Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology
volume 3 | issue 1 | 2025
pp. 54–82

Research Article

Teachers' Shifting Ideologies about Emergent Bilinguals Based on a Professional Learning Experience

Sharolyn D. Pollard-Durodola *
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jyoti G. Senthil
University of Bath

Kara Mitchell Viesca
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Received: September 27, 2024
Accepted: May 8, 2025
Published: August 23, 2025
doi: 10.5281/zenodo.16932794

In the United States, linguistic diversity and students' emerging second-language abilities (e.g., English) continue to be perceived as problems and not as a rich resource, driving teacher ideologies about students' abilities and aspirations to learn. In this qualitative study, researchers used a Language Teacher Cognition framework (Borg, 2009; 2015) and discourse analyses (Gee, 2011) to examine teachers' deficit ideologies that emerged during a professional learning (PL) experience (eWorkshop). Findings suggest that when two general education teachers experienced language-based pedagogical challenges that superseded their capacity to resolve, they responded with ideological frameworks that problematized the learner but were open to alternative ways of thinking. The eWorkshop design potentially positioned teachers for positive ideological shifts by exposing them to important language development content (e.g., readings, cognitive tools) in tandem with a process for thinking through a language-based problem of practice to enact more linguistically responsive instruction. Teachers of EB learners are expected to develop a "tolerance for ambiguity" (López et al., 2012; p. 46) that allows them to approach occasional pedagogical failure in ways that are not harmful to students. Future research must explore how to curate substantive PL experiences that build teacher resiliency during a process of ideological demystification. Teachers must increase their awareness of how their beliefs may mirror personal and societal tensions that can be internalized into their instruction.

Keywords: emergent bilinguals; professional learning coursework; teacher ideologies

1. INTRODUCTION

In some of the world's wealthiest nations, PK-12 children have the least opportunity to quality education due to circumstances (e.g., education policies, educator practices) beyond their control which are driven by larger social, political, and cultural contexts (Chzhen et al., 2018). UNICEF's Innocenti Report Card 15 - "An Unfair Start: Inequality in Children's Education in Rich Countries" (Chzhen et al., 2018) - suggests that schools can play an equalizing role in children's lives or create additional inequalities due to school capacity differences (e.g., literacy). Specifically, wealthy countries with substantial populations of first-generation immigrants were associated with higher

* Sharolyn D. Pollard-Durodola, Department of Early Childhood, Multilingual, and Special Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89154, the U.S.A., tgavins@email.sc.edu

levels of educational inequalities (Chzhen et al., 2018), implying that one should consider how well wealthy countries educate student populations who receive instruction in a dominant language that is not their mother tongue (MT).

As a wealthy nation, the United States ranks in the middle third of 41 high and middle-income countries in which educational inequalities are tantamount (Chzhen et al., 2018). Further, the U.S. primary school education system ranks in the bottom third based on students' grade 4 reading abilities–comprehension specifically– (Chzhen et al., 2018). Grade 4 reading achievement served as a barometer for measuring school inequalities due to the vulnerable positioning of students for academic failure when their primary school education did not provide a strong reading comprehension base to support learning across all disciplines (e.g., science). These disciplines inevitably require considerable use of language (e.g., sentence structure, vocabulary) (Hwang et al., 2021; Mancilla-Martinez, 2020). As such, U.S. lower rankings may not only reflect the low national reading profile of primary grade students but may also reflect the ways in which emergent bilinguals–U.S. born and those who are immigrants–have experienced language education historically (Baker & Wright, 2017; García, 2019). We use the term *emergent bilinguals* [EBs] for approximately 5.3 million U.S. students who are enrolled mostly in grades K-5 and speak a non-English language at home prior to school entry where they are traditionally exposed to English as the medium of instruction (MOI) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024).

EB learners have endured a complicated U.S. language education history (García, 2019) rooted in assimilation goals which prioritized linguistic homogeneity (García & Solorza, 2023) in the form of English monolingual school instruction and a version of "bilingualism" that uses the mother tongue (MT) (e.g., Spanish) as a tool for accelerating Standard English (e.g., Puerto Rico; García, 2019; Hsu, 2015). This practice is rooted in a pervasive deficit ideology in which linguistic differences are viewed as a deviation from the *norm* (e.g., one nation one language) (García & Solorza, 2023), resulting in an historically dismissive stance towards language education (e.g., the "*English is sufficient"* ideology) (Ruíz,1984).

As such, many educators with a general teaching license have historically felt unprepared to support the full linguistic repertoire of EB learners (Ball & Ladson-Billings, 2020; Kim, 2021; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NASEM], 2017; Schall-Leckrone, 2022) because they lack the formal training (bilingual education, TESOL certification) that requires competence in teaching the general curriculum to multilingual students (Li & Peters, 2020; Villegas et al., 2018). This lack of formal preparation for general educators is due to multiple factors including limited state mandates that require an endorsement to teach multilingual learners (Uro & Li, 2019) and inconsistencies in how teacher education methods courses address how to make the curriculum accessible for this student population (Villegas et al., 2018).

Further, few teachers participate in extended learning initiatives that target instruction for multilingual learners (Rotermund et al., 2017), especially training related to second-

language (L2) learning (Alfaro & Gándara, 2021). Without specialized knowledge and experiences (e.g., curated teaching with EB learners), general education teachers may not serve effectively as content specialists and L2 professionals simultaneously (Harper & de Jong, 2009) because the preparation that is required supersedes the knowledge gained with a general teaching license (López & Santibañez, 2018). One study found that general education teachers felt the least prepared in understanding how L2 develops and desired to learn more about the English language and its inconsistencies (Hiatt & Fairbairn, 2018). Without such knowledge, teachers may become susceptible to misinformation and preconceived notions about L2/bilingual development (e.g., Children can produce proficient English right away) (Kim, 2022) that may contribute to a "cycle" (Walker et al., 2004; p. 155) of deficit thinking about teaching EB students based on limited knowledge (Oh & Mancilla-Martinez, 2021).

This qualitative study utilized a language teacher cognition framework (LTC) (Borg, 2009) supported by discourse analyses (Gee, 2011) to examine the deficit-oriented ideologies of two in-service teachers who were participating in professional learning (PL) coursework to enact quality content instruction. These negative orientations may limit teachers' ability to respond effectively to students' language development needs, potentially positioning schools to reproduce historically-based inequalities.

2. TEACHER IDEOLOGIES ABOUT EB LEARNERS

Research on language teachers' beliefs emerged during the 1990s (Borg, 2015), providing a potential window into the unobservable psychological context (teachers' thoughts) that influences L2 teaching behaviors in culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) environments. Specifically, teachers' beliefs or ideologies about EB learners can be understood as explicit or implicit assumptions that focus on a range of school related issues (e.g., student learning) and accumulate over a lifetime of daily asset- (e.g., making cognate vocabulary connections) or deficit-based (e.g., accepting answers only in standard English) instructional decisions (Wang et al., 2021). Although terms such as beliefs, perspectives, and ideologies may be potentially interconnected and are used throughout the literature (Borg, 2015), the term ideology is applied in this study and derives from Gal and Irvine's (2019) framework in which ideology represents an incomplete view of the world because someone different may view the phenomena "…from a different standpoint…[and] see a different picture" (p. 12). The implication is that an ideology is not a static doctrine but is part of an individual's evolving interpretation of their perceived reality.

Asset-based ideologies focus on students' linguistic strengths (e.g., multilingual potential, home language as a resource) and anticipate student success (Wang et al. 2021). Asset-based ideologies about EB learners have been associated with teacher's educational preparation (Bernstein et al., 2021), access to sufficient resources when teaching in a linguistically diverse environment (Gallagher & Scrivner, 2024), and

personal experiences with languages that may serve as a resource for teachers (Bernstein et al., 2021; Ellis, 2016). Teachers who have limited or no exposure to other languages may lack the linguistic sensitivity (e.g., comparing grammatical systems) that could potentially deter the tendency to downplay challenges faced by EB learners during language-embedded content instruction (Ellis, 2016; Lucas et al., 2018). Linguistically responsive teachers (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) demonstrate more positive orientations towards teaching EB learners (Kim, 2021) due to their repertoire of strategies for supporting diverse individual student needs.

Deficit thinking can be operationalized as an ideology that views students based on "perceptions of their weaknesses rather than their strengths" (Gorski, 2011; p. 152) or accentuates a perceived inadequacy (Davis & Museus, 2019). Deficit ideologies include viewing EB students as lacking in intellectual/academic and language ability (Accurso et al., 2019; Mellom et al. 2018) or possessing a language deficiency when perceived as speaking a non-standard language (Accurso et al., 2019). Because language-based experiences undergird academic learning, language-related challenges are occasions where deficit ideologies may naturally emerge (Harper & Kayumova, 2022). As such, a student's emerging English abilities and language diversity may be perceived as problems that interfere with learning (Mancilla-Martinez, 2020) due to something "lacking" within the student (Kim, 2022; Ortiz, 2016). This can result in misconceptions about students' abilities (e.g., verbal), motivation to learn (e.g., "a *lack* of interest" in science) (Harper & Kayumova, 2021; p. 1094), and gradually lead to harmful effects (Accurso et al., 2019; Gorski, 2011; Kim, 2022).

For this reason, U.S. multilingual school-age learners continue to be over identified for a specific learning disability (e.g., reading) or a speech or language impairment due in part to inaccurate evaluation processes at the school level when special education placement decisions are made without understanding how bilingualism or L2 develops (Hamayan et al., 2023). These negative orientations have been used to interpret students' learning outcomes (Gorski, 2011; Mancilla-Martinez, 2020), documented in student appraisals (e.g., "a helpless hand raiser," Kim, 2022; p. 1025), and associated with low reading comprehension outcomes (2nd and 3rd grade). Teachers may allow students to remain disengaged during lesson challenges due to low expectations for student growth (Oh & Mancilla-Martinez, 2021).

Deficit orientations have been attributed to teachers' limited access to adequate resources, effective PD, L2/bilingual knowledge, and sufficient time to attend to students' linguistic needs during disciplinary instruction (Gallagher & Scrivner, 2024; Payant & Bell, 2022). The potential socializing aspect of broader education policies (e.g., English-only curricula) and sociopolitical contexts must also be considered (Kim, 2022; Payant & Bell, 2022). Exploring teachers' deficit ideologies within the context of their instructional practices is important and may contribute to existing scholarship around deficit thinking which emanates from a continued concern for how negative orientations

maintain hegemonic systems while failing to place accountability on inadequate educational practices (Davis & Museus, 2019).

In a literature review, Davis and Museus (2019) suggest that scholarly analyses over the last 20 years have conceptualized deficit thinking as a "blame the victim" (p. 119) ideology – a primarily implicit orientation that may appear in labels (e.g., deficiency) and language around educational practices in which the root cause of a student's challenges is attributed to something lacking in the learner (e.g., skills, knowledge, effort). Banks (2014), a special education researcher whose work was cited in the 2019 review, emphasized that deficit perspectives require a change in how students' behavior is conceptualized to improve children's educational experiences. The 2019 insights complement how deficit orientations are conceptualized in the language education field (Gallagher & Scrivner, 2024; Gorski, 2011; Kim, 2022; Ortiz, 2016), confirming that more research is warranted to mitigate the cycle of negative thinking that potentially arises when teachers are unsure of how to support EB students as content and language teachers (Kim, 2021; Walker et al., 2004).

3. TEACHERS' IDEOLOGIES AND PL EXPERIENCES

Recent systematic reviews and investigations from the language education field provide further insights about the nature of teachers' ideologies regarding EB learners. In one review, Kim (2021) investigated K-12 teachers' beliefs and attitudes about multilingual students from 25 studies disseminated between 1985 and 2015 that were conducted primarily in the U.S. and in a few non-U.S. settings (Canada, Spain). Several key findings were noted. In general, K-12 teachers predominantly held negative orientations about their multilingual learners–sometimes conditionally based on students' English proficiency–and considered linguistic diversity a burden. Teachers' orientations sometimes varied by their students' race or ethnicity with instances of negative orientations directed towards Spanish-speakers or those of Latinx heritage (e.g., easily loses interest in academic work) and more positive perceptions of students of Asian heritage (e.g., focused, responsible) (e.g., Penfield, 1987). Further, teachers with formal specialized training (e.g., bilingual education/TESOL degree/certification) demonstrated more positive attitudes towards multilingual learners and linguistic diversity. Knowledge (e.g., Bilingual/TESOL formal training) and experience (e.g., extensive TESOL teaching), however, were the two primary predictors of teachers' positive ideologies with implications for integrating some level of these essential ingredients in substantive PL experiences (Kim, 2021).

A closer examination of the qualitative survey responses from one investigation (Walker et al., 2004) within the systematic review indicated that the majority of K-12 teacher participants (N = 422) did not begin their teaching careers with deficit beliefs towards their students but that these ideologies and prejudices developed and crystalized over time. Teachers without adequate prior preparation were susceptible to misinformation

about multilingual students (e.g., disseminated from school systems) and those who held misconceptions about L2/bilingual development were prone to deficit orientations when their expectations for students' progress were not realized. Teachers who had positive experiences teaching linguistically diverse students cultivated asset-based beliefs while those with negative experiences due to feeling under-prepared, unsupported, and unsure of where to begin in their instruction to support students' linguistically and cognitively developed negative ideologies even when they were well-intentioned (Walker et al., 2004).

Gallagher and Scrivner (2024) extended Kim's 2021 work in a systematic review of 63 K-12 U.S. investigations that were published by the end of 2020. Researchers emphasized that the 2024 findings exposed the persistence of deficit orientations that have been extensively documented and that these orientations can be contradictory (e.g., valuing multilingualism while not promoting these practices). The review accentuated how external factors (e.g., school context) vastly shape teachers' ideologies and impact their actions regardless of their beliefs. Time and resource constraints (e.g., scarcity of materials, training), were key external factors that stymied teachers' willingness to differentiate instruction when needed, contributing to a cycle of negative orientations and justifications for not providing appropriate accommodations.

U.S. teacher education programs and other forms of extended PL coursework have, therefore, served as the backdrop for investigations on teachers' ideologies with an emphasis on practice-based (PB) experiences, requiring teachers to enact new concepts into practice while being responsive to student needs (Zeichner, 2012). These studies highlight how teachers' experiences instructing and observing multilingual students may provide pivotal moments to think through new knowledge applied in theory-to-practice connections. Tigert et. al (2021) confirmed that "consolidating theory with teaching experiences grounded in practice" (p. 1) is an essential ingredient in developing linguistically sensitive practices. Substantive PB experiences have been curated in multiple ways (e.g., designing lessons, tutoring, teaching) (e.g., Clark-Goff et al., 2020; Mellom et al., 2018; Renn et al., 2024; Viesca et al., 2020) for both pre- and in-service general education teachers. Although pre-service teachers' positive ideological shifts were documented in field experiences which required the integration of more linguistically responsive practices (Clark-Goff et al., 2020; Li & Peters, 2020), in-service teachers benefitted ideologically from similar PB opportunities.

As such, Daniel and Pray (2017) documented how two in-service teachers' deficit orientations (e.g., ideologies that Muslim students should be feared, stereotypes of students) were disrupted when enacting instruction for multilingual learners (Arabic, Urdu, Spanish) in more responsive ways. Teachers, enrolled in a one-year ELL endorsement program, were mentored to think through their problems of practice and episodes of "disjuncture" (Daniel & Pray, 2017; p.810) to enact practices consistent with coursework knowledge (e.g., linguistic theories) and their students' linguistic abilities (e.g., analyzing students' writing, speech). Disjunctures are experiences that stimulate

learning based on introspective questions: “Why has this occurred? How do I do this? (Jarvis, 2009; p. 133). Making sense of problems of practice and disjunctures facilitated ideological shifts and insights as teachers focused on the content that was being taught.

Similarly, Renn et al. (2024) and Mellom et al. (2018) reported shifts in teachers’ deficit ideologies when teachers were engaged in PB experiences. Renn et al. (2024) investigated the beliefs and practices of five general education teachers. Teachers were completing an add-on endorsement to support multilingual students while receiving customized coaching to enact new knowledge into their English language development (ELD) lessons. Coaching included a range of 40 topics including teachers’ attitudes/beliefs. This PL experience afforded positive shifts in teachers’ individual beliefs about their students and ELD practices (e.g., oral language interactions, writing) implemented in varied instructional formats. Further, Mellom et al., (2018) found that 3rd and 5th grade teachers who were trained to implement Instructional Conversations (IC) (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991) as a culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy (small group peer interactions) expressed more humanizing views of their EB students at the end of the year. Teachers attributed a shift in thinking to the time spent in small-group interactions which enabled them to know their students better and provide more relevant instruction.

Researchers (Viesca et al., 2020) noted, however, in an 18-week eWorkshop investigation that some teachers may experience a linguistically responsive learning curve that may be steeper to overcome because their prior knowledge and experiences may hinder their readiness for ideological change. In this study, a general education teachers’ deficit orientation on language (a barrier to learning) and misconceptions about multilingualism (e.g., MT maintenance creates English learning obstacles) remained difficult to reconcile with more expansive eWorkshop concepts. This resistance to new ideas may have contributed to minimal eWorkshop engagement, limiting this teacher’s ability to experience the potential of LRT practices. Researchers suggested that “change is dependent on both what is brought to the learning and the teachers’ investment in learning” (Viesca et al., 2020, p. 99). A teachers’ investment in PL matters.

Collectively, findings from these literature syntheses and practice-based studies suggest that teachers’ deficit ideologies are potentially malleable when teachers are better prepared to cope with the demands of language-based practices in linguistically responsive ways. Customized language awareness *experiences* with theory-to-practice applications may potentially provide opportunities for teachers to make sense of how to enact responsive practices consistent with new knowledge they are learning. These experiences may contribute to ideological transformations when teachers make an authentic investment in the PL opportunity. Further research, however, is warranted in this area.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The current qualitative study was grounded on Borg's (2009, 2015) language teacher cognition (LTC) theoretical framework as it has been operationalized in the second language acquisition field in which the teaching of English is the primary focus. LTC can be considered as "the complex, practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs, that language teachers draw on in their work" (Borg, 2009; p. 321). As such, exploring individual teachers' practice and cognition in teacher-generated accounts (Borg, 2015) is prioritized to better understand how teachers cope with the demands of language instruction. These accounts may provide insights on how teachers make sense of their world – including their perceptions of students (multilingual) and language practices (Borg, 2009). The teacher's active role as learner underscores the personal nature of an ideology because what teachers think and believe are influenced by continuous learning experiences (PL opportunities, classroom practices, schooling, context). Aligned to Borg's (2009) LTC framework is the idea that practice-based experiences (Daniel & Pray, 2017) may lead to ideological shifts as teachers encounter their world (e.g., students, instruction) differently (Gal & Irvine, 2019).

5. STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of this qualitative study was to more deeply understand the deficit ideologies of two general education teachers enrolled in an 18-week eWorkshop, *Language and Concept Development* [LCD] with 31 other PK-5 educators (general education teachers and specialists: Physical Education, Music, Life Skills) at the same school. Feiman-Nemser (2001) suggest that teachers may experience ideological shifts when they engage in a PL experience in which the content is connected to their daily challenges. The following research question was addressed: What ideological stances do teachers hold about EB students and how do these change over the course of a professional learning experience (eWorkshop)?

6. METHOD

6.1 Setting and Context

This qualitative study (Creswell & Poth, 2018), conducted in the U.S. Rocky Mountain Region, was part of a larger 5-year federally funded multi-state PD investigation across 10 universities. Scholars collaborated to understand quality content instruction for multilingual learners while developing opportunities (18-week eWorkshops) for general educators to design and enact quality instruction that has demonstrated positive outcomes for EB learners (e.g., August et al., 2009). School districts participated based on their high percentage of multilingual students and educators consented to allow their

online eWorkshop discussions to be considered as research data. The 18-week eWorkshops that were available for interested school districts were available at no cost and organized within a broader Language and Equity framework.

6.2 School Site

The setting for the current study was one PK-5 school, predominantly Latinx and with a minoritized population of 88%. The school was selected because it was situated in a school district that had entered into a three-year consent decree with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to resolve a civil rights violation which included inadequate development of EB students' English proficiency and low academic outcomes. All school district teachers were mandated by the DOJ to receive training to provide effective and equitable instruction to EB students to enable them to overcome language barriers that hinder meaningful academic participation. At the time of the study, 46% of the district's student population were acquiring English as a second language with many of these students (e.g., Grade 9, 52%; Grade 6, 47%; Grade 3, 43%) receiving special education services, suggesting an over-identification of multilingual students for these services.

Educators (N=33) in this study were primarily Caucasian with 8 identifying as Latinx and one as Asian American. Thirty-two teachers self-identified as English-dominant, one as Spanish-dominant, and two as proficient in a second language (Spanish). In terms of their intercultural experiences, 88% had traveled outside of the U.S., with 7 traveling more than 6 weeks at a time. Approximately 50% of the participants reported 14 to 34 years of teaching. All teachers held a general elementary license while two (kindergarten, grade 1) held formal training (CLD endorsement) to teach multilingual learners and two were enrolled in such training.

All teachers were implementing a Sheltered Instruction model, adjusting English as the MOI while teaching content knowledge because a bilingual education approach was not available. Although the school district mandated completion of the 18-week LCD eWorkshop, the current study focused only on participants' completion of Unit 3: Language Development. Teachers' post-eWorkshop responses to a brief questionnaire indicated that 93% believed the PL experience increased their knowledge and ability to work effectively with multilingual learners.

6.3 Classroom Teachers

Two teachers were purposefully sampled (Creswell & Poth, 2018) as by their demonstrated deficit orientations about EB learners as noted in preliminary analyses of the *Explore* discussion. This will be discussed later. Again, the literature suggests that a deficit ideology may problematize EB learners by upholding views about their

inadequacies and lack (e.g., language, abilities, effort) (Gorski, 2011; Kim, 2022). The two participants were more experienced teachers and were responsible for a general education classroom (3rd grade) or an ancillary K-5 music setting. At the time of the eWorkshop, they did not have formal preparation (Bilingual/TESOL education or an aligned endorsement) to support multilingual learners but held a general elementary or specialist (Music) license. Pseudonyms were used instead of actual names.

Lola was a 3rd grade Latinx educator with a general elementary license and 18 years of teaching experience. She was English dominant, had traveled internationally, and did not speak a non-English language. Her class enrollment included 10 students who spoke Spanish at home with some ability to speak and understand English and one Ukrainian student who spoke his MT at home.

Manuela, an experienced Latinx music educator, planned instruction for 23 different music sections for 500+ K-5 students in which half were EB learners. Students' home languages other than English included Spanish, Vietnamese, Laotian, Russian, Ukrainian, and a few languages she could not identify. She was English dominant while acknowledging "some" Spanish knowledge and had traveled internationally.

6.4 Measures and Data Collection Procedures

Two data sources were collected and analyzed after all teachers completed the 18-week LCD eWorkshop during the Spring semester as they followed an implementation timeline established by the district facilitator based on district-level DOJ-driven goals. Data included two written accounts provided by each teacher in the form of two topic-driven discussion posts (*Explore, Share*). Teacher-generated accounts were appropriate for investigating ideologies because they represented first-hand narratives of teachers' perceived reality (Borg, 2015) of their language teaching context. Teachers documented their perceived reality as they advanced through a three-part asynchronous learning cycle, participating in the *Explore* discussion prior to *Make-it-Work* - a job-embedded application that generated insights that were discussed in the final *Share* post.

6.4.1 Instructional Materials and Procedures

6.4.1.1 Theoretical Framework

The eWorkshop was grounded in a linguistically responsive teaching (LRT) paradigm (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) and Feiman-Nemser's (2001) responsive teacher-learning (RTL) framework. The LRT framework places "language" at the center of teachers' PL experiences that are curated for multilingual learners while highlighting the importance of *pedagogical language* (Bunch, 2013) and *disciplinary linguistic knowledge* (Turkan et al., 2014) in content teaching. The RTL framework, however, theorizes that

practitioner needs should be addressed across all stages (novice, veteran teachers) of a "professional learning continuum" (p. 1-14) because all educators are still learning to teach more effectively at every phase of their career. The implication is that language teachers require "sustained and substantive" (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; p. 1042) PL experiences (e.g., beyond brief workshops) that are relevant to their specific pedagogical concerns, including their language-based challenges (Li & Peters, 2020). In accordance with these frameworks, in-service teachers who may have inadequate preparation (e.g., specialized coursework, credentials) to support EB students' disciplinary learning may be considered as teachers who are still learning to teach multilingual students effectively.

6.4.1.2 The eWorkshop Design: Three-Part Learning Cycle

The 18-week asynchronous eWorkshops were developed by interdisciplinary teams of researchers, teachers, and graduate level students with expertise in disciplinary instruction (e.g., science), multimedia and technology, language acquisition, and language pedagogy. They were not designed for individual self-paced participation but were intended for teachers at the same school to participate simultaneously in a community of practice, allowing practitioners from different contexts to support each other while exploring new ideas. Each 18-week eWorkshop consisted of 6 smaller units, each requiring 3 weeks to complete, and were sequenced to build and connect new ideas to previous unit concepts (see Viesca et al., 2016 for details). Unit 3, Language Development, was organized around a focal question: *How can I uncover the language demands of my instruction?* Unit 3, therefore expanded foundational knowledge from Units 1 and 2, emphasizing that EB learners acquire content knowledge through language even when initially they may not have sufficient vocabulary to communicate ideas. Teachers were learning to provide students with explicit opportunities to demonstrate what they know even as they grew in their L2/bilingual abilities.

Each teacher participant advanced through a 3-part learning cycle (*Explore*, *Make-it-Work*, *Share*) which allowed them to engage in two topic-driven discussions. The following summarizes the scope and sequence for Unit 3: Language Development - *How can I uncover the language demands of my instruction?*

6.4.1.2.1 Explore

Teachers first engaged with L2 acquisition content (e.g., multimedia resources [how language functions in life and in L2 English learning], readings, WIDA Standards, L2 myths, cognitive tools [etc., Uncovering Language Demand, Concept Ladder]) before participating in a topic-driven asynchronous discussion: *What are challenges you face in uncovering language demand of your instruction?* This discussion encouraged collective participation before advancing to *Make-it-Work*.

6.4.1.2.2 Make-it-Work [MIW]

Teachers selected one of three job-embedded applications to analyze the language demand of a content lesson (e.g., video-record and analyze a lesson, use the Content Ladder tool to analyze a lesson, create their own analysis option) they would actually teach by integrating *Explore* insights. This experience utilized the disciplinary content that was being taught.

6.4.1.2.3 Share

Teachers uploaded their *MIW* materials and returned to the online discussion to share their *MIW* insights while reflecting on this question: *How can I uncover the language demands of my instruction?*

6.4.2 Data Analysis Procedures

This qualitative study focused on the analyses of words within participants' asynchronous discussion posts representing participant views to construct a "complex, holistic picture" (Creswell, 1998; p. 15) of educators' ideologies related to teaching EB learners. Qualitative analyses focused on unitizing the data by organizing topic-driven narratives into significant themes of commonality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). *Explore* and *Share* discussions served as pre- and post-data points centered around the *MIW* application. The *Explore* narratives generated 38 pages of data with individual posts ranging in length from 41 to 236 words. The *Share* narratives generated 38 pages of data with individual posts ranging from 100 – 319 words. Analyses included a tiered open-coding approach (Saldaña, 2016) that resulted in two data analytic stages.

6.4.2.1 Tier 1 Analyses

In the Tier 1 preliminary analyses, researchers first pawed (Ryan & Bernard, 2003) through the data to note the general flow of the *Explore* and *Share* discussions. As teachers introduced their class context, researchers noted their awareness of students' spoken languages and a reference to an uploaded table of the school's *Overall Proficiency by Grade*. This table utilized WIDA's terminology for L2 development stages (e.g., *entering, emerging*, *developing*) which are aligned to what multilingual students can do linguistically (e.g., *Can Do Descriptors*) (WIDA- University of Wisconsin Madison). Teachers did not utilize WIDA terminology to describe their students' L2 development with some utilizing more traditional labels (e.g., *Non-English Proficient* [NELP]). There was no evidence that teachers perceived students' MT as a barrier to subject-area learning.

Table 1. Summary of Themes and Codes

Themes and Sub-Themes	Keyword Search
Explore Discussion	
Language Demand Challenges	• The Structure of the English Language: Grammar/Syntax, Vocabulary, Morphology, and Phonology
	• Receptive/Expressive Language Expectations • Developmentally Appropriate Language Practices – PK/K • Differentiating Instruction- Diverse English Language Abilities
Teacher Beliefs	
English is a Difficult Language to Teach	• Teachers Require Deeper Knowledge: • Second Language Acquisition • English Language Structures • Students' Linguistic Abilities • Action Plans: Improve English Language Instruction
English is a Difficult Language to Learn	
Deficit Orientations about EB Learners	• Lack Motivation and Effort • Exhibit Language Deficiencies
Share Discussion	
Teachers' Increased Language Awareness	• Students' Linguistic Abilities Scaffolds/Modifications • Language Expectations Across the Curriculum • Confusing English Language Elements • Action Plans: Minimize English Language Confusion

Next, Atlas.ti23 software was utilized to support open-coding analyses of the *Explore* and *Share* discussions separately, attending to teachers' substantial responses to the two discussion prompts while excluding brief peer commentaries (e.g., *I agree with you*.). Researchers reviewed and discussed all codes to reconcile any disagreements (4 items)

before organizing the *Explore* codes into two broad themes and the *Share* codes into one theme. The themes were "outcomes of coding… and analytic reflection" (Saldaña, 2016; p. 198) (see Table 1 below for more details).

6.4.2.1.1 Explore Theme

Language-Demand Challenges (LDC) and Teachers' Beliefs (TB) served as the overarching *Explore* themes. The LDC theme reflected teachers' challenges attributed to uncovering the language demands within their content instruction (see Table 2 below for examples).

Table 2. Explore Verbatim: Teachers' Language-Demand Challenges

The challenges I face in uncovering language demand is the differing language and academic levels in my classroom. I have such a wide range of ability levels that I can struggle at times in meeting everyone's needs.
One of my biggest challenges I face when uncovering language demand in the gym is vocabulary words such as offense and defense. I find that repetition, modeling and the fact that the students actually perform the vocabulary words helps.
A challenge I face at the preschool level is syntax. Even native English speakers have difficulty with this when learning to speak our very complex language.
One challenge I face is taking into consideration all the grammatical nuances of the English language. Like when I'm teaching measurement but the students often refer to the topic as simply "measure." They hear me say both depending on the sentence I am saying, but the words are so similar and new to them they often flip flop them in their contexts.
One specific challenge I face is the neglect I put on which types of language structures my students do or do not know. This can provide a misunderstanding for them and a misunderstanding for me because I am not aware of their challenges most fully.
A challenge I have encountered with the language demands for CLD learners is that there are so many new vocabulary words and they might have multiple meanings. We have to make sure that all meanings are explained clearly to students.

The TB theme included two subthemes: Beliefs about the English Language–Difficult to Teach/Learn and Deficit Beliefs about EB Learners (see Table 3). The LDC theme and Beliefs about the English Language subtheme frequently overlapped because teacher participants predominantly discussed concerns about their level of English knowledge (e.g., *I did not learn anything about verb tense, etc. until college and would not consider myself an exper*t…) and the challenge of leveraging English as a second language to teach content to multilingual learners. Teachers also desired to transform their language-embedded disciplinary practices based on the knowledge they were

learning (e.g., *This will help us create scaffolds to support students in meeting content language objectives*). Previous investigations have similarly documented teachers' desire to expand their knowledge of the English language (e.g., inconsistencies, syntax) and L2 acquisition to better support students' learning (Hiatt & Fairbairn, 2018). References to EB students were minimal and mostly sympathetic. One teacher shared, "I always am so impressed when our students are able to learn a second language. English is such a difficult language to learn because we have so many frustrating rules!" Six teachers, however, made explicit negative commentaries about EB students' language, effort, and motivation to work hard. These statements were evidence of deficit orientations (e.g., something lacking in the learner) that have been previously noted in the literature (Kim 2022; Ortiz, 2016). Two of these teachers were selected for Tier 2 analyses due to their complete data set (*Explore/Share* posts) and years of experiences.

Table 3. Explore Verbatim: Teachers' Beliefs about English [Difficult Language to Teach/Learn]

I always am so impressed when our students are able to learn a second language. English is such a difficult language to learn because we have so many frustrating rules! The English language has complex patterns and rules that even the most proficient English speakers have trouble applying let alone students who are simultaneously learning two languages As a native English speaker, I don't think about word order, I just do it. It's good to have some guidelines to help.
That is one thing [grammatical structures] that English-speakers take for granted and just assume that students understand and keep up [sic]. I find myself needing to be more aware as well.
I notice that many of the sounds in our language are not present in other languages so making the correct sounds is difficult for preschool letters. Often a student can correctly identify the sound but has more difficulty saying it.
It is easy to forget the complexity of the language we use every day. The small nuances of prefixes, suffixes, verb tenses etc. can be highly confusing for our students learning language along with the concepts being taught.

6.4.2.1.2 Share Theme

The predominant theme across the *Share* discussion – shaped by *MIW* insights - was Teachers' Increased Language Awareness (see Table 4). This theme reflected teachers' deeper consciousness of disciplinary language expectations, students' linguistic potential, and actions to make the curriculum more accessible through embedded ELD tasks strengthened by clarifications of confusing English language elements.

Table 3. Share Verbatim: Teachers' Increased Language Awareness

In general, I noticed that language demands were a lot more plentiful than I would have imagined. There are so many expectations for students that I didn't even realize how confusing it could be for a language learner. I need to be more self-aware of my expectations and do a lot more checks for understanding.
I just completed the Concept Ladder for "Make it Work" and I found it really difficult to break down the science concept I chose into the language parts that address the needs of second language learners… Trying to make the lesson engaging and addressing vocabulary, language functions, and language structures is going to require a different way of thinking through the lesson from now on.
I chose to analyze 3-5 minutes of a guided math lesson on finding area. Some of the language functions that I noticed being used included: seeking information, informing, analyzing, and solving problems… I noticed that students were able to successfully communicate their ideas to one another and explain how to find the area or missing numbers in an equation. ELL students were able to be successful although their sentences might not have been grammatically correct all of the time. Making sure that ELL students knew the vocabulary ahead of time (length, width, square, rectangle) allowed them to be able to explain and solve the problems… It was interesting to become aware of just how many language demands there are in a math lesson. I want to begin focusing more on the language demands during math and how I can help students further their language skills during other content areas.
I analyzed a segment of a lesson that required students to compare and contrast two stories… In general, I noticed that just the amount of language function necessary for students to communicate their ideas was a lot! I noticed my fluent English speaker was quicker to process his ideas verbally with a partner or with myself before he felt comfortable writing his thoughts down on paper. With sentence stems and visuals, he was still able to participate fully…I believe it is important to ensure all students can access the activities without the curriculum being "watered down."
I analyzed a lesson I did during social skills when I was teaching students about the size of a problem. We want to teach students that our reactions should match the size of the problem… This is a very abstract concept and students need to be familiar with sizes (small, medium, big), feelings, and what reactions are. We use a flow map to teach problem, feeling, reaction. When I looked back on the lesson, I realized how much language was really being used by the students. They were not fully understanding and I needed to provide more scaffolds. When I created sentence starters, students were able to use that and make connections more appropriately.

6.4.2.2 Tier 2 Analyses

The Tier 2 analyses of the two teachers' *Explore* and *Share* discussion posts included further open-coding (Saldaña, 2016) followed by Gee's (2011) connections-building discourse analysis tool which promotes analyses of how participants make word connections. Discourse analyses were appropriate because discourse, when understood as "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world" (Jorgenson & Phillips, 2002; p. 1), may be used to shed light on teachers' subjective ideological stances (Cruz & Anderson, 2021). From an LTC paradigm (Borg, 2009), these ideological stances may be evident in discourse that provides insights about how teachers make

sense of their world – including perceptions of EB students and language practices. The researchers independently reviewed the two teachers' word connections within their *Explore* and *Share* discussions and reconciled any differences in data analyses. As such, trustworthiness of the study resided in the use of multiple data analytic strategies (initial Atlas.ti23 open-coding, unitizing codes into thematic categories, discourse analyses) and low-inference descriptors (verbatim) to ensure the analyses were not representative of researchers' personal views (Johnson, 1997).

Last, researchers referred to Gal and Irvine's (2019) interpretation of ideology to understand how other teacher participants described language-demand challenges that were similar to those encountered by the two focal teachers. Because an ideology represents an incomplete view of the world, other teacher participants may view EB learners and similar problems of practice differently. Two themes, representing teachers' deficit ideologies about their EB learners, emerged from the Tier 2 *Explore* analyses: EB Students Lack Effort and Motivation to Learn and EB Students Lack Language. One theme emerged from the Tier 2 *Share* analyses: EB Students are Capable of Complex Language Use.

7. FINDINGS

Below we summarize the findings from the Tier 2 analyses that address the research question: What ideological stances do teachers hold about EB students and how do these change over the course of a professional learning (eWorkshop) experience?

7.1 The Explore Discussion

Teachers' initial ideologies emerged during the *Explore* discussion after reviewing content on how language serves specific functions (e.g., comparing, informing) and has language structures (e.g., morphology, syntax) that may be challenging for multilingual students. The negative orientations were embedded in the context of a problem of practice.

7.1.1 EB Students' Lack Effort and Motivation to Learn

Lola, a 3rd grade experienced Latinx teacher, discussed her students' writing difficulties:

> One challenge with the language demand is transfer [sic] the oral practice to writing. Students often shut down in writing and revert back to the simple sentences. I am not sure if this is because they can't or that writing just seems to be an area where students lack motivation and take the easier way out. After reading the Pitfalls article, I found some good information to help me explain the "why" of our language. I heard that over time, students will learn it. This seems to align very well with our Morning Meeting [class time] opportunities. In the article I also heard the author mention not to over correct because this can cause students to shut down and not want to try. This seems

> like a real balancing [act] …After reading the article, I also was overwhelmed with the rules and the "why's" and it made me think just how difficult this must be for a Second Language Learner.

Lola initially described EB students' behaviors as not putting forth effort and lacking motivation (e.g., *can't*, *lack motivation*, *taking the easier way out*) when faced with complex writing tasks. Lola cannot understand the root cause of students' writing challenges, attributing the learning barrier to students' lack of motivation and the perceived tendency to "*take the easier way out*." Lola, however, pivots in her reflection with an acknowledgement of uncertainty: "*I'm not sure*." Lola was open to new knowledge to shed light on her classroom experiences based on her reference to the *Pitfalls* article (*good information*, *helps me to explain why*) that provided insights about how EB students learn: *"Students will shut down and not try when teachers over correct*." Lola begins to fine-tune her ideology about EB learners, acknowledging that designing appropriate content instruction *"seems like a real balancing act*." She is beginning to attribute students' writing difficulties to the complexity of the English language and not to their lack of motivation: "*It made me think just how difficult this must be for a Second Language Learner*."

In contrast, to Lola's initial negative orientation, another teacher participant demonstrated an initial awareness of how the English language structure (syntax) contributed to students' ability to transition from writing simple to complex sentences:

> One of the challenges I face right now in language demands is syntax during writing. Students have mastered simple sentences and are ready to move on to more complex sentences. After much modeling, sentence frames, discussions, and think alouds, students are still not able to make their sentences make sense in writing, or they go back to the simple sentence structure. They can make simple sentences orally, so they have the first step! The English language is very complex and confusing so we'll continue practicing. This is a skill that will take years to master.

This teacher did not describe EB students as unmotivated or taking the easier way out during complex writing tasks but maintained an asset-based perspective of students' abilities: *They can make simple sentences orally, so they have the first step!* Similarly, another teacher participant believed that "specific [English] language attributes" contributed to students' expressive and receptive language challenges:

> I have found this year…the subtle differences in … language need are profound. One may be able to use pronouns with ease while the others have not developed the ability to identify, let alone use, terms such as "this," "that one," "hers," and so on. Without carefully tracking the specific language attributes, and whether the student showed the ability expressively and receptively, I would be totally missing critical language pieces in intervention for kiddos.

This teacher believed that "critical language pieces" contributed to students' language abilities. She held herself accountable for identifying/tracking students' expressive/receptive language development without problematizing students for knowledge they were still developing.

7.1.2 EB Students Lack Language

Unlike Lola, Manuela, a music teacher with some level of Spanish proficiency (self-disclosed as "somewhat") felt overwhelmed in planning music instruction (e.g., music theory) for a much more linguistically diverse K-5 student population and for a larger number of students (500) in which 250 were multilingual learners. She wrote the following:

> I agree the prep time to get appropriate visuals to support the language of a lesson sometimes feels prohibitive. I save everything in files to make future lesson prep a little simpler…I think the biggest challenge…is dealing with so many different levels of students whose variety of language experiences is unknown to me. Having 23 different classes means it takes much longer to get to know the specific language needs of a given group of students. Language needs are not limited to ESL students. Even students who speak English only are sometimes significantly lacking in English vocabulary. It is impossible to know what deficiencies will need to be addressed until a particular group is engaging with a lesson.

Manuela underscored overwhelming time constraints and a wide-range of student abilities (e.g., *different grade levels*, *varied language experiences*) that she had to "*deal with*" - a negatively charged colloquial expression that refers to a thing (a context) or person that creates a difficult situation or causes a problem that one must attend to (Merriam Webster Dictionary). When considering the language demand of music instruction designed for a wide range of linguistically diverse learners, Manuela perceived students' *language deficiencies* as the focus for instructional planning. She referenced the eWorkshop *Explore* content when acknowledging the importance of embedding visual representations of essential music terms into her lesson but does not fully anticipate the broader range of language expectations within her discipline that may hinder students' ability to benefit from music instruction. Similar to Lola, she acknowledges that she does not know (e.g., *unknown to me*, *takes much longer to get to know*) how to provide adequate language support for her students.

The physical education (P.E.) teacher also planned instruction for large multilingual classes (250 students). In comparison to Lola, he identified the language demands of P.E. tasks and specific language stimulation strategies (modeling, repeating, enacting word meanings) with an asset-based belief that EB students could successfully participate in the scaffolded activities. He did not problematize EB learners' emerging language abilities:

> One of my biggest challenges I face when uncovering language demand in the gym is vocabulary words such as offense and defense. I find that repetition, modeling and the fact that students actually perform the vocabulary words helps.

Overall, deficit ideologies emerged when the two focal teachers described their inability to engage students successfully in language-embedded disciplinary tasks although they seemed supportive of students' content learning. Other teacher participants encountered similar problems of practice but made sense of their experiences

differently. This included more asset-based perceptions of students and responsive language practices with a deeper awareness of how the complexities of the English language must be addressed to ensure student's access to the curriculum.

7.2 The Share Discussion

The Tier 2 *Share* analyses provided evidence of the two focal teachers' ability to discern how the presence of heavy language demands within academic tasks could interfere with students' learning. Teachers perceived EB learners as capable of complex language use while making sense of how to enact practices (linguistic scaffolding, language modeling) that were consistent with the knowledge gained from the eWorkshop content.

7.2.1 EB Students are Capable of Complex Language Use

Lola described her MIW experience as "eye-opening":

> I agree with you about thinking math is easier. This activity opened up my eyes to just how many language demands there are in math…I videotaped a math lesson on the floor on area and perimeter and knowing the difference between them. After looking at the lesson, I realized students had to inform, use synonyms, compare and contrast and evaluate. The lesson was language heavy and while teaching I used visuals on the TV as well as gestures to help students with vocabulary. I rewatched the video and observed and compared a bilingual student and a non-bilingual student and noticed some differences in how they responded. The bilingual student was slower to answer and seemed a little more reluctant. The other students didn't seem to need as much time to think. This activity did help me see the language expectations in a simple lesson.

Lola's lesson analyses (e.g., I observed and compared… I realized that students had to…) included phrases that implied a nuanced awareness of how EB students are expected to use language during analytical tasks that are characteristic of the mathematics discipline. Lola now perceived EB learners as capable of persevering through language heavy tasks and that they are still taking in new information and learning when may engage with the curriculum differently than their native English-speaking peers. The *Share* post provides evidence of Lola's more positive and expansive ideological orientation based on the *MIW* experience. This more positive ideological stance was also noticeable in Manuela's *MIW* experience (analysis of a music lesson):

> One of the things I've noticed myself doing since beginning this course is intentionally using essential vocabulary as many times as possible during direct instruction. I also now realize that "essential vocabulary" is not limited to academic content. When I repeatedly use the same language in that 3-5- minute span, I notice that students are more willing and able to use it as well. I love the use of the word "intentional" in this [eWorkshop]. These strategies are wonderful tools for having our students intentionally engage with each other through language using sentence stems or similar tools to help students with feeling confident and successful in these interactions… I found trying to do this through a Concept Ladder a more difficult task than others I have tried. On the other hand, it was

> a useful process to force myself to think in new ways…I had to think a little deeper. It occurred to me that in creating music, students have to evaluate [her emphasis] what they are playing and synthesize [her emphasis] their choices on staff paper using music notation. The Language Demands Tool is turning into my favorite tool so far.

Manuela shared that EB students were "successful," able, and "willing" to undertake complex music tasks (e.g., evaluate, synthesize data on music staff paper) when she implemented linguistically responsive practices (e.g., anticipating how students should use language in her discipline, modeling language). She referred to the eWorkshop's Concept Ladder tool which required her to think deeper about the language expectations within the music discipline: *…it was a useful process to force myself to think in new ways*. Manuela acknowledged that planning music instruction to support varied levels of language proficiency required more thinking and effort. Similar to Lola, her analyses included clarifying phrases (*It occurred to me that in creating music, students have to evaluate… When I repeatedly use the same language in that 3-5- minute span, I notice that students are more willing …*) that imply a deeper awareness of students' abilities (linguistic, cognitive) based on her *MIW* experience.

Throughout the eWorkshop, Lola and Manuela remained receptive to new knowledge and invested time in the tasks. As such, they attributed their deeper awareness about L2 development to eWorkshop participation (e.g., Manuela: *One of the things I've noticed myself doing since beginning this course…*).

8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The goal of the present study was to examine general education teachers' ideologies about EB learners that emerged from a PL experience (eWorkshop) and to understand how they changed. Drawing from Borg's (2009, 2015) LTC framework that teachers' ideologies are influenced by continuous learning experiences, the investigators noted ideological shifts in the two focal teachers as they utilized eWorkshop content to think through problems of practice to enact disciplinary instruction in linguistically responsive ways. This finding is aligned to insights from Kim's (2021) systematic literature review which suggested that *knowledge* (e.g., L2/Bilingual development) and *experience* (training, customized teaching) were two main predictors of teachers' positive ideologies towards multilingual learners. As such, the two focal teachers with initial negative ideologies towards EB learners were positioned to think differently about their students and their instruction as they actively engaged in reflective eWorkshop tasks. As a practice-based PL approach, both "process and content" (Renn et al., 2024; p. 160) mattered in curating experiences to increase teacher's language awareness (Valdés et al., 2005) as a critical lever in disrupting misconceptions about multilingual learners.

Specifically, the eWorkshop design potentially positioned teachers for ideological shifts by exposing them to important language development *content* (e.g., *Explore* readings,

cognitive tools [Concept Ladder], knowledge about the functions/structures of language) in tandem with a *process* which required them to think through a language-based problem of practice. This is important because most teachers do not notice the language used during instruction without specific guidance (process) because these experiences are easily taken for granted (Valdés et al., 2005). Further, the *MIW* customized application may have served as a turning-point in teachers' perceptions of EB students (strengths, abilities, motivation) based on observations of students' language use and development through a more expansive lens (eWorkshop content).

As such, findings from the current study align with previous scholarship (Daniel & Pray, 2017; Renn et al.,2024) in which explicit content and process were essential ingredients in a PL experience that contributed to in-service teachers' ideological transformations. Renn et al. (2024) premised that customized ELD coaching provided a crucial process to "get teachers to higher levels of application" (p. 160) while attending to individual needs (e.g., personal attitudes/beliefs). However, teachers also needed to learn concrete content from their university ELL-endorsement coursework (e.g., oral language development) to enact these ideas in their language and literacy practices. Daniel and Pray (2017) documented how customized mentoring of teachers in a similar ELL-Endorsement program enabled them to think through problems of practice and episodes of disjuncture to enact practices consistent with coursework content (e.g., linguistic principles).

In these studies, teachers' ideological shifts were evident (e.g., positive attitudes towards students; deficit views shifted to more affirming orientations) along with an increased attention to EB students' strengths and language development. These findings were consistent with those of the current study and suggest that teachers' deficit ideologies may be potentially disrupted when they are actively engaged with high priority knowledge and substantive PB experiences. This includes taking advantage of comprehensive materials, substantial trainings with tailored tasks, and opportunities to make sense of occasional failed instructional experiences by enacting new ideas within the content they teach. Short-term generic strategy-driven workshops may not yield the same ideological transformations (Lucas et al, 2018; Lucas & Villegas, 2010).

9. LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Our findings should be considered in the context of study limitations. First, there was a missed opportunity to explore the rationale underpinning the initial deficit orientations of the two teachers because the researchers did not identify teachers' ideologies while participants were engaged in the eWorkshop. Although the deficit ideologies were noticeable to the researchers based on a review of the literature, these statements may have been perceived as innocuous by the two teachers, warranting follow-up discussions (e.g., ethnographic) to generate deeper ideological clarity (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017). In general, teachers' ideologies, often implicit or hidden (Borg, 2011), may represent

"unresolved…tensions" (Cruz & Anderson, 2021; p. 13) that may or may not be moderated by their personal experiences (e.g., parental socialization) and K-12 schooling (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Elshafie et al., 2023; Gallagher & Scrivner, 2024). Assimilationist experiences in restrictive English-only school environments may produce teachers who hold negative orientations about L2/bilingual practices and EB learners (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Elshafie et al., 2023).

The current study did not collect such contextual data. Therefore, it was not possible to reason how teachers' lived experiences may have contributed to their orientations about teaching multilingual learners. Future research must explore how teachers' personal experiences shape their ideologies. Further, follow-up data were not collected to determine if the two teachers were able to navigate future language-based challenges from more asset-based perspectives due to their deeper language awareness. In general, teachers of EB learners are expected to develop a "tolerance for ambiguity" (López et al., 2012; p. 46) that allows them to approach contradictions and occasional pedagogical failure in ways that are not harmful to students. Future research must explore how to curate substantive PL experiences that build teacher resiliency during a process of ideological demystification. Disrupting deficit thinking requires that teachers develop a deeper understanding of who they are as individuals (Gorski, 2011) and this is an ongoing process (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We received funding from the Office of English Language Acquisition (CFDA: 84.305A 13).

THE AUTHORS

Sharolyn D. Pollard-Durodola is a Professor in the Department of Early Childhood, Multilingual, and Special Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Their research interests include language and literacy development of multilingual students and the intersection of educator beliefs with language education policies.

Joyti G. Senthil is a doctoral student with an emphasis on Educational Leadership, Management, and Policy at the University of Bath. Their research interests include national, multilingual, and curricular policies aligning with leadership and school reforms from an international perspective.

Kara Mitchell Viesca is a Professor of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Their research interests include advancing equity in the policy and practice of educator development, particularly for teachers of multilingual learners.

REFERENCES

Accurso, K., López Rodriguez, A., & López, A. (2019). Challenging deficit perspectives of multilingual learners in everyday talk. *Currents, 42*(1), 39–40.

Alfaro, C. & Bartolomé, L. (2023). Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. In A. Dardner, K. Hernandez, K. D. Lam, & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (pp. 496–512). Routledge.

Alfaro, C. & Gándara, P. (2021). Binational teacher preparation: Constructing pedagogical bridges for the students we share. In P. Gándara, & B. Jensen (Eds.), *The students we share: Preparing U.S. and Mexican educators for our transnational future* (pp. 45–69). State University of New York.

August, D., Branum-Martin, L., Cárdenas- Hagan, E., & Francis, D. J. (2009). The impact of an instructional intervention on the science and language learning of middle grade English language learners. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2*(4), 345–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345740903217623

Baker, C. & Wright, W.E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education* (6th ed). Multilingual Matters.

Ball, A. F., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2020). Educating teachers for the 21st century: Culture, reflection, and learning. In N. S. Nasir, C. D. Lee, R. Pea, & M. M. De Royston (Eds.), *Handbook of the cultural foundations of learning* (pp. 387–403). Routledge.

Banks, T. (2014). From deficit to divergence: Integrating theory to inform the selection of interventions in special education. *Creative Education*, *5*(7), 510–518. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.57060

Bernstein, K. A., Kilinc, S., Deeg, M. T., Marley, S. C., Farrand, K. M., & Kelley, M. F. (2021). 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

Borg S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, *39*(3), 370–380. https://doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009

Borg, S. (2015). Researching teachers' beliefs. In B. Paltridge, & A. Phakiti, (Eds.), *Research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 368–380). Bloomsbury Academic.

Borg. S. (2009). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury.

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298–341. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Chzhen, Y., Rees, G., Gromada, A., Cuesta, J., Bruckauf, Z. (2018). *Innocenti Report Card 15:* An unfair start – Inequality in children's education in rich countries. UNICEF Office of Research. https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/media/1846/file/UNICEF-Report-Card-15-An-Unfair-Start-EN.pdf

Clark-Goff, K., Eslami, Z. R., & Graham, K. M. (2020). Mainstream preservice teachers' beliefs about English language learning and teaching: Contextual factors and belief change. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, 26*, 15–29. https://doi.org/10.2458/jslat.2160

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

Cruz, J., & Anderson, K. T. (2021). Reconceptualizing online discussion forums as a fabricated focus group: Illuminating educators' language ideologies through asynchronous discussion posts. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 37(1), 19–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2021.1991031

Daniel, S. M., & Pray, L. (2017). Learning to teach English language learners: A study of elementary school teachers' sense-making in an ELL endorsement program. *TESOL Quarterly*, *51*(4), 787–819. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.347

Davis, L. P., & Museus, S. D. (2019). What is deficit thinking? An analysis of conceptualizations of deficit thinking and implications for scholarly research. *NCID Currents*, *1*(1), 117–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/currents.17387731.0001.110

Ellis, E. (2016). *The plurilingual TESOL teacher: The hidden language lives of TESOL teachers and why they matter*. Walter de Gruyter.

Elshafie, M., Cole, J. Z., & Zhang, J. (2023). We want them all to speak in English…So, no Spanish: Preservice teachers' language ideologies towards emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology*, *1*(1), 56–85. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8365030

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, *103*(6), 1013–1055. https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00141

Gal, S. & Irvine, J. (2019). *Signs of difference: Language and ideology in social life*. Cambridge University Press.

Gallagher, M. A., & Scrivner, S. (2024). Teachers' beliefs about language diversity and multilingual learners: A systematic review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543241257533

García, O. (2019). Decolonizing foreign, second, heritage, and first languages: Implications for education. In D. Macedo (Ed.), *Decolonizing foreign language education: The misteaching of English and other colonial languages* (pp. 152–168). Routledge.

García, O., & Solorza, C. R. (2021). Academic language and the minoritization of US bilingual Latinx students. *Language and Education*, *35*(6), 505–521. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1825476

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Routledge.

Gorski, P. C. (2011). Unlearning deficit ideology and the scornful gaze: Thoughts on authenticating the class discourse in education. *Counterpoints, 402*, 152–173. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42981081

Hamayan, E. V., Marler, B., Sánchez-López, C., Artiles, A., & Damico, J. (2023). *Special education considerations for multilingual learners: Delivering a continuum of services*. Brooks.

Harper, A., & Kayumova, S. (2023). Invisible multilingual Black and Brown girls: Raciolinguistic narratives of identity in science education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *60*(5), 1092–1124. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21826

Harper, C. A., & de Jong, E. J. (2009). English language teacher expertise: The elephant in the room. *Language and Education*, *23*(2), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802152788

Hiatt, J. E., & Fairbairn, S.B. (2018). Improving the focus of English learner professional development for in-service teachers. *NASSP Bulletin, 102*(3), 228–263. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636518789261

Hsu, F. (2015). The coloniality of neoliberal English: The enduring structures of American colonial English instruction in the Philippines and Puerto Rico. *L2 Journal*, *7*(3), 123–145. https://doi.org//10.5070/L27323549

Hwang, H., Cabell, S. Q., & Joyner, R. E. (2021). Effects of integrated literacy and content-area instruction on vocabulary and comprehension in the elementary years: A meta-analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 23*(3), 223–249. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2021.1954005

Jarvis, P. (2009). *Learning to be a Person in Society*. Routledge.

Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education Review, 118*(2), 282–292.

Jorgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.

Kim, A. I. (2022). (De)legitimation of monolingual ideologies in a US teachers' forum. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(3), 1021–1032. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1740163

Kim, S. L. (2021). A review of the literature on teachers' beliefs about English language learners. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *2*, Article 100040. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100040

Li, N., & Peters, A. W. (2020). Preparing K-12 teachers for ELLs: Improving teachers' L2 knowledge and strategies through innovative professional development. *Urban Education, 55*(10), 1489–1506. https://doi.org//10.1177/0042085916656902

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. *Naturalistic Inquiry*, *289*(331), 289–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8

López, A., Zepeda, M., & Medina, O. (2012). *The dual language learner teacher competencies report*. Alliance for a Better Community.

López, F., & Santibañez, L. (2018). Teacher preparation for emergent bilingual students: Implications of evidence for policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(36). http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2866

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2010). The missing piece in teacher education: The preparation of linguistically responsive teachers. *Teachers College Record*, *112*(14), 297–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/0161468110112014

Lucas, T., Strom, K., Bratkovich, M., & Wnuk, J. (2018). Inservice preparation for mainstream teachers of English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. *The Educational Forum, 82*(2), 156–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420852

Mancilla-Martinez, J. (2020). Understanding and supporting literacy development among English learners: A deep dive into the role of language comprehension. *AERA Open, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858420912198

Mellom, P. J., Straubhaar, R., Balderas, C., Ariail, M., & Portes, P. R. (2018). "They come with nothing:" How professional development in a culturally responsive pedagogy shapes teacher attitudes towards Latino/a English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71*, 98–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.013

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NASEM] (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. The National Academies Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). *English learners in public schools*: *Condition of education*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf

Oh, M. H., & Mancilla-Martinez, J. (2021). Elementary schoolteachers' bilingual development beliefs and English learners' English reading comprehension achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 122*(2), 165–190. https://doi.org/10.1086/716899

Ortiz, S. (2016, June 14). *Collaborative vs. traditional models for English learners in special education* [Workshop]. Colorado Department of Education.

Payant, C., & Bell, P. (2022). "Very easy, it's an English class, therefore they should not rely on a French text" English language teachers' beliefs regarding L1 use for literacy instruction. *Language Teaching for Young Learners*, *4*(1), 143–170. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.21004.pay

Penfield, J. (1987). ESL: The regular classroom teacher's perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586353

Renn, J., Li, H., Choi, W., Wright, W., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2024). Making "small waves of change": Dual language and general education teacher transformation through instructional coaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 58*(1), 138–167. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3216

Rotermund, S., DeRoche, J., & Ottem, R. (2017). *Teacher professional development by selected teacher and school characteristics: 2011-12* (Report No. NCES 2017-200). National Center for Education Statistics.

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education*, *8*(2), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods*, *15*(1), 85–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239569

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Schall-Leckrone, L. (2022). Equipping all teachers to teach disciplinary language: Toward a developmental continuum in teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(2), 840–851. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3141

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1991). *The instructional conversation: Teaching and learning in social activity*. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5th0939d

Tigert, J. M., Peercy, M. M., Fredricks, D., & Kidwell, T. (2022). Humanizing classroom management as a core practice for teachers of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(4), 1087–1111. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3093

Turkan, S., De Oliveira, L. C., Lee, O., & Phelps, G. (2014). Proposing a knowledge base for Teaching academic content to English language learners: Disciplinary linguistic knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(3), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811411600

Uro, G., & Li, D. (2019). *English language learners in America's great city schools*. Council of the Great City Schools.

Valdés, G., Bunch, G., Snow, C., & Lee, C. (2005). Enhancing the development of students' language(s). In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 126–168). Jossey-Bass.

Viesca, K. M., Gray, T., Masterson, J., Demers, K. E., Dray, B., Nguyen, D., … & Pollard-Durodola, S. (2020). Content teacher ideologies and perspectives on multilingual learners. In S. Hammer, K. M. Viesca, & N. L. Commins (Eds.), *Teaching content and language in the multilingual classroom* (pp. 76–102). Routledge.

Viesca, K. M., Hamilton, B., Davidson, A. O., & the eCALLMS Team (2016). Supporting linguistically responsive teaching: e-Learning communities for academic language learning in mathematics and science (eCALLMS). In C. P. Proctor, A. Boardman, & E. H. Hiebert (Eds.), *Teaching emergent bilingual students: Flexible approaches in an era of new standards* (pp. 215–236). Guilford Publications.

Villegas, A. M., Saizel, LaMora, 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

Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Iiams, M. (2004). Not in my classroom: Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 130–160.

Wang, S. H., Lang, N., Bunch, G. C., Basch, S., McHugh, S. R., Huitzilopochtli, S., & Callanan, M. (2021). Dismantling persistent deficit narratives about the language and literacy of culturally and linguistically minoritized children and youth: Counter-possibilities. *Frontiers in Education*, *6*, Article 641796. https://doi:10.3389/feduc.2021.641796

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(5), 376–382. https://doi:10.1177/0022487112445789