and mixed methods research designs (e.g., Bacon, 2020; Bernstein et al., 2018; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Lindahl & Henderson, 2019). The literature has shown that teachers in dual language settings have largely embraced a predominately monoglossic language ideology, which hinders their efforts to provide an effective transitional and bilingual education to their students (Briceño, 2018; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016).

Some studies have stressed the multiplicity, complexity, and contradiction in educators' ideologies (Bernstein et al., 2018; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Zúñiga, 2016). For instance, Bernstein and colleagues (2018) used a mixed-methods study design to investigate the language ideologies of 28 teachers toward the implementation of dual language education (DLE) in two urban schools. Most DL teachers held pro-multilingualism ideologies, yet they were also neutral on pro-monolingual ideologies.

Similarly, Zúñiga (2016) produced conflicting findings when analyzing the language orientations of two third-grade bilingual teachers in a dual-language school in Texas using classroom observations and interviews. The results showed that teachers were torn between language-as-problem and language-as-resource orientations, claiming appreciation for bilingual language practices while simultaneously positioning bilingual education and development as problematic to success on the English state test.

3.2 Preservice Teachers' Language Ideologies

While researchers have conducted significant research into language ideologies for in-service teachers, studies examining PSTs' language ideologies and practices are limited (Bacon, 2020; Barbosa, 2020; Lew & Siffrinn, 2019; Nuñez & Espinoza, 2019). Similar to the studies on in-service teachers' language ideologies, the findings suggest that PSTs often hold contradictory language ideologies. For instance, Lew and Siffrinn (2019) explored the language ideologies of 200 PSTs enrolled in ESOL courses at an urban university. The results suggested these PSTs embraced heteroglossic ideologies such as valuing home languages, but they also upheld standard English as the default language of authority, education, and communication. Many of the PSTs began by describing how they accepted and appreciated the use of various languages even in the classroom; however, they often concluded by acknowledging that this extended only to informal settings, while they restricted formal situations to standard English.

A similar finding emerged in Barbosa's (2020) study, where bilingual PSTs challenged monolingual ideologies but simultaneously seemed to believe that the goal of bilingual education was to transition EBs to an English monolingual classroom. Similarly, Bacon (2020) used a mixed methods study design to investigate the language ideologies of 127 PSTs enrolled in a Sheltered English Immersion course in Massachusetts. The analysis showed how personal language experiences and school language experiences could lead individuals to differing ideological stances, such as normalizing vs. challenging monolingualism.

Taken together, studies on language ideologies for inservice and PSTs have shown that teachers' language ideologies lack clarity and are often vacillate between restrictive/deficit ideologies (seeing language as a problem) and more additive language ideologies (seeing language as a resource). However, several issues deserve further investigation. First, with the exception of Bacon (2020), none of the studies investigated the factors shaping PSTs' ideologies and how those ideologies inform the teachers' pedagogical orientations with EBs. Additionally, only Zúñiga (2016) used Ruíz's orientations to understand the influence of language ideologies on teachers' practices. To address these gaps, we employ similar methodological choices as previous research. Several studies conducted in the Southern United States (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016) using qualitative methods, such as interviews and students' assignments, informed the qualitative design of this study to capture the complexity of language ideologies in a diverse setting.

Specifically, we address the following research questions:

1. What language ideologies are held by elementary PSTs enrolled in a teacher education program at a major urban university in the Southern United States?

2. How might personal language experiences and school language experiences influence PSTs' language ideologies and pedagogical orientations?

4. METHOD

According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), basic qualitative studies focus on the inner lives of individuals: how they understand, interpret, and ascribe meaning to their experiences and the world they live in. Thus, this research design enabled us to gain in-depth insights into the case of elementary PSTs and ensured that the researched phenomena could be explored within its context and using multiple data sources.

4.1 Research Design

A basic qualitative study design was chosen because this study's purpose was to understand PSTs' language ideologies, the factors possibly shaping them, and their

potential impact on PSTs practices. To align with previous research, this study utilized multiple data sources, including semi-structured interviews, vlog entries analysis, and the researchers' journal (e.g., Lemmi et al., 2019; Lew & Siffrinn, 2019; Nuñez & Espinoza, 2019; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016). Data triangulation helped in achieving a deep understanding of the participants' language ideologies.

4.2 Research Setting

This study was conducted at a research university located in an urban city in the Southern United States. According to the teacher education office at the target university, the total undergraduate enrollment was 47,090, with a gender distribution of 50.4% female students and 48.6% male students. The students were predominately Hispanic (N = 15,639), followed by White (N = 10,831), Asian American (N = 10,155), African American (N = 4,811), International (N = 3,273), and Other (N = 2,381). The diversity in the student population reflects the state's diversity, which made it a good site to conduct the research.

4.3 Participants

Due to COVID-19, the interviewing process for this study continued in the spring, summer, and fall of 2021, concurrently with data analysis until saturation was reached. We employed purposeful sampling techniques to choose the participants for this study (Patton, 1990). By using a selection survey (see Appendix A), we tried to get maximum variation. Table 1 outlines the seven participants selected, followed by a brief description. Pseudonyms are used for all participants.

Table 1. Preservice Teacher Participant Cases

Case	Ethnicity	Age	Gender
Lauren	Asian	25	Female
Maya	Hispanic	21	Female
Cassie	Asian	21	Female
Aya	Hispanic	34	Female
Rosa	African American	26	Female
Charlie	White	30	Male
Peter	African American	21	Male

The following preservice teachers participated in this study:

Lauren is a 25-year-old first-generation student. She was born in Vietnam and immigrated to the United States with her family at the age of three. Her entire education was in American public schools, from pre-K to high school. She considers herself bilingual and speaks English and Vietnamese.

Maya is a first-generation Hispanic student. She was born in the United States to two Mexican parents. She considers herself bilingual, speaking Spanish with her parents and English and Spanglish with her younger siblings and cousins. She completed her schooling in American public schools.

Cassie is a 21-year-old Pakistani student born and raised in the United States. She was educated in American public schools. She identified herself as a bilingual who speaks English and Urdu. She speaks Urdu with her family at home, but she prefers English with her siblings and cousins.

Aya is a first-generation Hispanic student. She was born in Mexico and came to the United States when she was two. She considers herself bilingual, speaking Spanish with her parents and English with her siblings. She completed her schooling in American public schools.

Rosa is a 26-year-old African American student. She was born in the South but moved numerous times, as her parents worked in the military. Although her father is Puerto Rican and her mother is Creole and speaks French, they speak only English at home.

Charlie is a 30-year-old American student. He was born in Florida and moved to Texas in middle school. Although his parents have German roots, they speak only English at home.

Peter is an African American student who was born in Texas. He is 21 years old, and his family previously lived in Oklahoma. They all speak English at home.

4.4 Data Collection

4.4.1 Interviews

Interviews with the PSTs served as the primary source of data. Semi-structured interviews are an ideal data collection tool to study language ideologies because they allow participants to describe their thoughts, ideas, perceptions, and experiences in their own words, serving as a rich source of raw data (Patton, 2015). After IRB approval was granted, the first author piloted the interview questions with four PSTs in March 2021. Then, we conducted a 45-minute semi-structured interview with each PST. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we used videoconferencing (Zoom) to conduct the interviews. We used the four-part interview protocol construction by Carspecken (1996): topic

domain, lead-off question, covert categories for each topic domain, and possible follow-up questions (see Appendix B).

4.4.2 Vlog Entries

As the researchers did not teach the course, the participants were asked to share their course assignments with us, namely two video blog (vlog) entries. A vlog is a blog that includes a video made by the blogger, sometimes followed by a reflection about the topic or topics discussed in the video (Hramiak et al., 2009; Luehmann & Tinelli, 2008; Stiller & Philleo, 2003; Top et al., 2010). The participants created two vlog entries as part of the course assignments for all sections of the course. In Entry One, they made a 5-to-7-minute video to reflect on their language learning experiences. In Entry Two, they interviewed a current teacher of emergent bilinguals at a public school or a young adult or adult who learned English as a second language in the United States in the public school system and wrote a short reflection. Because the vlog entries were utilized by the PSTs as a reflective tool and collaborative tool for interaction with peers, they served as an important data source to shed light on the participants' language ideologies.

4.5 Data Analysis

We used thematic analysis (TA) to analyze the data; specifically, we followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach. We became familiar with the data for the interviews by carefully reading and rereading each participant's interview transcript. We followed the same technique with the vlog entries and added our comments from our reflective journals. Then, we started the coding process by setting broad topic codes or a priori codes defined by the research questions. For instance, some a priori codes for our first research question included: (a) views about home language use inside the classroom; and (b) views about standard language use inside the classroom. For example, the interview excerpt, "I think their primary focus should be to use standard language within the classroom, just to kind of overall help them understand and implement their understanding to their learning" fell under the code titled “views about standard language". Some a priori codes for the second research question were: (a) personal language experience; and (b) school language experience. For example, the statement that "Spanish is my primary language. I only speak Spanish with my parents here at home" was coded as "personal language experience".

We also considered and compared different portions of the data against each other to discover and identify meaningful themes and further triangulate the data. We then went through the themes and checked that they represented the codes. We also refined and merged some themes/subthemes into single coherent themes. At the end of this phase,

we were able to define and describe the themes, specify how each theme captured a specific aspect of the data, and explain each theme's relevance.

The whole data analysis process was iterative, moving between data sets and incorporating and interweaving various data sources. The data was viewed through an analytic lens throughout the report, providing not merely a description of the data but rather a critical analysis aligned with the research questions. To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, the analysis relied on data triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing.

5. FINDINGS

5.1 Findings for Research Question One

Research Question One asked: What language ideologies are held by elementary preservice teachers enrolled in a teacher education program at a major urban university? The PSTs' interviews and vlog entries were analyzed to answer this question using Ruíz's (1984; 2010) three language orientations framework as a priori themes for analysis. The following main themes were evident: home language as a problem, as-right, and as-resource orientations, as well as standard language ideology.

5.1.1 We Want Them All to Speak in English … So, no Spanish

At some point in their interviews and vlog entries, all seven PSTs made statements portraying home language use inside the classroom as a problem. Despite being first-generation bilingual students, when asked about the language they expected their students to use in the classroom, Lauren, Maya, Cassie, and Aya all chose only English, suggesting home languages could be used for translation only until the students were fully fluent in English, "We want them all to speak in English … So, no Spanish" (Lauren, interview). Cassie also believed that learners would benefit from English-only classrooms, as these classrooms provided the exposure necessary to become fluent and that it was important to speak only English, it being the only language the teacher knew. She further stressed that using more than one language in the classroom could be a cause of confusion, saying, "I feel like if the student is speaking, you know, like their home language at school and also English, it will definitely confuse them" (Cassie, interview).

As for the monolingual participants, Charlie, Peter, and Rosa, they also saw home language use inside the classrooms as a problem. For instance, Charlie stated that he expected his students to use mainly English in the classroom simply because he did not understand other languages. He believed they needed to be immersed in order to learn

English. They all thought that using more than one language could confuse the learners and that the aim of the school was to learn English. For instance, Peter also stressed, "It might slow the learning if we use … more than one [language], especially with young [students]" (Peter, interview).

The data showed only a few incidents of both bilingual and monolingual participants viewing home language as a right. For example, Lauren and Rosa demonstrated a language-as-right view when she insisted that home languages should be spoken at home and that it would be a shame if students lost their home languages. Similarly, Maya felt that students had the right to speak their own languages with their classmates or even with her, but all assignments and schoolwork should be done in English.

Lauren, Maya, and Charlie exhibited contradictory views regarding the use of English by EBs' families that showed an interjection between language as a right and as a problem. For instance, Charlie stated that he expected EBs' families to speak their home language at home, especially if their children were in English-only classrooms, which is a language-as-right view where individuals have the freedom to speak their home languages to preserve them (McNelly, 2015). However, he also believed that parents speaking English with their children would serve as practice and help them learn English, which is a language-as-problem perspective. Lauren and Rosa expressed similar contradictory views: They expected EBs' families to speak English wherever possible at home, which contradicts their initial statements that students' home language should be spoken at home.

Unlike the previous orientations, a language-as-resource orientation views students' language abilities, regardless of language variety, as a resource that can contribute to achieving positive outcomes in education and development (Hult, 2014). The participants' views about home language as a resource were few and often contradictory in nature. They all argued that home language could be used as a resource only transitionally until English fluency was achieved. For instance, Lauren argued in favor of students hearing two languages at school, yet she also believed that English-only classrooms were good for EBs, as they came to school to study English.

Charlie's view of home language as a resource emerged in his statement that home languages could be used as a mediator in teaching content classes, which he believed could be beneficial to students even if they might be getting "less practice in English" (Charlie, interview). He also said that he wished he knew some Spanish in order to incorporate it into his classroom and be able to communicate with parents. However, in his vlog, he expressed a different view when he commented on the use of two languages simultaneously in dual-language schools.

The participants in this study mainly embraced language as a problem orientation. The results also positioned the PSTs', though at times, their language ideologies spanned within the continuum of seeing EBs' home language as a problem, right, and resource. This is consistent with the use of Ruiz's framework for policy analysis, as the

orientations are not mutually exclusive, and even individual policies frequently exhibit multiple orientations (Zúñiga, 2016).

5.1.2 We Should Only Be Speaking Proper English in the Classroom

Standard language ideology refers to a bias for the idealized "standard" spoken language that is used and promulgated by those in positions of power and dominance over disfavored, minority varieties of language (Lippi-Green, 2006). The six racially and ethnically diverse participants in this study held a standard language ideology, stating that standard English was the proper way of speaking English and that EBs should adhere to it in their classes and that vernacular language was not academic, and that it was the role of schools to correct it. Vernacular language, they argued, was not academic and was only suitable for talking with friends; using it elsewhere would lower their chances of getting a job, and it was the role of schools to correct it.

For example, although Lauren said she would allow her students to use their "slang" or dialects at school as their right to speak what they wanted, she also stressed that the school's role was to correct this dialect use, "I think in school, it [English varieties] would--we would have to correct it. Because that's, to me, that's not standard English" (Lauren, interview 1). Similarly, Maya stated that standard language was the proper way of speaking English and that EBs should be speaking it in her classes, suggesting it was a marker of intelligence and hard work that would open doors for students after graduation. Other varieties of English, she believed, should not be spoken inside the classroom; non-standard English may be suitable for speaking with friends, but it could create difficulties in learning at school and lower their chances of getting a job, "I think we should only be speaking proper English in the classroom" (Maya, interview).

Two of the monolingual participants shared the same beliefs; for instance, Rosa associated standard language with "professionalism, and I would say, [being] hardworking" (Rosa, interview). Peter had the strictest views among all the participants when it came to varieties of English. He was a strong advocate of standard English and argued that it should be used in schools to the exclusion of all other varieties "So that if they(students) have those (non-nonstandard English varieties), then there's no way that English, just standard English, is the only option to use" (Peter, interview). He also believed that students had the right to learn standard English and should master it to be able to pass standardized tests. He would correct his students if they spoke their varieties of English and show them "the proper way" (Peter, interview). For him, standard English was how students could earn respect, whereas non-standard varieties of English were only suitable for speaking with friends; they were not enough to communicate complex ideas at school.

Charlie was the only monolingual participant who did not believe there to be a single proper way of speaking English. He stated his acceptance of all varieties of English, although he acknowledged that it could impact communication, "English is English of different dialects. All of that will affect how you communicate and affect how you speak English. But it's still English. I don't think one is proper and one is improper" (Charlie, interview).

Both the bilingual and monolingual participants held the view that non-standard language use would hinder employment. For instance, Lauren who is bilingual, believed that standard English would open doors in employment, and employers would take skilled speakers of standard English more seriously than those who spoke other varieties of English. She also said that she had seen instances of people having difficulties in getting a job speaking their non-standard varieties of English.

Maya, Cassie, Aya, Charlie, and Rosa all stressed that speakers of non-nonstandard varieties of English are judged and "viewed differently" (Maya, interview). Rosa highlighted the role of society in setting out the norms, "I would say…Because as a society, you'd have certain standards or certain norms, and if you're not using like those norms, then they may probably put you at the bottom of the list". In the same vein, Charlie commented that "they [non-standard English speakers] will run into problems. Sorry. They would at least get like preconceived notions or like, a little bit of judgment. Yeah, it could give them some problems. Yes, for sure."

Overall, the participants in this study voiced standard language ideologies that positioned vernacular dialects and non-standard varieties as appropriate only when students were speaking with their friends, not in a classroom setting. Finally, they all attributed their classroom language preferences to the standardized tests that all students had to take, as those tests relied mainly on standard English and offered no accommodations for non-English speakers or non-standard English speakers.

5.2 Findings for Research Question Two

Research Question Two asked: How do current and past personal language experiences and school language experiences influence their language ideologies and pedagogical orientations? To answer this question, the PSTs interviews and vlog entries were analyzed using Bacon's (2020) framework "a trajectory of language ideologies." According to this framework, personal, coursework, and teaching experiences (lived ontology) inform language ideologies and pedagogical orientations. We will present personal language experiences, school language experiences, and teaching experiences extracted from vlogs and interviews and draw the connection between these experiences and language ideology and pedagogical orientations of PSTs.

5.2.1 Home, School, and English Only Policy

Personal language experiences encompass a wide variety of aspects of language learning, use, and exposure, such as self-identification as a speaker of one or multiple languages and experience in certain language contexts, familiar or unfamiliar (Bacon, 2020). Despite their varied backgrounds and ethnicities, the seven PSTs in this study shared some commonalities: They were all taught in monolingual English-only American public schools and were studying toward EC-6 generalist certification. The bilingual participants, Lauren, Maya, Cassie, and Aya, grew up in households speaking languages other than English. Their parents held heteroglossic language ideologies and were keen on teaching them their first languages. Lauren, for example, grew up in a household speaking only Vietnamese, but she also started her schooling in the United States at the age of four. At home, she speaks her home language only with her parents, who are not fluent in English, while she speaks English with her siblings and cousins, as they are not fluent in Vietnamese. Although her parents were very keen to teach her Vietnamese, sending her to a Vietnamese language class every Sunday for five years, she still prefers English over her home language. Cassie is a Pakistani student born and raised in the Southern United States. She speaks Urdu with her family at home but prefers English with her siblings and cousins. Similar to Lauren's parents, Cassie's parents were keen on teaching her Urdu and put her in an Islamic school when she was young, where she was taught Arabic and the Quran. She identified herself as a bilingual who speaks English and Urdu.

Both Maya and Aya grew up to Mexican parents who speak Spanish at home. Aya's parents told her and her brother to speak only Spanish at home, not English, as they were exposed to English at school. Despite that, she ended up feeling more comfortable using English with her brother and later with her children. Like Aya, Maya speaks Spanish with her parents and grandparents but speaks only English or sometimes a mix with her cousins and younger siblings. She prefers English now, as she is practicing it more in school and with friends; she tends to forget her Spanish. Despite that, she is proud to be bilingual, saying, "We (her family) agreed that knowing more than one language gives us an advantage in life and helps us connect with our ELL students as teachers" (Maya, vlog).

When asked about their school language experiences, all the bilingual participants who were taught by mainly monolingual teachers in English-only classrooms talked about the process of learning English in their elementary years under an assimilationist English-only policy. Lauren, Cassie, and Aya were enrolled in English-language classrooms with pull-out classes in their elementary school. This form of education, in which children who speak minority languages are withdrawn from their mainstream classes for remedial lessons in the majority language (e.g., ESL pull-out programs), is considered a weak form of education for bilingual students (Baker, 2011). Lauren reported that her home language was not used as a resource in learning inside the school at the elementary level: "Language in our school is strictly English… I never

spoke the [sic] Vietnamese to anybody besides when I got home" (Lauren, interview). Cassie felt that not being able to speak English made her different, and it was hard for her to make friends. She was pulled from the class to go to ESL class in a different room where her teacher spoke only English. When she returned to English-only classes in the fourth grade, she "blended" with everyone by speaking English. She also mentioned how her teacher encouraged her to speak English at home to get more practice. Similarly, Aya questioned the English-only policy in her elementary school, where she was not allowed to speak Spanish.

Rosa, Charlie, and Peter identified themselves as monolingual students who grew up speaking only English at home despite their parents' diverse backgrounds. Unlike the parents of bilingual participants, who held a heteroglossic language ideology that values bilingualism, these parents held a monoglossic language ideology and insisted on speaking English to their kids despite knowing multiple languages other than English. For instance, Rosa's father was a Puerto Rican who spoke Spanish with his family; however, he only spoke English to Rosa. Similarly, Charlie's parents had German roots but spoke only English at home.

Rosa's, Charlie's, and Peter's bilingual experiences came from taking foreign language classes in their high schools, where their teachers promoted monoglossic language ideologies. For example, when learning Spanish, Peter's and Rosa's teachers at schools used only Spanish and no English was allowed. Similarly, when Charlie was learning German at his school, his teachers insisted on a German-only policy and did not allow English to be used inside the classrooms.

On the one hand, the bilingual participants in this study grew up in households that valued bilingualism, with their parents holding a heteroglossic language ideology that encouraged learning their first language along with English. Despite their parent's efforts and due to the restrictive language policies evident in the participants' schooling, they all preferred to speak English with their siblings. On the other hand, the monolingual participants' parents held a monoglossic language ideology and insisted on speaking English to them despite having different first languages.

Both the bilingual and monolingual participants were taught by mainly monolingual American teachers in English-only classrooms. Some of the bilingual participants questioned this English-only policy and disliked the fact that their home languages were not allowed in their schools. Similarly, the monolingual participants also disliked the fact that English was not allowed in their second language classes.

5.2.2 Pedagogical Orientations and Teaching Experiences

The participants were asked about their preferred instructional strategies to use with EBs, which they chose based on their personal language experiences, coursework experiences, and student teaching experiences. Teaching experiences may encompass a

variety of experiences in both full-time and student teaching (Bacon, 2020). Particularly relevant to the current study is experience in teaching EBs. The participants all had teaching experiences in different schools during their Student Teaching 1 and 2 courses, with their interview statements indicating minimal exposure to EBs.

When asked about their preferred instructional activities for EBs, Lauren, Cassie, and Maya were influenced by their mentors in the student teaching experiences. For instance, Cassie preferred the read-aloud strategy as her mentor used it, "Another strategy that was really effective was read-aloud. That is something we did a lot because my teacher taught ELA [English Language Arts] and social studies, and that was really effective for the students" (Cassie, interview). Similarly, Lauren chose visuals, repetitions, and translations based on her student teaching experiences. Finally, Maya taught English Language Arts to fourth graders in her student teaching. Her students were mainly White, and she had very few EBs in her classes. Thus, she did not use any differentiation strategies for her EBs, and she followed the same teaching style as her mentor. "So I would mainly go off like the same teaching style that my mentor teacher was, would do, because I don't know, I don't really want to change anything" (Maya, interview).

Both Charlie and Maya chose visuals based on their personal language experience learning in high school where their teachers used visuals, "I think visuals are super important, especially for the younger kids. I mean, how else do we learn what something is without looking at it" (Aya, interview). Finally, Rosa and Peter chose their instructional activities based on their university coursework. Rosa also chose visuals and simplification in the teacher's talk, and Peter chose visuals and translations, "I was taking some certification, practice exams and that (translation) came up in the course, about the ESL students, sometimes translating the work will help them" (Peter, interview).

Despite their language as a problem orientation, the participants' lived ontologies did not normalize the monolingualism they faced in their schools, but their ideologies were not reflected in their choices of effective instructional strategies for EBs. Instead, they based their choices on what they thought was effective with them as language learners and as observers during their student teaching experiences and learners in their coursework about EBs.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 PSTs' Language Ideologies

The findings of research question one showed that the PSTs in this study had a multiplicity of existing contradictory ideologies that positioned home language mainly as a problem, and in some incidents, as a right or as a resource. These results confirmed the complexity of language ideologies. The PSTs in this study claimed to value EBs'

home languages and bilingualism but nevertheless simultaneously prioritized English and standard language. These PSTs expressed their appreciation for the importance of different languages but ultimately restricted in-classroom language use to standard English. The findings of this align with the previous literature on language ideologies in that they appear to be multiple and contradictory in nature (Barbosa, 2020; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Irvine, 1989; Kroskrity, 2004; Lew & Siffrinn, 2019; Palmer, 2011; Zúñiga, 2016)

Kaveh (2022) refers to these contradictory beliefs as "feel-good language-as-resource orientations" (p. 2), wherein teachers design their instructional goals prioritizing English over the very home languages they claim to value. Other writers refer to teachers' contradictory language ideologies as "ideological tension" (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2017; Freeman, 2004; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). Given this conflict, teachers' educational programs should enable PSTs to reach "ideological clarity" (Alfaro, 2019) to better serve EBs in their classes which can be achieved first by exposing them to instructional practices that run counter to the ideologies they consciously or unconsciously hold.

Being introduced to ideological tensions may lead teachers to question and revise their own ideologies (Assaf & Dooley, 2010). Many teachers, upon experiencing such tensions, will consciously examine their ideologies in light of the socioeconomic, linguistic, cultural, and educational realities of the students in their classes, helping them develop ideological clarity (Bartolomé, 2004). Alfaro and Bartolomé (2017) stress that ideological clarity should be developed in tandem with pedagogical knowledge and skills.

6.2 PSTs' Lived Ontologies and Pedagogical Orientations

The bilingual participants' home languages were not used as a resource inside their schools. Under the English-only policies implemented by their teachers, they struggled to meet the academic and standard English requirements in content classes. These school experiences are typical of PSTs, the majority of whom have largely been taught under restrictive language policies that emphasize assimilation. Such language policies can produce teachers who hold deficit ideologies, even if they are of similar racial profiles as their students and might be expected to have broader views of minority language use (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017).

The three monolingual PSTs in this study had bilingual experiences from taking foreign language classes in school, similar to Bacon's (2020) monolingual participants. Although they hated not being allowed to use their first language in class, they did not connect this experience to that of their students; rather, their expectations were that students should speak only English inside their classrooms and adhere to an English-only policy if present. This seeming contradiction shows the complexity of language

ideologies and the factors affecting them (Irvine, 1989). This monolingual ideology was also expressed by the bilingual participants. However, the myth that English-only policies benefit EBs has been contested by several researchers (August et al., 2011; Menken, 2013); in fact, EBs learn better if their home language is valued and utilized as a resource using translanguaging (García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Wei, 2014) and culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies (Gay, 2018; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Although the PSTs in this study taught in different contexts, they had minimal or no exposure to EBs. In order to address the deficit ideologies that PSTs might hold about EBs, it is vital that teacher education include exposure to EBs and bilingual training (Gutiérrez, 2008; Moore, 2018; Villegas et al., 2018; Williams & Ewing, 2019). An essential part of this training is mentorship. PSTs are more likely to uptake the teaching methods, models, and strategies that they receive more training in during the course of their training (Moore, 2018). Several researchers have stressed the importance of mentorship in producing quality teachers (Goerling, 2013; McCann, 2013) and introducing positive change in the framework of educational programs (Wang & Odell, 2002).

In fact, Bacon (2020) highlighted the fact that teachers who are trained using monolingual models are frequently unwilling or unable to utilize and incorporate bilingualism in their classrooms. PSTs are more likely to uptake teaching methods, models, and strategies that they receive more training in during the course of their training (Moore, 2018). A key factor in ensuring that teachers can effectively teach their EBs is for their mentors to empower them with knowledge and experience before they enter service. To this end, Orland-Barak and Wang (2021) urged mentors to regularly and systematically review, question, and revise their mentoring practices. We extend this by calling for mentors who can address the needs of EBs in their classes and model translanguaging and linguistically responsive strategies for preservice and novice teachers. This is the only way that future teachers will learn to value EBs' home languages, use them as a resource in their learning, and bridge the gap between theory and practice.

The participants in this study based their choices of preferred instructional activities with EBs on their personal language experiences, coursework experiences, and student teaching experiences. Despite their seemingly language-as-problem orientation, the participants utilized a variety of strategies to teach EBs, including some strategies shown to be quite effective (Goldenberg, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). The findings for this research question support the assertions put forth by previous researchers that language ideologies are strongly influenced by previous experiences with language and language learning (Busch, 2010). While the experiences these PSTs described do not constitute the entirety of their language experiences, they nevertheless are a key piece in the puzzle of their "lived ontologies" (Bacon, 2020, p. 176).

7. IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION

This study yields several implications for teacher education programs that have the potential to positively shift PSTs toward more pluralistic and heteroglossic language ideologies. There is a need to transform teacher education curricula to increase the number and quality of courses throughout the program on second language methodology, translanguaging, and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching. Specifically, teachers' educators must address PSTs' conceptualizations of translanguaging and offer courses focusing on ways to incorporate it in teaching and assessment.

Teacher education needs to include opportunities for PSTs to learn methods and strategies to improve their teaching abilities for EBs, this includes linguistically responsive strategies. Such education and training should not consist of a single course but should be expanded and built upon throughout the entirety of the teacher education program. In addition, teacher educators should provide ample opportunities for PSTs to interact with EBs during their student teaching, preferably in dual-language settings, and aid them in identifying ways to use the language resources students bring to the classroom.

There are also implications for PSTs' mentors and their modeling of translanguaging and culturally and linguistically responsive practices. It is not just PSTs who should be encouraged to critically reflect on their language ideologies and their views on standard language and different varieties of English. Mentors and educators of PSTs should reflect on the ways their language ideologies impact their teaching and share their thoughts, beliefs, and experiences with the PSTs they teach, whether through discussion or a written teaching philosophy statement. This critical reflection will drive them to produce changes that will enhance emergent bilinguals' learning experiences inside their schools.

In sum, this study shows the importance of providing opportunities for PSTs to reflect on the critical role of language in their lives. Moreover, it is vital that they extend this reflection into action via methods such as curricular modules that provide concrete pedagogical practices. There is a dearth of resources to help PSTs realize, understand, reflect on, and exercise their beliefs, especially those that involve validating and making use of the rich variety of languages and dialects that will inevitably become part of their future classrooms.

8. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study yields some interesting findings about PSTs' language ideologies; however, there is a considerable need for more research in this area. Future research needs to study PSTs' practices in student teaching placement as there may have been differences between what the participants described about their teaching and their actual practices.

In addition, given the findings that PSTs' pedagogies with EBs were influenced by their mentors, further research is needed into not just PSTs themselves but also their educators and mentors in school settings. Furthermore, this study approached its research questions using qualitative methods, including multiple data sources (interviews, vlog entries, and researchers' journals) to allow PSTs to express their perceptions and tell their own stories. However, data derived from other sources, such as classroom observation, with its focus on moment-by-moment teacher practices, and language autobiographies, with their focus on reflections, could produce different perspectives that could be useful.

9. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has some limitations. Its scope was limited to a single U.S. university. Although we tried to include cases from different backgrounds, the low return rate of the survey influenced our participant selection and likely indicated some self-selection bias. Thus, some voices were underrepresented or missing in this study (e.g., international students), and their insights would have been a valuable addition. Nevertheless, it is likely that the demographics of the participants in this study were reflective of the Department of Education population at the university. Interviews as a research method are, by nature, subject to interpretation. The fact that we conducted the interviews virtually due to COVID-19 restrictions created additional limitations, such as a lack of control over potential distractions to the participants (Illingworth, 2001).

Despite limitations, this study yields some interesting findings about PSTs' language ideologies; however, there is a considerable need for more research in this area. Future research needs to study PSTs' practices in student teaching placement as there may have been differences between what the participants described about their teaching and their actual practices.

In addition, given the findings that PSTs' pedagogies with EBs were influenced by their mentors, further research is needed into not just PSTs themselves but also their educators and mentors in school settings. Furthermore, this study approached its research questions using qualitative methods, including multiple data sources (interviews, vlog entries, and researchers' journals) to allow PSTs to express their perceptions and tell their own stories. However, data derived from other sources, such as classroom observation, with its focus on moment-by-moment teacher practices, and language autobiographies, with their focus on reflections, could produce different perspectives that could be useful.

THE AUTHORS

Marwa Elshafie has a doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Houston. She has taught second language methodology and ESL courses in different countries and is currently working as a lecturer at UH. Her research interests include preservice teachers' language ideologies, translanguaging, and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching.

Mikel W. Cole is an Associate Professor at the University of Houston. He studies multilingual learners and emergent bilingual students in K–12 settings and is particularly interested in the development of culturally-sustaining and translanguaging teaching methods and practices that utilize linguistic and cultural strengths in the classroom. He engages in the preparation of teachers to provide equitable and effective instruction for these students as well as the research that explores the intersections of language policy with classroom instruction.

Jie Zhang is an Associate Professor of Bilingual/ESL Education at the University of Houston, TX, USA. Her research interests include bilingual and biliteracy development, bilingual/ESL teacher education, and language and literacy integration in content area instruction for multilingual learners.

REFERENCES

Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory Into Practice*, *58*(2), 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569400

Alfaro, C., & Bartolomé, L. (2017). Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers: Honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. *Issues in Teacher Education, 26*(2), 11–34.

Assaf, L. C., & Dooley, C. M. (2010). Investigating ideological clarity in teacher education. *The Teacher Educator*, *45*(3), 153–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2010.489144

August, D., Goldenberg, C., & Rueda, R. (2011). Restrictive state language policies: Are they scientifically based? In P. Gándara, & M. Hopkins, (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 139–158). Teachers College Press.

Bacon, C. K. (2020). "It's not really my job": A mixed methods framework for language ideologies, monolingualism, and teaching emergent bilingual learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71*(2), 172–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118783188

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Barbosa, M. R. (2020). Conflicting language ideologies concerning bilingualism and bilingual education among preservice Spanish teachers in South Texas. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada, 20*(2), 325–351. https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6398202016837

Bartolomé, L. I. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 97–122.

Bartolomé, L. I. (Ed.). (2008). *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality*. Peter Lang.

Bernstein, K. A., Kilinc, S., Deeg, M. T., Marley, S. C., Farrand, K. M., & Kelley, M. F. (2018). Language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers implementing dual language teaching for the first time: Pro-multilingual beliefs, practical concerns. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 24(4), 457–480. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1476456

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a

Briceño, A. (2018). "En Español esa palabra no tiene ningún sentido:" A cross-case analysis of three Mexican American dual language teachers' language ideologies and instructional differences. *International Multilingual Research Journal,12*(4), 288–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2018.1470436

Busch, D. (2010). Preservice teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 318–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365239

Carspecken, P. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research*. Routledge.

Cole, M. W. (2012). *Effectiveness of peer-mediated learning for English-language learners: A meta-analysis* (Publication No. 3538810) [Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global Database.

Correll, P. K. (2016). *Teachers' preparation to teach English language learners (ELLs): An investigation of perceptions, preparation, and current practices*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky]. UKnowledge. https://doi.org/10.13023/ETD.2016.531

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(4), 286–302. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053004002

Dooly, M. (2005). How aware are they? Research into teachers' attitudes about linguistic diversity. *Language Awareness, 14*(2-3), 97–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668827

Durgunoglu, A., & Hughes, T. (2010). How prepared are the US preservice teachers to teach English language learners? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 32–41.

Figlio, D. N., Giuliano, P., Marchingiglio, R., Özek, U., & Sapienza, P. (2021). *Diversity in schools: Immigrants and the educational performance of U.S. born students* (NBER Working Paper No. No. w28596). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w28596/w28596.pdf

Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2017). Educator language ideologies and a top-down dual language program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(6), 704–721. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1071776

Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 10*(4), 263–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2013.846210

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Freeman, C. E. (2004). *Trends in educational equity of girls & women: 2004* (NCES 2005-016). National Center for Education Statistics.

García, O. (2009a). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(2), 322–326. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2778500

García, O. (2009b). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Goerling, C. Z. (2013). "Juggling 400 oranges": Calling all mentor teachers. *English Journal, 102*(3), 13-15.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator, 33*(2), 8–44.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(3), 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509–532. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40264383

Hramiak, A., Boulton, H., & Irwin, B. (2009). Trainee teachers' use of blogs as private reflections of professional development. *Learning, Media and Technology, 34*(3), 259–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439880903141521

Hult, F. M., & Hornberger, N. H. (2016). Revisiting orientations in language planning: Problem, right, and resource as an analytical heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe, 33*(3), 30–49.

Hult, F.M. (2014). How does policy influence language in education? In R. E. Silver & S. M. Lwin (Eds.), *Language in education: Social implications* (pp. 159–175). Continuum.

Illingworth, N. (2001). The Internet matters: Exploring the use of the Internet as a research tool. *Sociological Research Online, 6*(2), 79–90. https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.600

Irvine, J. T. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist, 16*(2), 248–267. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1989.16.2.02a00040

Kaveh, Y. M. (2023). Re-orienting to language users: humanizing orientations in language planning as praxis. *Language Policy*, *22*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09645-0

Kaveh, Y. M. (2022). Beyond feel-good language-as-resource orientations: Getting real about hegemonic language practices in monolingual schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 347-362. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3053

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Blackwell.

Lemmi, C., Brown, B. A., Wild, A., Zummo, L., & Sedlacek, Q. (2019). Language ideologies in science education. *Science Education, 103*(4), 854–874. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21508

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

Lindahl, K., & Henderson, K. I. (2019). The intersection of language ideologies and language awareness among in-service teachers of emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 7*(1), 61–87. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.17024.lin

Lippi-Green, R. (2006) Language ideology and language prejudice. In E. Finegan & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Language in the USA* (pp. 289–304). Cambridge University Press.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55–72). Routledge.

Luehmann, A. L., & Tinelli, L. (2008). Teacher professional identity development with social networking technologies: Learning reform through blogging. *Educational Media International*, *45*(4), 323–333. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523980802573263

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.977712

McCann, T. M. (2013). Mentoring matters: A Reflection on mentors and mentoring. *The English Journal*, *102*(6), 88–90. https://resolver.scholarsportal.info/resolve/00138274/v102i0006/88_mmaromam.xml

McNelly, C. A. (2015). Language learning policy through the lens of language as a problem, as a right, and as a resource. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *6*(1), 5–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/26390043.2015.12067782

Menken, K. (2013). Emergent bilingual students in secondary school: Along the academic language and literacy continuum. *Language Teaching, 46*(4), 438–476. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000281

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Moody, S. M., Matthews, S. D., & Eslami Z. R. (2020). Bridging the gap: The use of translanguaging in shared readings. In G. Neokleous, A. Krulatz & R. Farrelly (Eds.), *Handbook of research on cultivating literacy in diverse and multilingual classrooms* (pp. 555–576). IGI Global.

Moore, M. (2018). Learning to teach bilingual students: How teacher candidates appropriate linguistically responsive practices. *Action in Teacher Education, 40*(3), 336–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2018.1486749

National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). *English Language Learners in Public Schools. Condition of Education*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf

Nuñez, D., & Espinoza, K. (2019). Bilingual preservice teachers' initial experiences: Language ideologies in practice. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 18*(3), 228–242. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2017.1386105

Orland-Barak, L., & Wang, J. (2021). Teacher mentoring in service of preservice teachers' learning to teach: Conceptual bases, characteristics, and challenges for teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education, 72*(1), 86–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119894230

Palmer, D. (2009). Code switching and symbolic power in a second-grade two-way classroom: A teachers motivation system gone awry. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(1), 42–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235880902965854

Palmer, D. (2011). The discourse of transition: Teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *5*(2), 103–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2011.594019

Pappamihiel, E. (2007). Helping preservice content-area teachers relate to English language learners: An investigation of attitudes and beliefs. *TESL Canada Journal, 24*(2), 42–60. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v24i2.138

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.

Reaser, J., & Adger, C. T. (2008). 12 Vernacular Language Varieties in Educational Settings: Research and Development. In B. Spolsky & F. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 161–173). Blackwell.

Reeves, J. (2004). "Like everybody else": Equalizing educational opportunity for English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(1), 43–66. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588258

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Ruíz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J. E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155–172). Information Age.

Stiller, G. M., & Philleo, T. (2003). Blogging and blogspots: An alternative format for encouraging reflective practice among preservice teachers. *Education, 123*(4), 789–797.

Top, E., Yukselturk, E., & Inan, F. A. (2010). Reconsidering usage of blogging in preservice teacher education courses. *Internet and Higher Education, 13*(4), 214–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.05.003

Van Hook, C. W. (2002). Preservice teachers' perceived barriers to the implementation of a multicultural curriculum. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 29*(4), 254–264.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003

Villegas, A. M., SaizdeLaMora, K., Martin, A. D., & Mills, T. (2018). Preparing future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. *The Educational Forum, 82*(2), 138–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420850

Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*(3), 481–546. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003481

Wei, J. M. (2006). Language choice and ideology in multicultural Taiwan. *Language and Linguistics, 7*(1), 87–107.

Wiley, T., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 511–535. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587696

Williams, D., & Ewing, J. (2019). Exposing preservice teachers to emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Multicultural Affairs*, *1*(4),1–12. https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/jma/vol4/iss1/4

Woolard, K. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & O. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–47). Oxford University Press.

Zúñiga, C. E. (2016). Between language as problem and resource: Examining teachers' language orientations in dual-language programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *39*(3–4), 339–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1242438

APPENDIX A

Preservice Teachers Screening Survey

Preservice teachers _screening _survey

Thank you for taking time to answer my survey. This will take less than a minute, and it will help me choose the participants for my study. Your responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential.

*Required

1. Name *

2. Email *

3. Phone

4. Major *

Tick all that apply.

- [ ] Early Childhood (EC) - 6th grade generalist
- [ ] EC – 6 Bilingual Generalist
- [ ] English, Language Arts, Reading (ELAR) 4-8
- [ ] Math 4-8
- [ ] Social Studies/ History 4-8
- [ ] Science 4-8
- [ ] EC-6 Generalist with ESL/Special Education Supplemental
- [ ] EC-12 Special Education

Other: [ ] _____

5. What is your home language? *

6. Do you speak other languages? Please specify

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol

The purpose of this interview is to understand the PSTs' language experiences at home and schools and to garner information about their language ideologies and pedagogical orientations.

Topic One: Language Ideologies

Lead-off Question

What language/s do you expect EBs to use inside the classrooms? Why?

Covert Categories

Home language -as-problem, -as-right, and -as-resource, views about standardization and academic language use

Possible Follow-Up Questions

What language do you think EBs should use at home?

What does the term standard English mean to you? Is there a correct / proper way of using English? Do you think students should be allowed to use non-standard forms of English in the classrooms?

Topic Two: Lived Ontologies

Lead-off Question

Thinking about your language learning experiences, can you tell me how you learned a second language at school?

Covert Categories

Family background, personal language experiences, school language experiences, teaching experiences with EBs

Possible Follow-Up Questions

What language do you speak at home? Tell me about your experiences learning about language/s at school. What kinds of activities the teachers used to help you learn English?

Were you allowed to use your home language at school? What language did the teacher use at school?

Which phase are you in student teaching? Tell me about EBs in your class (Who are they, what are their cultural and language backgrounds).

Topic Three: Pedagogical Orientations

Lead-off Question

Describe an ideal learning environment where EBs learn in school settings.

Covert Categories

Opinions about teaching EBs, instructional strategies, differentiating instruction.

Possible Follow-Up Questions

How did the teacher you observed differentiate the instruction for EBs from native speakers?

Tell me about the challenges in teaching EBs from your observation / experiences.

What are your preferred instructional strategies with EBs?

Would you like to add more comments about teaching EBs?