A CASE STUDY ON CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

IN DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL

EDUCATION

A Dissertation

by

CAROLINE A. HESSE

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

May 2022

A CASE STUDY ON CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

IN DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL

EDUCATION

A Dissertation
by
CAROLINE A. HESSE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Laura M. Jewett
Chair of Committee

Dr. Zulmaris Díaz
Committee Member

Dr. Kim Potowski
Committee Member

Dr. Alma Rodríguez
Committee Member

May 2022

ABSTRACT

Hesse, Caroline A., <u>A Case Study on Critical Consciousness in Dual Language Bilingual Education</u>. Doctor of Education (EdD), May, 2022, 239 pp., references, 179 titles.

This ethnographic case study explores how dual language bilingual education (DLBE) educators understand, enact, and acquire their perceptions of and tools to educate for critical consciousness, especially in relation to culturally and linguistically diverse students who are often labeled as "emergent bilinguals", "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs". The present study responds to Cervantes-Soon's (2014) call for attention to critical consciousness in DLBE. Hence, the purpose is to gain insight into the role of critical consciousness in DLBE educators' work. The findings inform practitioners' as well as scholars' work, and lend insight for those who study critical consciousness, social justice in education, and/or DLBE programming.

DEDICATION

The completion of my doctoral studies would not have been possible without the love and support of my family and friends alike. My mother, Charlene, my father, Joseph, and my husband, Haman especially tolerated my frequent absences and occasional rants, motivated me to continue when I faltered, and were my cheerleaders on the long and winding path to this degree. Thank you for your love and patience and forgive me for what I didn't do with you while I was completing this work. We'll make up for some of those lost opportunities now.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Through historic murders, protests, election tensions, and the impacts of Covid-19, the

years 2020, 2021, and 2022 have brutally demonstrated systemic societal inequities that define

the lives of minoritized residents of the United States. Though some argue such conditions are

located in the distant past, evidence suggests otherwise. Incarceration, eviction, health, and

unemployment reports as well as murders such as those of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, 23

mostly Latinx shoppers at a Texas Walmart, and too many others suggest systemic inequities

remain alive and well and with us all today. The disproportionate vulnerability of Black and

brown residents of the U.S. to the coronavirus and its complications also lends even more

relevance to the examination of systemic inequity of all kinds.

One tool to examine and interrogate societal systems is critical consciousness. In short,

critical consciousness is the combination of critical reflection around societal conditions

followed by action to change systemic injustices (Freire, 1968). In education, critical

consciousness may show up in the thinking and actions of pedagogues as well as students

themselves. Since by design and definition, at least half of the students in DLBE programs are of

a minoritized population, examining critical consciousness in DLBE educators' work is crucial.

The highly ethnically and racially charged political narrative and debates of the last few years

combined with these events suggest that exploring ways to make education more democratic

(Apple, 2014) are all the more urgent.

While some recent research has made strides in the study of critical consciousness through quantitative means (Shin, Ezeofor, Smith, Welch, & Goodrich, 2016; Simmons, 2019), my interest lies in humanization of the teachers and the students who make up a dual language, two-way immersion, or dual language bilingual education community. I argue that humanization is the essence of social justice and critical pedagogy. To me, conditions are ideal for such humanization when thick data, in the form of narrative and lived experiences, is garnered from sources whose voices are less often heard and less likely to be amplified. For this reason, I used qualitative means to examine the ways that critical consciousness shows up in dual language educators' work. Through ethnographic interviews and data analysis, I used case study methodology to explore how dual language educators understand, enact, and acquire their perceptions of and tools to teach for social justice, especially in relation to culturally and linguistically diverse students who are labeled by our system as "emergent bilinguals", "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs". Research suggests that bilingual (Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019) and especially DLBE (Hood, 2020) educators require specialized preparation, and Valenzuela (2016) even argues that all who work with Latinx youth need expertise in critical consciousness. What is the state of things today? critical consciousness: naming the notion, and framing ways to operationalize it, in DLBE education.

Findings from my study hold the promise of significant insights for a number of stakeholders, from teacher education program directors, to DLBE program leaders, to instructional coaches, to professional developers, as well as individual DLBE educators seeking to refine their understanding and expand their application of critical consciousness in their practice. My findings may encourage teacher education program administrators to consider integrating critical consciousness topics into teacher educator development, perhaps with the

integrating critical consciousness topics into teacher educator development, perhaps with the help of Valenzuela and colleagues' (2016) guiding text. Cervantes-Soon (2014) cautions:

> Unless we shift our focus to critical consciousness and social justice in TWI, the potential for disempowerment of Latin@ children is just as likely as in other more-traditional programs. Without a critical orientation, children from the dominant group in TWI programs are also robbed of a chance to have more fully human relationships and develop a critical understanding and challenge hegemonic notions of national identity, immigration, and U.S. nativism, as well as learning to use language to address global concerns, such as promoting peace, reducing poverty, and defending human rights. (Cervantes-Soon, 2014, p. 78)

My study responds to Cervantes-Soon's (2014) urgent call for attention to critical consciousness, as the purpose is to gain insight into the role of critical consciousness in DLBE educators' work. Several broad questions frame my proposed investigation. They are as follows:

1. How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?

2. How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in that DLBE setting?

3. How do DLBE educators acquire their understanding regarding critical consciousness in a DLBE setting?

The results inform practitioners' work and lend insight for those who study dual language bilingual education programming.

In hindsight, the question of how DLBE educators acquire their understandings of critical consciousness might have fit more logically as the first research question. After all, individuals must acquire or develop ideas and skills before they can understand and enact them. However,

this turn of thought resulted from carrying out the study and subsequently discussing the results with committee members. I came to this way of thinking through the process of conducting the research. Initially it seemed to me that it is easiest to talk about a concept, then how it is applied, before talking about where one's notions about that concept emerged from. That order mirrored, to me, the way an educator spirals into a topic. I considered reordering the questions after the study was conducted, but that is not reflective of how I carried it out. Thus, it seems to me a fitting compromise to maintain the original order of questions as I examined and thought about them, but also share this insight with the reader.

Problem

The purpose of the present qualitative study is to gain in-depth understanding of how DLBE teachers understand and operationalize critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of culturally and linguistically diverse students sometimes labeled "emergent bilinguals", "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs". I will from this point onward use the term emergent bilingual, because it carries less of the negative connotations that other descriptive terms for language learning students have come to convey. In light of societal events and the political narrative in U.S. society in the early 2020s, it is all the more urgent to understand the school experience of minoritized students, achievement gaps between minoritized and majority-identity students, and what teachers do about it. In addition, this study is particularly relevant because of the growing attention to the sociocultural elements (not just the academic elements) of bilingual education (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, Palmer, Heiman Schwerdtfeger, & Choi, 2017; Guerrero, Guerrero, Soltero-González, & Escamilla, 2017; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer, Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, & Heiman, 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Valdez, Freire, & Delavan,

2016). It is unsettling that discussions on the subtractive nature of what should be - were intended to be - additive efforts were already underway so long ago (Valdés, 1997; Valenzuela, 2005). Because of persistent inequities in the educational experiences of minoritized students, this research is both highly relevant and urgently needed.

The evidence is overwhelming that students often labeled emergent bilinguals need - have long needed - something from their formal school experience that they have not been getting in order to be successful in formal education (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Fry, 2003; Hodges, Tay, Maeda, & Gentry, 2018; Kerper Mora, 2002; Olivos & Quintana de Valladolid, 2005; Samson & Collins, 2012; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Valenzuela, 2005; Young, Lakin, Courtney, Martiniello, Adler, Blood ... & Miller, 2012). Some more recent scholarship (Castro-Olivo, 2014; O'Neal, 2018; O'Neal, Goldthrite, Weston Riley & Atapattu, 2018) examines the relationships between social and academic elements of emergent bilingual students' educational experience and suggests that simply attending bilingual programming- even the much-hailed DLBE model - is not a cure-all pill for the ills emergent bilingual students face in U.S. schools. Something more is needed for emergent bilingual students to gain educational parity and to have a truly additive school experience. The real impact of DLBE programming - understood narrowly as instruction of academic content in two languages - appears to fall short of its vaunted reputation. I would argue that what is needed is critical consciousness.

So what are those who teach such students, giving them, doing for them, teaching them? How do they understand and operationalize their professional responsibilities in relation to such students, and how do they acquire their notions? How do they understand, enact, and learn about elements of critical consciousness? I feel an urgency to make more progress in these new-but-old

questions and problems, as do many other educators of emergent bilingual students. I sought to do so, with this study.

In this section I have given an overview of the problem and made a compelling argument for the relevance of this study. Next, I lay out my rationale for the design and approaches I have chosen. Then, I give background on the setting in which the study was conducted. Subsequently, I provide a detailed explanation of the methods I used for participant sampling, data collection and analysis. Lastly, I address issues of positionality and trustworthiness.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into the role of critical consciousness in DLBE educators' work. Several broad questions frame my proposed investigation. They are as follows:

1. How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?
2. How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in that DLBE setting?
3. How do DLBE educators acquire their understanding regarding critical consciousness in a DLBE setting?

The results inform practitioners' work and lend insight for those who study the educational model called dual language, two-way immersion, or dual language bilingual education programming.

Trustworthiness/Positionality

In this section, I address questions of trustworthiness as well as my own positionality. I show how I engaged in ethical research and how I assured safety of participants' data.

Central to trustworthiness is recognizing and acknowledging one's positionality. I recognize the challenge and potential danger in being a White, female, middle class, adult, and researcher who is also a current staff member at one of the research sites. The intersection of my identities can represent potential for abuse when collecting and analyzing data from participants who are current or former colleagues, from participants who include "native Spanish speaking" as well as "native English speaking" individuals, and participants with a wide array of life experiences that may have led them to have experiences and perspectives very different from mine.

In addition, as an insider I have both greater potential for a better understanding of participants' context at the same time that I also have greater potential for overreach and blurring boundaries. In some cases, I teach, or taught, participants' children in one context or another. In some cases, I work or worked in their classrooms with students that we share or shared at varying times of day. In some cases, I have been their instructor as they pursued bilingual certification and a master's degree in bilingual education. The power imbalance and undercurrents inherent in this situation, and whether I am doing all I can to counter it, has been constantly present in my mind as I conducted this research. It has been my challenge as a teacher-researcher and participant-observer in the school where I work and also where I collected data (Brewer, 2000) to collect data without causing change in responses and therefore impacting subsequent data, interpretations, and insights. Although I cannot know it with complete certainty, I feel reasonably confident that participants felt at ease with me. This is the case in part because participants all freely chose to participate in my study, and I am nobody's supervisor. In addition, I conducted a portion of my research in the same school to which I have already been assigned as part of my existing position and am on good terms with my current colleagues including those

who participated in this study. Furthermore, I conducted the other portion at a school in which I was previously employed and that I left on good terms with my then-colleagues.

Member checking, collection of data through multiple avenues, and underlying intent are also elements of trustworthiness. I acknowledge that an interview is not a neutral tool guaranteed to collect "the truth" and that I must be acutely and continuously aware that any interview is likely to be "influenced by the personal characteristics of the interviewer, including race, class, ethnicity, and gender" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 643). I used a feminist interview approach, attempting to make it such that the interview felt like a conversation of important issues, and the interviewees felt that it was one being carried out between equals (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Subsequently, I checked data collected in the initial interview by later clarifying unclear data or requesting elaboration during the second, individual interview. I have also tried to maintain interviewees' voices in my writings and attempted to make their stories and counterstories about the intersections of language, identity, education and social justice accessible to an audience of interested educators and ethnographic case study researchers. Finally, confidentiality is key to trustworthiness. I used pseudonyms for all participants, which were of their own choosing. I detailed the way I stored data for safekeeping in the previous section.

Design

The purpose of the present study is to gain insight into how critical consciousness shows up in DLBE educators' work, particularly in relation to a subset of students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual. Several broad questions guide my ethnographic case study. They are as follows:

1. How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?

2. How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in that DLBE setting?

3. How do DLBE educators acquire their understanding regarding critical consciousness in a DLBE setting?

Methods

In this section, I summarize the approach I have chosen. Then, I summarize the setting in which the study was conducted. Subsequently, I provide a brief explanation of the methods I used for participant sampling, data collection and analysis. Lastly, I address issues of positionality and trustworthiness.

Much of what has received attention about DLBE has focused on academic achievements of students therein (Cobb, Vega, & Kronauge, 2006; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Thomas, Collier, & Collier, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Hernández, 2011; Nascimento, 2017; Steele, Slater, Zamarro, Miller, Li, Burkhauser, & Bacon, 2017; Watzinger-Tharp, Swenson, & Mayne, 2018) and on the nuts and bolts of running such a program (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Li, Steele, Slater, Bacon, & Miller, 2016; Lindholm-Leary, 2012). I am interested in phenomena not measured by such data. How do educators respond to the inequities they witness? What do they think and what do they think they do? How can this wisdom be leveraged to provide further education, skills, and tools to existing and would-be DLBE practitioners? What teachers do for their bilingual students in dual language, how they work for social justice, matters (Alanis & Rodriguez. 2008; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014) and intersections of educator and student demographics, competencies, needs, and outcomes beyond simple scores deserve more attention (Parkes, Ruth, Anberg-Espinoza, & De Jong, 2009). Their understanding of critical consciousness, the ways they enact it, and the ways they acquire their ideas about it are worth examining.

9

To explore such questions, qualitative methods are most appropriate because they facilitate the gathering of detailed and rich data for insight into participants' worlds (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). In addition to lending better insights, qualitative research has the potential to positively impact our world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In particular, this study follows ethnographic case study design (Creswell, 2013). Ethno-case study (Parker-Jenkins, 2018) aims to understand the attitudes, beliefs, and values that influence participants' practices. Case study is both an appropriate and meaningful approach to explore my research interests and fits my practical needs. Case study methodology aligns with research in a natural setting (Stake, 2005; Yin 2013) and allowed me to retain my employment in a dual language setting. It also permitted me to collect data "in terms of hours, days and weeks" (Parker Jenkins, p. 16), in some cases perhaps through a single interview or discussion (Kitzinger, 1995; Stewart & Shamdasani, 2014).

Ethnographic data collection methods I used included interviews and document analysis. I recruited current and former colleagues from two Spanish-English DLBE elementary schools to examine how DLBE educators understand, enact, and acquire their understanding and practices around critical consciousness. My intent is that my work creates new understandings that can help me and other DLBE professionals to improve our practice.

In this section I have laid out my arguments for the approach and tools I have selected for this study. In the next section, I define the terms of my study.

Definition of Terms

In this section, I define key terms used in this study that may have broad and varied applications in passing conversation but have specific applications in this study. These include demographic descriptions such as "emergent bilingual", "native Spanish speakers" and "ELLs",

10

the labels "educator" and "dual language bilingual education" versus "dual language immersion" and "two-way immersion", the descriptor "bilingual", and of course, "critical consciousness". In this study, my questions are aimed at understanding educators' thoughts and work in relation to students sometimes labeled emergent bilingual. Although such terms can be problematic because they may group people into rigid categories artificially or contribute to stereotypes, they are also a tool to help interviewees focus their responses around those students who attend dual language programs and are identified as or with marginalized cultural and linguistic groups (ie "Hispanic, "Latino", "immigrant", "limited English proficient", "home language not English", and so on). Therefore, in this paper I use the term "emergent bilingual" to describe students whom others may think of as "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs" or by another term. At the same time, I encourage the reader to keep in mind that (perceived) identities are often blurry, misunderstood or mis-used, and defy absolute definitions.

Furthermore, in this study, "educator" is used to refer to any professional, certified non-volunteer staff who teach or support student learning in a DLBE setting. Participants may have varying official titles, from "teacher" to "resource specialist" to "social worker" to "gifted support specialist" to "librarian" to "speech and language pathologist", but here they are all included under "educator". In addition, DLBE programming can present differing characteristics in both literature and reality; in this study, "dual language bilingual education" is used as a synonym for what others have for decades called "dual language immersion" and also "two-way immersion". Programming by these names refers to an educational setting in which the long-term and consistent use of two languages for academic learning is carefully planned and the minority language and culture is purposefully promoted. In this paper, it is also understood to be a context in which all students and teachers spend the entire school day teaching and learning content in

11

each of two languages while together in the same classes, such that majority and minority language speakers are learning side by side in any given classroom. While literature may use "DLI" or "TWI" or "DLBE", in this paper I use DLBE unless citing literature that uses the prior terms.

Moreover, the term "bilingual" is a self-identification that participants were allowed to use without any external assessment. The reasoning for this decision is practical. First, the nature of a participant's bilingualism is not the focus of this study even though language is a factor in the overall context. Second, I am not in a position to analyze linguistic abilities. Given that that language proficiency lies on a spectrum, can be varied by context, and is tricky to evaluate, I opted to let participants decide whether to apply such a label to themselves. Finally, the term critical consciousness can be understood as critical reflection plus action. A more involved definition is as follows:

> Three components are theorized to comprise critical consciousness: (1) critical reflection, which refers to youths' critical analysis of current social realities and recognition of how social, economic, and political conditions limit access to opportunity and perpetuate systemic injustices; (2) sociopolitical efficacy, which encompasses the perceived ability to act to change these conditions; and (3) critical action, which is the extent to which individuals actually participate in individual or collective action (Diemer & Blustein 2006; Diemer, Kauffman, Koenig, Trahan, & Hsieh, 2006; Diemer, McWhirter, Ozer, & Rapa, 2015; Watts et al., 1999). (Godfrey & Burson, 2018, p. 19)

A second, more straightforward definition of critical consciousness comes to us from Paolo Freire. It states that "[critical consciousness means] learning to perceive social, political,

and economic contradictions and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality"

(Freire, 1974, p. 4).

This section defined key terms that may carry varying connotations or definitions

elsewhere, and I have explained how the terms should be understood in this dissertation. In the

next section, I summarize my design and rationale.

Conclusion

The momentous years 2020-2022 magnified the nature of numerous systemic societal

inequities that define the lives of minority residents of the United States, showing that such

conditions are not located in the distant past. One tool to examine and interrogate societal

systems is critical consciousness. In education, critical consciousness may show up in the

thinking and actions of pedagogues as well as students themselves. Since by design and

definition, at least half of the students in DLBE programs are of a minoritized population,

examining critical consciousness in DLBE educators' work is crucial. The highly charged

political events and narratives of 2020-2022 suggest that exploring ways to make education more

democratic (Apple, 2014) are all the more urgent.

While some recent research has studied critical consciousness through quantitative means

(Shin, Ezeofor, Smith, Welch, & Goodrich, 2016; Simmons, 2019), my interest lies in

humanization of the people who make up a DLBE community. I argue that humanization is the

essence of social justice and critical pedagogy and that thick data, in the form of narrative and

lived experiences, is needed to amplify voices that are less often heard or amplified. For this

reason, I used qualitative means to examine the ways that critical consciousness shows up in dual

language educators' work. Through ethnographic interviews and case study methodology, I

explored how dual language educators understand, enact, and acquire their perceptions of and

tools to teach for and with critical consciousness, especially in relation to culturally and linguistically diverse students who are labeled by our system as "emergent bilinguals". Research suggests that bilingual (Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019) and especially DLBE (Hood, 2020) educators require specialized preparation, and Valenzuela (2016) even argues that all who work with Latinx youth need expertise in critical consciousness. Findings from my study provide insights for a number of stakeholders, from teacher education program directors, to DLBE program leaders, to instructional coaches, to professional developers, as well as individual DLBE educators seeking to refine their understanding and expand their application of critical consciousness in their practice. Finally, my study responds to Cervantes-Soon's (2014) urgent call for attention to critical consciousness:

> Unless we shift our focus to critical consciousness and social justice in TWI, the potential for disempowerment of Latin@ children is just as likely as in other more-traditional programs. Without a critical orientation, children from the dominant group in TWI programs are also robbed of a chance to have more fully human relationships and develop a critical understanding and challenge hegemonic notions of national identity, immigration, and U.S. nativism, as well as learning to use language to address global concerns, such as promoting peace, reducing poverty, and defending human rights. (Cervantes-Soon, 2014, p. 78)

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter introduces literature that informs questions of critical pedagogy in bilingual contexts and to which this proposed study stands to lend insight. I begin with a discussion of literature that highlights long standing inequalities in public education. Then I review a constellation of literature that represents research responses to these inequalities. First I explore literature that unpacks the notion of humanizing pedagogy and it's potential to counter those systemic educational inequalities. Within humanizing pedagogy, I address culturally relevant, culturally responsive, and culturally sustaining pedagogy, and the promise and problems each present for the activist, culturally sensitive educator. This chapter concludes with a section that examines critical consciousness and the potential it holds for promoting educational justice, particularly in DLBE settings. This chapter shows that examining how critical consciousness shows up in DLBE educators' work is a significant, and underexplored, research question.

Myth of Educational [E]quality

Despite the passage of time, Freire's (1968) description and indictment of a banking style of schooling – in which teachers give official knowledge and students uncritically accept and accumulate it - and the resulting uncritical education continue to be relevant today. Many in our neoliberal society continue to receive an uncritical education (Giroux & Giroux, 2006), an education that does not challenge the status quo. McLaren argues modern education is akin to

"intellectual chloroform" (McLaren, 2016, p. 2), which "anesthetiz[es] young brains and puts[s] dreams into deep sleep" (McLaren, 2016, p. 2). According to Giroux & Giroux (2006), McLaren's characterization is far from hyperbole. Giroux & Giroux (2006) write that modern education actually "punishes critical thought" (Giroux & Giroux, 2006, p. 21). Meanwhile, Salazar (Salazar, 2013) maintains that schooling can be dehumanizing for invisible "hyphenated-American[s]" (p. 121), such as non-white, non-English speaking, non-U.S.-born, those of non-stereotypical "American" phenotype. Ladson-Billings (2006) observes a persistent crushing, educational debt suffered by many members of non-dominant groups. From medical literacy to financial literacy and a multitude of skills and capital, certain kinds of critical knowledge can mean the difference between empowerment and powerlessness, disaster and survival, and perhaps even life and death.

The notion that education is the great equalizer is deeply entrenched in the American ethos. Meritocracy and equality are seductive and persistent myths. Or, as Ravitch (2014) writes, a "hoax". In fact, a body of influential scholarship in critical studies suggests that schools are anything but great equalizers (Darder, 2003; Duncan-Andrade, 2010; Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Giroux & Giroux, 2006; Kincheloe, 2008; Orfield & Lee, 2005; McLaren, 2016; Ravitch, 2014; Valenzuela, 1999). Perhaps a more apt description might be the "great *in*equalizers". Darder (2003) writes that schools actually perpetuate the marginalization of certain "politically and economically vulnerable within society" (Darder, 2003, p. 11), in part through a hidden curriculum that functions to reproduce inequalities instead of correcting them. Another way in which schools perpetuate historical marginalization is through the emphasis on "skills and drills over critical thinking or critical content" (Giroux & Giroux, 2006, p. 23). Kincheloe (2008) and other scholars (Diaz, Whitacre, Esquierdo, & Ruiz-Escalante, 2013; Palmer & Wicktor-Lynch,

2008; Ravitch, 2014) suggests that obsessive attention to testing, test preparation, and test data in schools contributes to low quality education and the perpetual marginalization of vulnerable students. In fact, Ravitch (2014) calls such false fixes as increased standardized testing in education one of many modern "hoaxes".

Giroux and Giroux (2006) argue that another way in which schools reproduce inequalities is evident in the ways some "more closely resemble either jails or high-end shopping malls, depending on their clientele, and teachers are forced to get revenue for their school by hawking everything from hamburgers to pizza parties" (Giroux & Giroux, 2006, p. 22). This description struck a chord with me because I had nearly the exact same thought when I moved from a suburban high school to one at the heart of the medium sized city. I thought "the hallways feel like a prison in comparison to my old school" and made this comment to anyone who asked about my new job. Students who attend "shopping-mall" schools were mostly white, and students who attended the "jail" schools were of diverse racial and cultural backgrounds. If schools were truly equalizers, they would at least provide the same resources and setting. If they were in the business of implementing equity, they would actually flip the existing conditions. A more white, more privileged student body would attend the jail-like, underfunded schools, and a more diverse, more marginalized student body would attend the shopping mall schools. But this is not the case. Thus, schools are often actually *inequalizers*.

Giroux and Giroux's (2006) views on the actual intent and impact of schools and education are harsher yet:

> ...neoliberal capitalism performs the dual task of using education to train workers for service sector jobs and produce lifelong consumers. At the same time, neoliberalism feeds a growing authoritarianism steeped in religious fundamentalism and jingoistic

17

patriotism encouraging intolerance and hate as it punishes critical thought, especially if it

is at odds with the reactionary religious and political agenda pushed by the Bush

administration. Increasingly, education appears useful to those who hold power, and

issues concerning how public and higher education might contribute to the quality of

democratic public life are either ignored or dismissed. Moral outrage and creative energy

seem utterly limited in the political sphere, just as any collective struggle to preserve

education as a basis for creating critical citizens is rendered defunct within the corporate

drive for efficiency, a logic that has inspired bankrupt reform initiatives such as

standardization, high-stakes testing, rigid accountability schemes, and privatization.

(Giroux & Giroux, 2006, p. 21)

Giroux and Giroux (2006) underscore the role of schools and schooling in reinforcing

the powers that be, instead of upending those powers to make space for the historically

marginalized. This critique counters the narrative that schools and schooling will "save" those on

the bottom, if they only work hard enough to earn their way up the social-educational ladder.

Testing and funding policies and customs ensure that such a liberal narrative is the fantasy of the

idealistic educator - at least the way schools and schooling are today. Like those whom Freire

encountered fifty years ago, students today find themselves in similar circumstances. They are

still likely to face educational experiences centered on "skills and drills over critical thinking or

critical content" (Giroux & Giroux, 2006, p. 23) that does little to address the achievement gap

while continuing to leave them in educational debt (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

The literature begs a critical question. Could some injustice large and small have been

avoided, preempted, or prevented through a different kind of education? Schools and school staff

have many opportunities over a period of years to leave lasting positive impressions, to make

lives better, to change attitudes, to alter future events. Given the amount of time students spend in schools, how can they *not* have had some type of influence on the paths students' lives take? Crucially, individual teachers may recognize that they are not serving certain marginalized groups of students well with their current set of skills and wish to correct this gap in their knowledge, as O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez (2008) found when examining teacher perceptions of their preparation to teach linguistically and culturally diverse learners in North Carolina. While individual teachers and teacher agency play a role in bringing about social justice on a small scale, the system in which they and their students coexist reaches all of us, everywhere, and therefore merits our lingering gaze. In its current state, schools and the traditional system of education do more to contribute to the marginalization of certain groups of people than to fight it. And yet, it need not be so. As Giroux and Giroux (2006) write, educators and other stakeholders in education who exercise critical, or sociopolitical, consciousness can undermine the neoliberal logic of their workplaces and change the course of both schooling and encounters such as those between George Floyd and Derek Chauvin. As such, critical pedagogy is useful to guide us in this direction. Critical pedagogy, writes Darder (2003), "is fundamentally committed to the development and evolvement of a culture of schooling that supports the empowerment of culturally marginalized and economically disenfranchised students" and "seeks to help transform those class structures and practices that perpetuate undemocratic life" (p. 11). As McLaren (2016) sees it, critical pedagogy implies a "process of humanization (2016, p. 30). As such, humanizing pedagogy can be understood as a form of critical pedagogy. The next section highlights humanizing pedagogy as it intersects generally and departs in its particularities from the more expansive terrain of critical pedagogy.

This section examined existing research on the state of U.S. education, and potential results of an uncritical education. The literature points to ways in which the U.S. educational system marginalizes many anonymous victims. Taken together, the research suggests that critical pedagogy is a useful lens in identifying ways education can contribute to social justice efforts. The next section addresses ways that the system could transform itself into one that humanizes those many instead of dehumanizes them. I examine scholarship on named pedagogies that can contribute to such a critical transformation. These include humanizing, culturally relevant, culturally responsive, and culturally sustaining pedagogies. Finally, I address studies that examine critical consciousness in the context of bilingual education and particularly in DLBE.

Humanizing Education

Though a glance into Houghton Mifflin history books might lead one to believe otherwise, the United States of America is not overwhelmingly white, male, English speaking, Judeo- Christian, heterosexual, abled, middle class. Rather, it is and has forever been a culturally and linguistically diverse place, even before colonization began in the 1490s. "Native Americans", though some outsiders may call the diverse groups of people by that same name - were never the monolithic group such a name implies. This detail has long gone unrecognized, unacknowledged, and/or actively erased by the dominant groups, such as the conglomerates who write "history" textbooks. However, increasing scholarly attention to culturally and linguistically relevant/responsive/sustaining education has the potential to address this social injustice. This section explores the notion of humanizing pedagogy. Then I address three interrelated terms that have been used to describe culturally attentive efforts to [partially] decolonize education: culturally relevant, culturally responsive, and culturally sustaining pedagogies. I examine their similarities and nuanced differences, and their significance in relation to bilingual education, in

20

particular DLBE. In the last section, I discuss critical consciousness, or sociopolitical consciousness, and studies that are like my own in content, form and focus. In this dissertation, the term critical consciousness should be understood as more than an awareness of sociopolitical and economic realities and their relationship to systems of power and privilege. Critical consciousness should also be understood to include the express intent to transform those systems. Importantly, I am excluding literature that deals with Marxist thought outside of critical pedagogy. I acknowledge that this has an important place in the discussion of humanizing pedagogy and critical theory writ large. However, the focus of this study lies deep within the folds of critical pedagogy. Due to time and space limitations, I begin with Freire's work and move forward in time.

To teach can be to oppress. To teach can also be to [help] free, or transgress (hooks, 1994). The subsequent sections show the potential in several types of culturally attentive pedagogies to do either. First, I address the broad umbrella of humanizing pedagogy and Freire's contribution to it. Then I address the philosophical offshoots of culturally relevant, culturally responsive, and culturally sustaining pedagogies. In the last section, I address critical consciousness in the context of bilingual education, particularly in dual language education.

Humanizing Pedagogy

Those who study and wrestle with the applications of humanizing pedagogies have a philosophical grandparent in Paolo Freire. Born in 1920s Brazil, Paolo grew up in a middle-class family. When the Great Depression swept the world, his family was introduced to the sufferings of a hand-to-mouth life. Young Freire came to understand how hunger and basic needs could interrupt learning. Eventually, he became a schoolteacher after studying philosophy and law. Still later, he became the director of a university extension program that taught literacy to the

peasants in his area. In that role, he came to the conclusion that literacy was about more than decoding letters on a page or the transmission of facts. Rather, it required critical thinking. He recognized that a meaningful education implies a kind of decolonizing of the mind and soul, and he organized the educational programs according to this notion. One unfamiliar with Freire might question whether Freire's "cultural circles" could actually lead to cold, hard achievement. Yet history shows that students in his program learned to read, and think, so quickly, and to such an extent, that the military government felt threatened, shut down his program, and exiled him. This response suggests the power of culturally attentive, humanizing education. Paolo Freire's success in teaching people of oppressed groups to read is reflected in his own oppression by the powerful groups his work so challenged. Freire's persecution by the powerful suggests the power of his ideas, and the power of humanizing pedagogies, to lead to not only tangible academic success but also a better life for the marginalized student (Freire, 2013).

In 1968, already in exile, Freire laid out his philosophy of teaching and learning in the book Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Although Freire did not describe his work as "humanizing pedagogy", through his work he was, in essence, humanizing the oppressed people he hoped to educate. The humanizing spirit can be seen in the fact that he considered his relationship to his students, and the relationship between any teacher and any student, should have a dual role. A teacher should - can - also be a student, and a student should - can - also be a teacher. Thus, his use of terms such as "teacher-student" and "student-teacher" reflect a humanizing turn in the conceptualization of teaching, learning, and schooling. It became conceivable that education could be an exchange, an interaction, a two-way road, an experience of sharing between human beings, instead of a delivery, an imposition of one human being's packaged thought onto another, a manipulation of one by the other.

Freire, and the student-teachers with whom he fleshed out his ideas, brought about a significant shift in educational philosophy. Instead of filling empty vessels with recipes of colonized knowledge, teacher-students help students-teachers reach an expanded level of consciousness and humanity. Salazar (2013) notes that Freire rejected attempts to turn this philosophy into a set of rules or practices to be copied, studied, and memorized by future generations of educators. Such steps run counter to the idea of humanizing pedagogy, which does not seek to make the students fit a mold but rather attempts to address the unique humanity of each student. Another way I think of it is through cooking metaphors. Traditional teachers direct students to correctly follow a historical recipe with precisely measured ingredients and following the exact protocol for preparation. Humanist teacher-students, on the other hand, are innovative cooks who discuss and compare recipes, ingredients, flavor preferences, and food sourcing with their student-teachers before collectively deciding how to cook the meal that serves the group's needs and wants best.

Humanizing pedagogy is, therefore, an approach that defies packing for official curricularization and evaluation. It is an ongoing process with no end, because there is no end to our developing humanity - until we leave this life. Therefore, some educators and their supervisors may find humanizing pedagogies difficult to discuss or apply, because it is difficult to say what to do or what not to do, what to say or what not to say. Humanizing pedagogy resists being assessed with checklists and taught with handbooks, and these are the bread and butter of neoliberal teacher education and development initiatives.

This is not to say educators cannot, should not, or have not attempted to more fully describe and understand humanizing pedagogy. In 1994, scholar of "anti-racist multicultural education" (p. 174) Lilia Bartolome published "Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a

humanizing pedagogy" in the Harvard Educational Review. With this "seminal piece" (Salazar, 2013, p. 128), Bartolome revived a thread in the ongoing discussion about the education of what Freire might have called "the oppressed" and what she terms "culturally and linguistically subordinated" students. In the piece, she reflects that she is often faced with teaching well-meaning graduate students - often individuals of privilege without understanding that privilege - who seek a magic bullet. In short, they want and expect to learn methods, techniques or strategies to use with their so-called underachieving students, and do not question the systems that exist around themselves and their students that might contribute to that exact circumstance. Citing Freire, Bartolome (1994) argues that teachers must develop deep social and political awareness in order to teach students of subordinated groups. In fact, she writes that it is "critical" that they "humanize the education experience of students from subordinated populations by removing the hostility that often confronts these students" (Bartolome, 1994, p. 190). She cautions readers against the uncritical search for a method that will "work" with students from subordinated groups. She also warns against the uniform and thoughtless application of a method that might help "failing" students "succeed". Students perceived and treated as minorities cannot be treated as monolithic.

> I believe that by taking a socio-historical view of present-day conditions and concerns
> that inform the lived experiences of socially perceived minority students, prospective
> teachers are better able to comprehend the quasi-colonial nature of minority education.
> By engaging in this critical sociohistorical analysis of subordinated students' academic
> performance, most of my graduate students (teachers and prospective teachers) are better
> situated to reinterpret and reframe current educational concerns so as to develop
> pedagogical structures that speak to the day-to-day reality, struggles, concerns, and

dreams of these students. By understanding the historical specificities of marginalized

students, these teachers and prospective teachers come to realize that an uncritical focus

on methods makes invisible the historical role that schools and their personnel have

played (and continue to play), not only in discriminating against many culturally different

groups, but also in denying their humanity. By robbing students of their culture,

language, history, and values, schools often reduce the students to the status of

subhumans who need to be rescued from their "savage" selves. The end result of this

cultural and linguistic eradication represents, in my view, a form of dehumanization.

Therefore, any discussion having to do with the improvement of subordinated students'

academic standing is incomplete if it does not address those discriminatory school

practices that lead to dehumanization. (Bartolome, 1994, p. 176)

Since this clarion call for education that humanizes students that Bartolome describes as

culturally and linguistically subordinated, others have taken up the term. Franquiz and Salazar

(2004) cite both Freire and Bartolome in the introduction to their five-year ethnographic study in

Mexican American high school students in Northern California. Furthermore, they apply the

term "humanizing pedagogy" to their study of the relationship between these students, the

pedagogy of their "teacher allies" (p. 37), and the students' academic identity and resilience.

Franquiz and Salazar (2004) argue that teachers must go beyond traditional, narrow

understandings of teaching and must build relationships with students who are otherwise

devalued and "de-ethnicize[d]" (p. 37).

Salazar (2013) extends the body of work on humanizing pedagogy. She writes in first

person of her experiences as a "hyphenated American" (p. 121), of her feelings of isolation and

self-dislike, and of having to leave behind her language and culture when she entered the U.S.

school system. She explains that her education was an exhausting experience characterized by

"endless struggles to preserve my humanity" (p. 121). She writes of associating brown-ness with

failure and white-ness with success already at a young age, and of hoping she could alter her

appearance by working her way into the high reading group - of which all members were white

children - in elementary school. Salazar (2013) argues that "the educational goals for students of

color continue to be those of cultural replacement and assimilation into mainstream values and

practices" (p. 122) and that when they fail, stakeholders blame students of color, their culture,

their language, and anything but a Eurocentric educational system. She understands humanizing

pedagogy to include these components, though admittedly we cannot know if Freire would

approve of such a simplified, potentially reductionist list:

1. The full development of the person is essential for humanization.

2. To deny someone else's humanization is also to deny one's own.

3. The journey for humanization is an individual and collective endeavor toward critical
consciousness.

4. Critical reflection and action can transform structures that impede our own and others'
humanness, thus facilitating liberation for all.

5. Educators are responsible for promoting a more fully human world through their
pedagogical principles and practices.

(Salazar, 2013, p. 128)

Given that language and culture are integral elements of an individual's humanity, and

inseparable from students as from teachers, it is no surprise that Salazar (2013) cites

Valenzuela's (1999) notion of subtractive schooling in the same paragraph as she cites Ladson-

Billings' (1995) observation that students of color sacrifice their very psychological health to

have a chance at academic success in the current education system. In fact, Ladson-Billings' and others scholarship around cultural relevance in education are addressed in the next section. The literature suggests that humanizing pedagogy and dual language are of a similar essence. Humanizing pedagogy can be seen as the inspiration for dual language. Conversely, dual language can be seen as an expression of humanizing pedagogy. In this section I have addressed the notion of humanizing pedagogy, its genetic connection to dual language, and shown its relevance and potential to transform the U.S. education system. Next, I address culturally attentive pedagogies of three similar but not identical types.

Three Culturally Attentive Pedagogies

In this section I explore Ladson-Billings' and others' notions of cultural relevance in education. Pedagogy that reflects such relevance is - or should be - integral to working with emergent bilingual students. It is certainly integral to my thinking about my students every day and guides my thinking in this study. In addition to the early term "culturally relevant pedagogy", I also address the closely related notions "culturally responsive pedagogy" and "culturally sustaining pedagogy" and identify any key differences they may imply. Notably, the term "linguistic" is absent from the terms in the next section, even though scholarship on "culturally and linguistically" focused education exists. Language is arguably one of the core components of culture. I understand why some have decided to separately note "linguistic" in description of relevant, responsive, or sustaining pedagogy. However, I concur with Paris's (2012) view that language and culture are inextricably linked - they are as fingers on the same hand. Discussion of culture cannot take place without discussion of expression, which includes language. Furthermore, space and time limitations lead me to limit my discussion to three types

of "culturally" attentive pedagogies in this piece. The tensions and nuances of culturally *and* linguistically attentive pedagogies deserve a study unto themselves.

The theoretical parent of culturally relevant pedagogy as discussed in this study, Gloria Ladson-Billings, wrote about "culturally relevant instruction" beginning in the early 1990s. She theorized that culturally relevant pedagogy ought to "problematize teaching and encourage teachers to ask about the nature of the student-teacher relationship, the curriculum, schooling, and society." (1995, p. 483). Furthermore,

> culturally relevant teaching must meet three criteria: an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness. Next, I argued that culturally relevant teaching is distinguishable by three broad propositions or conceptions regarding self and other, social relations, and knowledge. (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 483).

Since then, numerous scholars (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011; Cartledge, Kea, Watson & Oif, 2016; Choi, 2013; Durden & Truscott, 2010; Esposito, Davis & Swain, 2012; Esposito & Swain, 2009; Howard, 2003; Hyland, 2009; Maye & Day, 2012; Leonard, Napp & Adeleke, 2009; Morrison, Ortiz, 2009; Robbins & Rose, 2008; Saint-Hilaire, 2014; Schmeichel, 2012; Wortham & Contreras, 2002; Young, 2010;) have taken up her term to write about issues one can view as interrelated with critical pedagogy. Some scholarship addresses ways to "do" culturally relevant pedagogy in practice (Morrison, Robbins & Rose, 2008; Saint-Hilaire, 2014; Young, 2010), including work by the concept's founder herself (Ladson-Billings, 2008). Other prior scholarship addresses culturally relevant pedagogy and its intersections with special education (Cartledge, Kea, Watson & Oif, 2016) or at-risk students (Maye & Day, 2012), indigenous education (Ortiz, 2009), notions of social justice and equity (Esposito & Swain, 2009;

28

Schmeichel, 2012), school reform (Esposito, Davis & Swain, 2012) and teacher education, reflection, or professional development (Durden & Truscott, 2010; Howard, 2003; Hyland, 2009). In addition, some scholars have addressed culturally relevant pedagogy and its intersection with "ELL" students (Choi, 2013; Leonard, Napp & Adeleke, 2009) and "Latino" students (Wortham & Contreras, 2002).

The notion of culturally relevant pedagogy is useful to my study in that it suggests that education can mean more than preparing students academically. Rather, education also implies attention to cultural competence and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness. Two decades later, however, Ladson-Billings (2014) embraced a shift in conceptualization of culturally relevant pedagogy, as manifested in a subtle but significant shift in the terminology to culturally *sustaining* pedagogy. I address the term that resulted from that shift in the last subsection, in order to align this text with the chronology of the published scholarship. In the next subsection, then, I address an earlier shift from culturally *relevant* pedagogy to culturally *responsive* pedagogy.

The previous section addressed culturally relevant pedagogy. Given a subsequent shift in terminology to culturally *responsive* pedagogy. I address that term that resulted in this section. Now I address culturally *sustaining* pedagogy.

Some scholarship published before the emergence of the term culturally relevant pedagogy examined intersections of school and home culture (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982). Ladson-Billings praised Erickson and Mohatt's (1982) notion of "culturally responsive teaching" as connoting a more equitable view of student culture. They write that culturally responsive pedagogy may stem from making "small changes" and by "discovering the small differences in

social relations which make a big difference in the interactional ways children engage the content of the school curriculum" (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982, p. 40).

A more recent conceptualization of culturally attentive instruction has been termed "culturally responsive pedagogy" and is grounded in Ladson-Billings and others' work. Gay (2002) cites Ladson-Billings when she argues that

Culturally responsive teaching is defined as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively. It is based on the assumption that when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, they are more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and are learned more easily and thoroughly (Gay, 2000). As a result, the academic achievement of ethnically diverse students will improve when they are taught through their own cultural and experiential filters (Au & Kawakami, 1994; Foster, 1995; Gay, 2000; Hollins, 1996; Kleinfeld, 1975; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995). (Gay, 2002, p. 106)

Scholars who took up this term have written about its intersection with art education (Acuff, Joni Boyd, Brent Hirak, & Nangah, 2012), teacher education and professional development (Gere, Buehler, Dallavis & Haviland, 2009; Sleeter, 2011; Warren, 2018), teaching in secondary (Herrera, Holmes & Kavimandan, 2012), as well as post-secondary settings (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009), urban education (Grant & Asimeng-Boahene, 2006), literacy (Moje & Hinchman, 2004; Souto-Manning, 2009). Some scholarship has focused on culturally responsive pedagogy in relation to the education of students labeled as Puerto Rican (Irizarry & Antrop-González, 2007), Latino (Irizarry, 2007), indigenous or native peoples (Bishop, 2008; Savage, Hindle, Meyer, Hynds, Penetito, & Sleeter, 2011), African American (Howard & Terry

Sr, 2011; Ware, 2006), and ELL (Santamaria, 2009). Memorably, Ware (2006) equates culturally responsive pedagogy with the notion of being a "warm demander", which resonates with the notion of humanizing pedagogy. Other scholars have suggested ways that culturally responsive pedagogy can be applied to improve various elements of a minoritized student's experience, from literacy to math to science instruction (Taylor & Sobel, 2011). And yet, scholars continue to debate the nuances of terminology and a newer term has emerged with a publication by Django Paris (2012). I elaborate on this shift in the next section.

While Gay's notion of culturally responsive pedagogy falls shorts of explicitly including language as a factor, her definition is useful to my study in that she states that educators would do well to use cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students to teach those same students. This aligns with my stance, in my work overall and in this study. In fact, the thread that runs throughout all the literature cited here is the notion that teachers should critically examine and question their own practices and perspectives and turn their gaze to the practices and perspectives of their students who come from historically subordinated groups as do culturally and linguistically diverse students. Recent scholarship by Paris as well as others has taken this thread a step further and presented us with the term culturally *sustaining* pedagogy. It is this term that I explore in the following subsection.

In recent years, scholarship in culturally attentive pedagogies has shifted from culturally "relevant" pedagogy to culturally "sustaining" pedagogy. In 2014, Ladson-Billings published "Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: aka the remix", in which she embraced the evolution of her original work and a shift to a new term coined by Paris (2012). Paris argued that the term "culturally sustaining pedagogy" better embodied the practices and stance he sought to promote,

and Ladson-Billings (2014) agreed that her original term had taken on connotations that she no longer recognized. What has shifted? Paris (2012) writes that

> Culturally sustaining pedagogy...has as its explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers. That is, culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling. (p. 95)

Notice that Paris (2012) expands on the concept of that which might be understood strictly "cultural" to include the linguistic element. Though he does not specifically name forms of bilingual or language-supportive education in this piece, his definition explicitly acknowledges a linguistic factor inherent in culture and integrates both into his vision of a truly democratic education. This newest term and concept is useful to me in this study because it both labels certain forms of existing bilingual programming - the ones we should emulate - at the same time that it nudges those programs that do not attend to culture and language as a means to more fully democratic education to do so.

In light of Paris' (2012) explanation, bilingual education, especially forms of bilingual education that protect and support a student's home language instead of trying to erase it, can be understood as a form of culturally sustaining pedagogy. This means that DLBE can be viewed and experienced as a humanizing, democratic, culturally relevant and responsive and sustaining framework - a truly decolonizing tool, if we chose to make it such. A tool for social justice. The literature in this section suggests that humanizing pedagogy, and various forms of culturally attentive pedagogy, can be extended to justify and support certain forms of bilingual education, and especially DLBE. Culturally relevant pedagogy contributes to the notion that culture and language are intimately connected, and that sociopolitical consciousness is the task of a teacher

32

whose calling is social justice. This is the focus of my study. Culturally responsive pedagogy acknowledges that students' lived experiences have a central place in the curriculum, though it falls short of explicitly addressing language and notions of social and political justice. Culturally sustaining pedagogy reiterates the notion that culture and language are inseparable, and casts an education with such a focus as a tool to promote a truly democratic society. All lend a useful lens to an examination of the education of "culturally and linguistically diverse" students. Furthermore, notions of culturally attentive pedagogies acknowledge students' lived experience while also being central to my study.

Literature in the next section shows that scholars have already recognized this connection and application and used the lens of humanizing and culturally attentive pedagogies to examine bilingual programming, especially the DLBE variety. This underscores the significance of the present study, which is to gain in-depth understanding of how DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of culturally and linguistically diverse students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual or other related terms.

Humanizing Pedagogies in Bilingual Education

Literature in the previous section established that humanizing and culturally attentive pedagogies are useful in examining the education of emergent bilingual students, especially in DLBE programming. This highlights the significance of seeking deeper understanding of how critical consciousness shows up in DLBE educators, and how it works. This is especially true of DLBE educators' work with emergent bilingual students. Next, I examine how scholars apply and use the lens of humanizing and culturally attentive pedagogies to examine bilingual programming, especially DLBE programs.

While Freire (1987), Bartolome (1994), and others who have written about humanizing pedagogy might not have specifically discussed bilingual or DLBE education in their arguments, one can extrapolate that such programs could be humanizing in the right set of circumstances. Bartolome (1994) writes that "cultural and linguistic eradication represents...a form of dehumanization" and that "therefore, any discussion having to do with the improvement of subordinated students' academic standing is incomplete if it does not address those discriminatory school practices that lead to dehumanization" (Bartolome, 1994, p. 176). Such a statement can be applied to certain manifestations of bilingual education if one views instruction in the first and an additional language as a method of addressing the same discriminatory practices and cultural and linguistic eradication Bartolome mentions. Franquiz and Salazar (2004) argue that teachers must work to build relationships to students who are otherwise devalued and "de-ethnicize[d]" (p. 37) by the system they find themselves in. Such an argument can be applied to certain forms of bilingual education if one views instruction in the first and an additional language as pertaining to ethnicity and self-value. Salazar (2013) writes about her isolating experiences as a "hyphenated American" (p. 121), of having to abandon her language and culture when she entered school in the U.S., and of her "endless struggles to preserve my humanity" (p. 121). She recounts her rejection of her own brown-ness and her yearning for white-ness, results of her experiences in elementary school. Consider her argument that "the educational goals for students of color continue to be those of cultural replacement and assimilation into mainstream values and practices" (p. 122) and that a humanizing pedagogy would include the full development of each individual, a movement toward critical consciousness, critical reflection and action, and an education that promotes a "more fully human world through...pedagogical principles and practices" (Salazar, 2013, p. 128).

I join Sánchez, García, and Solorza (2018) and others in arguing that certain forms of bilingual education can be seen as a step toward social justice, a notion not identical but interrelated with humanization. Particular manifestations of bilingual programming, especially critical DLBE programs, can fulfill Salazar's (2013) requirements and therefore be considered a humanizing form of education. Furthermore, such programs also represent potential venues for culturally relevant, responsive, and sustaining curriculum and pedagogies, given the appropriate circumstances, an explicit mission, and stakeholder and educator preparation. Crucially, however, dual language contexts inappropriately designed have the potential to present minority language students with subtractive, disempowering experiences (Freire, 2014; Palmer, 2007; Valdés, 1997) and therefore we must take care to speak of "certain" or particular bilingual settings. Di Stefano (2017) notes that some of dual language immersion's highly publicized and vaunted "results are connected to the way DLI programs are organized and instruction is executed" (p. 173). Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) note that

> The power of a dual language program is not just in its additive nature but in the pedagogical equity that exists for both language groups. It is not enough to merely adjust the language of instruction; teachers must adjust their philosophy, their teaching strategies, and their view of ELs. (p. 316)

 Indeed, as Diaz, Whitacre, Esquierdo, & Ruiz-Escalante (2013) note, simply using Spanish for instruction does not make the instruction high quality or critical. Exploring these intersections and nuances are the subject of the next three subsections.

Three Culturally Attentive Pedagogies in Bilingual Programming

As I argued previously, humanizing pedagogy that reflects such a critical cultural component is, can be, or should be integral to working with emergent bilingual students. In fact,

some scholars even view the use of culturally attentive pedagogies as a tool teachers can use to combat reproduction in schools and fight for social justice (Esposito & Swain, 2009). Crucially, it *can* be but *may not* be so in all bilingual programs. Freire (2014) argues that

> ...DL programs are not meeting their full potential if biculturalism and sociopolitical consciousness are not part of the program. DL programs need to develop students' biculturalism and sociopolitical consciousness in order to counter the dominant ideologies that negate or demean the Latina/o culture and language, helping Latina/o and White students see Spanish and Latino culture from a critical and resource perspective (Santa Ana, 2002). Despite research showing the additional benefits of biculturalism and sociopolitical consciousness, many teachers are not supporting these practices. (p. 23)

Freire reminds us that it is important to keep in mind that the label, the spirit, the intent, and the impact of a program may be at odds. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that some, not all, bilingual programs are imbued with humanizing and culturally attentive pedagogies. In the prior section, I showed how the notion of humanizing pedagogy can be congruent with forms of bilingual education. In this section, I explore Ladson-Billings' and others' related notions of cultural relevance, responsiveness, and sustenance in conjunction with bilingual education. In addition to intersections of bilingual education and "culturally relevant pedagogy", I address intersections of "culturally responsive pedagogy" and "culturally sustaining pedagogy" with forms of bilingual education in the next three subsections.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Bilingual Contexts

When Ladson-Billings wrote about culturally relevant instruction in 1995 and argued that culturally relevant pedagogy ought to "problematize teaching and encourage teachers to ask about the nature of the student-teacher relationship, the curriculum, schooling, and society"

36

(1995, p. 483), she may not have had any of the various forms of bilingual education in mind. However, consider her three criteria for culturally relevant teaching: a teacher should develop students' academic abilities, but also promote their cultural competence and their sociopolitical or critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 483). I argue that these very criteria are integral to the power of bilingual education, especially DLBE.

Some scholars (De La Trinidad, 2015; Ortiz, 2009) have written about intersections between culturally relevant pedagogy and bilingual education broadly defined. De La Trinidad (2015) writes that bilingual education in Arizona was conceived as culturally relevant education for the historically ill-served Mexican American students of the region. It is important to note, however, that other bilingual programs may fail to attend to cultural relevance. (This is especially true of transitional bilingual programs, which shift students away from their home language as quickly as possible.) Others have written more specifically about the intersection of culturally relevant pedagogy and DLBE (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Alfaro, Durán, Hunt, & Aragón, 2014; Freire, 2014; Freire & Valdez, 2017, Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017). For example, Kabuto (2017) and Souto-Manning and Martell (2017) found that cultural relevance is key in successful, critical dual language literacy instruction. In fact, Alfaro, Durán, Hunt, and Aragón (2014) found that culturally relevant pedagogy was a central tenet of dual language teachers' work at the "innovative" (Alfaro et al., 2014, p. 19) Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School in California. Crucially, this school is described as "one of the highest performing" (Alfaro et al., 2014, p. 19) in the school district, and has won awards for closing achievement gaps. This suggests that far from attending only to the soft issues, cultural relevance in education can reach into the orbit of positivist, data-based results. In fact, some scholars (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Freire, 2014) have found that commitment to using culturally

relevant pedagogical practices are hallmarks of successful dual language programs, though unfortunately other research (Freire & Valdez, 2017) suggests that some dual language teachers decline to use or believe they cannot implement culturally relevant pedagogy.

The literature in this section shows that notions of culturally *relevant* pedagogy provide a useful lens through which to view bilingual programming and in particular DLBE programs. Next, I discuss literature that addresses the intersection of bilingual education and culturally *responsive* pedagogy.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in Bilingual Contexts

Since Gay (2002) wrote about culturally responsive teaching, numerous scholars (de Jong & Bearse, 2014; DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020b; Fitts, 2009; Rodríguez, 2014) have taken up her term to write about the connection between cultural responsiveness and bilingual education, especially the DLBE variant. Rodríguez (2014) argues that culturally responsive texts were crucial elements of a quality bilingual program. De Jong & Bearse (2014) write that culturally responsive teaching is a crucial element of a DLBE program that truly elevates the minority language and culture. Notably, they also found that such cultural responsiveness and elevation was constantly challenged and undermined by what might be described as colonizing or colonial features of the traditional school system that housed the dual language program they examined. Fitts (2009) found culturally responsive pedagogy was "underutilized" (p. 87) in dual language settings.

Research also suggests that not only is a dual language classroom teacher's culturally responsive pedagogy vital to creating additive experiences for the traditionally marginalized half of the student body. DeMatthews & Izquierdo (2020b) write that culturally responsive school leaders are key in creating a supportive experience for minoritized students in dual language

settings. In fact, DeMatthews & Izquierdo (2020b) link the implementation of such conditions to the pursuit of social justice. This is a notion that influences my work as a DLBE practitioner and my thinking around this study.

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy in Bilingual Contexts

Some prior research by DeMatthews & Izquierdo (2020a) suggests that dual language schools that have successfully addressed inequities in their communities have done so, in part, by providing elements of a culturally sustaining education. In her dissertation, Marialuisa Di Stefano (2017) shared the results of a 10-week ethnographic study in a third-grade dual language classroom. She found that culturally sustaining pedagogical practices to be a key element in dual language curriculum that supported students' identity. She noted that students' identity, sense of belonging, language practices and cultural factors were intertwined and, given a skillful teacher, can be woven into the dual language curriculum. Crucially, she notes that sociocultural elements may not always be addressed in a dual language setting because they may not be formally integrated into the curriculum. The degree of culturally sustaining pedagogy, then, may depend upon dual language individual teachers' awareness and ability. This finding is supported by Freire (2020), which found that dual language teachers must be intentional about addressing and integrating sociopolitical elements into dual language programming in order for the program to be a truly humanizing, liberating experience for minoritized students.

As other scholars have argued with cultural relevance and responsiveness, Di Stefano (2017) and DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2020a) cast the provision of cultural sustenance through dual language education as a step on the pursuit of equity and social justice. The intersections of humanizing pedagogy and culturally attentive pedagogies in bilingual education and in the

service of social justice influence my work as a dual language practitioner and inspire me to pursue this study.

Di Stefano (2017) raises the important point that dual language programming must be appropriately conceived, designed, supported, and delivered in order to create humanizing experiences for language-minority students. Attending simply to the label or adhering to simplistic conceptualizations of dual language education as simply teaching in two languages misses great opportunities to enact social justice. Di Stefano (2017) writes that

> DLI programs are not simply an instrument to facilitate Latin@ students in their acquisition of English, but rather a twofold opportunity for Latin@ students to nurture their community language and culture, and for White students to embrace that community and develop a sense of belonging and membership through the language. DLI programs can become a counter-hegemonic instrument because they dismantle power relations based on race and socioeconomic status, among other elements. The use of Spanish as the language of instruction is not enough to develop a suitable DLI program. Students need a culturally sustaining practice that allows all to engage in conversations, where minority groups can have their voices heard and students from the majority group can advocate for a more equal distribution of resources. (p. 175)

Crucially, Di Stefano selected the term "can" in this description, instead of a more definitive term. Many practitioners and academics alike agree that minoritized students in dual language programs currently do not necessarily experience the legendary "astounding" education (Collier & Thomas, 2004) prior scholarship might have predicted (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; La Serna, 2017; more?). What, then, are we missing?

The literature in this section highlights the natural convergence between culturally relevant, responsive, and sustaining pedagogies and bilingual education. It also establishes the problematic nature of uncritical implementation of bilingual education. Taken together, existing scholarship points to the importance of examining bilingual educators' perspectives with an eye for the critical. It also highlights the importance of gaining in-depth understanding of how DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual.

Critical Consciousness

In this section, I draw primarily from Freire to define critical consciousness and situate it in the dual language literature. Literature that explores the notion of critical consciousness, and its intersection with dual language programming, suggests that truly humanizing, relevant, responsive, sustaining experience implies an element of critical consciousness. While literature establishes these as similar and intertwined notions, they are not one and the same concept, and without critical consciousness, a dual language experience can still present some student with dehumanizing encounters that are the hallmark of our neoliberal system and the partial result of an uncritical, "banking" (Freire, 1968) style education. I show the relevance of research at the intersection of the two, and how my study contributes new insight.

The goal of a dual language educator guided by critical pedagogy is to challenge the status quo and make a positive change in her or his students' lives, as per the definition of critical pedagogy. Such an educator might imbue her or his teaching with sociopolitical or critical consciousness or awareness, which can be seen as an organ within the body of critical pedagogy. Freire (2016) and Freire (1968/1974) understand critical consciousness as the awareness of social, political, and economic realities and their role in maintaining systems of power and

privilege, in addition to the pursuit of the transformation of those systems. Importantly, some scholars view the term critical consciousness as interchangeable with sociopolitical consciousness:

> Becoming sociopolitical conscious is the most important tool for educators to fight against oppressive language education policies. The development of sociopolitical consciousness, also called critical consciousness, focuses on the growth of students' conscientization/conscientização. (Freire, 2016, p. 45)

Juan Freire, who has written prolifically about the possibilities of dual language education to challenge systemic inequities, even uses both the terms "critical consciousness" and "sociopolitical consciousness" in various publications between 2014 and 2020. Furthermore, he writes that DLBE educators ought to attend to sociopolitical consciousness for the potential impact it can exercise on their students' lived experiences. Perhaps for that reason, Freire (2014) also asserts that DLBE educators' beliefs about elements of their work merit exploration.

 In that vein, my study is particularly relevant because of the growing attention to the social, cultural, and political elements (not just the academic elements) of bilingual education (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Fitts, 2009; Flores & Clark, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Guerrero et al., 2017; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer et al., 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Valdez et al., 2016). As Bustos Flores and Riojas Clark note, one should not assume that "teachers will have sociocultural knowledge or a critical consciousness simply because of shared identity, cultural group, or languages" (Flores & Clark, 2017, p. 5) with minority students they may teach. And yet "researchers also suggest that critically conscious ethnic minority teachers can recognize issues of oppression and create a learning context in which minority students and others will

flourish (Galindo, 2007; Rintell & Pierce, 2003; Chapter 3)" (Flores & Clark, 2017, p. 5). Whether teachers are of dominant or minoritized identities, critical consciousness has clear power for their students, especially the historically least empowered ones. In any given DLBE class, that is about half of the students in the room. This represents huge potential for a teacher to enact change - or squander the chance.

These are the possibilities that lead me, with intensity and urgency, to pursue my study of dual language teachers' thinking around their teaching. I hope to discover critical pedagogues who subvert official knowledge (Apple, 2014) and disrupt social reproduction. I hope to find critical consciousness in teachers and in their teaching. Palmer, Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, and Heiman (2019) as well as others (Babino & Stewart, 2018; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; Hood, 2020) have begun to highlight the role of critical consciousness in DLBE in ways that prior scholarship in that area did not. Some write of "social consciousness" (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017) in the same contexts. Well known scholars in early dual language conceptualizations, such as Thomas and Collier, Hamayan, Cloud, Freeman and Freeman, Genesee, and others focused on the academic and linguistic elements of such programming, without highlighting the sociopolitical implications beyond "elevating Spanish" in planning and instruction. Scholars such as Deborah Palmer, Juan Freire, and others have taken the tickle of doubt that they felt as DLBE teachers and opened a new chapter in scholarship around DLBE programming.

Even higher education has begun to take note of the wave of critical consciousness research. In some institutions, teacher educators have begun to highlight the role of critical consciousness in preparing teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse (Patel, 2019; Tyrrell, 2019) and especially emergent bilingual students (Alfaro, 2019; Garza, 2010; Greer, 2019;

Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019; Simmons, 2019). Some scholarship (Farruggio, 2009) refers to elevating the "sociopolitical" consciousness or critical "awareness" (Palmer & Menard-Warwick, 2012) of teachers or preservice teachers in similar ways and to similar effect. Patel (2019) explains that

> Preservice teachers are underprepared to address the needs of racially, linguistically, and culturally diverse students in their daily practice. They also report difficulty in countering White bias as it appears in daily teaching. As a result of this lack of preparation, many teachers do not have the capacity to challenge systemic inequities and institutional barriers once they become credentialed new teachers in classrooms. Many researchers have called for teacher education programs to focus on developing critical consciousness and teaching for social justice to disrupt this phenomenon. (Patel, 2019, p. iii)

Alfaro (2019) argues that critically conscious dual language teachers can challenge dominant ideologies. Far from being unimportant, changing minds thereby also changes actions - in the moment and in the future. Garza (2010) even sees in critical consciousness a potentially healing tool of decolonization. Palmer and colleagues (2019) and others (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020) argue that attending to bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, is not sufficient, but that DLBE programming must attend to a fourth goal: critical consciousness for all students. In fact, Palmer et al. (2019) argue it is, or should be, a "fundamental goal" of such programming.

At the same time, other research suggests that critical consciousness may be less than fully applied, integrated, and/or utilized in DLBE settings. Though some scholars hail it for its additive *potential* in DLBE, they also see room for improvement (Alfaro, 2019; Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; La

Serna, 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Sánchez, García, & Solorza, 2018; Valenzuela, 2016). Such findings suggest DLBE practitioners and researchers would benefit from more research in this particular area.

Literature explored in this section highlights research that addresses critical consciousness, both in DLBE programming and the education of teachers of emergent bilingual students overall. Taken together, existing scholarship suggests that the question of critical consciousness in teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students is relevant and meaningful, and a potential powerful tool to counteract some of the inequities of our neoliberal system and educational machine that such students suffer. Furthermore, such consciousness among the teaching staff is even more relevant in programming that serves students who have intersecting marginalized identities: immigrant, English language learner, Latinx, among others. Valenzuela (2016) has gone so far as to argue that all who work with Latinx youth need expertise in critical consciousness. I have also shown that humanizing pedagogy, culturally relevant, responsive, and linguistic pedagogies, and critical consciousness are closely related and intertwined notions that are despite nuances differences nonetheless of the same philosophical family, with social justice as the progenitor. Furthermore, I have shown that this study merits the use of qualitative methods, such as ethnographic interviews, given that other scholars have applied the same approach in similar studies (Shin, Ezeofor, Smith, Welch, & Goodrich, 2016; Simmons, 2019). Finally, this study responds to Cervantes-Soon's (2014) urgent call for attention to critical consciousness.

In short, I have shown the urgent and relevance of examining how dual language educators understand, enact, and acquire their notion of what it means to teach for critical

45

consciousness, especially in relation to culturally and linguistically diverse students who are labeled by our system as emergent bilingual or other related terms.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this qualitative study is to gain in-depth understanding of how DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of culturally and linguistically diverse students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual. This study follows case study design (Creswell, 2013) and relies on ethnographic methods. In this chapter, I first revisit the guiding research questions, and the criteria for sampling and participant eligibility. Subsequently, I lay out the problem and the context of the study, articulate the research design and rationale for that design. Then I address methodology as well as questions of trustworthiness and positionality. Finally, I address limitations at the conclusion of this chapter.

Research Design

In this section, I lay out the purpose of my study, my research questions, and elaborate on the rationale for the approach I have chosen. Then, I give background on the setting in which the study was conducted. Subsequently, I provide a detailed explanation of the methods I used for participant sampling, data collection and analysis. Lastly, I address issues of positionality and trustworthiness.

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into how DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of students

47

sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual or by other related terms. Several broad questions guide my ethnographic investigation. They are as follows:

1. How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?

2. How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in that DLBE setting?

3. How do DLBE educators acquire their understanding regarding critical consciousness in a DLBE setting?

This study explores bilingual DLBE educators' understanding of teaching for critical consciousness and how they enact it, particularly in relation to their students often labeled as emergent bilingual or related historic terms. Furthermore, I explore how they came to acquire their understandings and practices. The data that form the basis of this study stem from three sources: a focus group interview, individual interviews, and artifacts.

A qualitative design makes the most sense given that my research interests lent themselves to exploration without prior identification of variables and hypotheses (Creswell, 2002), and given my access to a limited number of participants. Qualitative research is conducive to working more closely and at length with a smaller population, as opposed to less so with a larger population, which allowed me to gain deeper insight into my research questions. In addition, no quantitative method that I considered felt adequate to meaningfully accomplish this goal and provide the impactful contextual information, the human voice that I hoped to share with the readers of my study. I considered and reconsidered the notion of a survey, even one that might prompt short-answer responses instead of restrictive, Likert-scaled responses. Still, I could not see it being the appropriate tool and method to collect the data to provide the insight I hoped to gain. I used a quantitative method, in conjunction with a survey tool, for my master's research:

I found myself disappointed with the data I gathered and the lack of insight it provided me. I was left with far more questions than answers, and more questions even than when I began the study. That experience helped guide me away from quantitative approaches, and towards qualitative approaches, for this work. Qualitative research is the most appropriate approach to gather sufficiently detailed and rich data for insight into participants' world (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001) and their performance of identity through language use and behavior in a dual language context. Furthermore, case study methodology allowed me the exploration of patterns, in a natural setting that I seek (Stake, 2005; Yin, 2013). I always planned to retain my position as full-time practitioner in a DLBE setting not only for practical reasons, but because it is a setting I deeply care about and want to understand better. "The all-encompassing feature of a case study is its intense focus on a single phenomenon within its real-life context..." (Yin, 1999, p. 1211; Yin, 1994, p. 13), and fortunately, I already found myself in the very context that I want to understand better as I was planning this study. Case study also aligns with my desire to focus on culturally and linguistically attentive pedagogies within the DLBE setting. It is also practical for me to pursue a case study, since it permits me to collect data "in terms of hours, days and weeks" (Parker Jenkins, p. 16) and because my interaction with certain participants who are geographically removed or who lead very busy lives may be limited to a single interview or discussion (Kitzinger, 1995; Stewart & Shamdasani, 2014). Case study lent itself to the ethnographic methods I was interested in using and aligned with my circumstances.

Case study methodology allowed me the deep exploration of patterns, in a natural setting (Stake, 2005; Yin, 2013), while ethno-case study (Parker-Jenkins, 2018) aims to understand the attitudes, beliefs, and values that influence participants' practices. Therefore, I find ethnographic methodology was a logistically appropriate and philosophically compatible approach for the

present case study. Ethnographic methods, especially in-depth interviews with participants, aligned best with my research question as well as my practical needs. I could not commit to the two-year period appropriate for a full-blown ethnography. However, for the last four years I have been a staff member at one school where I decided to collect data and also plan to retain my employment there in future. Therefore, I represent the consistent and relatively prolonged presence that ethnographic methods require (Creswell, 2002). Having been a staff member for five years at the second school from which I recruited participants, I argue that I was also a consistent and prolonged presence at that site as well. These factors combined mean ethnographic methods align well with the present study, but also that I have pre-existing insider understanding of the context of the study.

Ethnographic methods are also philosophically appropriate for me as a researcher. I have found myself drawn, time and again, to scholarly work that employed ethnographic methods (Freeman, 1996; Heath, 1983; Potowski, 2007; Rosa, 2019; Valenzuela & Rubio, 2018). Perhaps this type of work appeals to me because I noticed, even before being able to articulate it, that employing ethnographic methods implies engagement with society and, at least in the right researcher's hands, marries the purely academic with social justice work (Heath & Street, 2008). Because of an "inherent sensitivity to people, to culture, and to context" (Gilmore & Glatthorn, 1982, p. 3), ethnographic case study methodology strikes a necessary balance between my goals and values, and also space and time limitations (Parthasarathy, 2008). Even more specifically, critical ethnography (Creswell, 2002) best fits my intentions to use the understandings I gleaned from the data to eventually empower other dual language educators to better serve students of traditionally marginalized groups. For these reasons, I chose to conduct a focus group interview, subsequent individual interviews, and document analysis as my methods.

Document analysis and interviews were appropriate tools for my study for a number of reasons. Documents of curricular or related materials were simple for participants to provide and for me to collect, could prompt questions and discussion by jogging participants' memory regarding the details of a busy school life, and could provide clarity that oral information may lack. Furthermore, the focus group interview added the personal voice of the practitioners plus live discussion and thinking. The focus group interview brought out commentary that might otherwise have remained dormant. The subsequent individual interview then provided the chance for participants to share perspectives and thoughts either that they preferred not to do in a group, or that arose after they reflected on the focus group interview and what they heard others say in that setting. Interviewing participants in two different formats about their views and interpretations regarding the intersection of critical consciousness and their work as DLBE educators provided thick data for better understanding, as demonstrated by work with similar methods and a similar critical bent (Mazak & Herbas-Donoso, 2014; Picower, 2012).

In this section I have laid out my arguments for the case study design of this study and the ethnographic approach to data gathering. In the next section, I describe the context of my study. In particular, I describe the participants in this study.

Context

In this section, I describe the two DLBE sites from which participants were recruited. I also describe their programming, student, staff, and community attributes, and give an overview of how they were founded. Then I describe the sites from which participants were recruited, and describe participants themselves.

The first is a site in the Midwestern United States, where I have been employed since August of 2018. The second is a site in the Southeastern United States, where I was previously

51

employed for five years This is also the site at which I became interested in doctoral studies, and where I had the personal and professional epiphany that we who worked at the school were attempting to do more than teach academics in Spanish and English.

Although the Southeastern school is a magnet school and the Midwestern school is a charter school, they have more in common than not. Both sites are dual language elementary schools where Spanish and English are the partner languages of instruction. Student enrollment at both is such that approximately half of the students are of low income. Both are schools in a small college town. Raciolinguistic and sociolinguistic issues are the focus of much professional development and discussion at both sites. Because of the many similarities between the two, I chose these sites to recruit participants, in addition to my preexisting professional connections to the sites and the people therein.

The first site of my study was La Escuela Midwest (pseudonym), a dual language charter elementary school in a small university town in the Midwest. It began in 2004 as a strand inside a traditional school and has since moved into its own building. It houses kindergarten through fifth grade, with three classroom teachers each dedicated to kindergarten through third grade, and two classroom teachers each at fourth and fifth grade levels. Various kinds of support and specialized educators work with students in multiple classes and grades. This school of approximately 50 staff members and 300 students loosely follows the 90-10 model, using the partner languages Spanish and English. In a 90-10 model, students in kindergarten experience 90 percent of daily instruction in Spanish and 10 percent in English. Then in first and second grades, the percentage of English increases until in third grade the languages of instruction are balanced, with 50 percent Spanish use and 50 percent English use. This linguistic balance continues through fifth grade. However, the system is a hybrid model that makes use of some features of

Escamilla, Hopewell, Butvilofsky, Sparrow, Soltero-González, Ruiz-Figueroa, and Escamilla's

biliteracy framework (2014) and some features of more traditional dual language frameworks.

Though it began as a strand program inside an elementary school belonging to the urban

district that it is administratively served by, the program currently resides in a small school

building rented from a suburban school district. (The dividing lines between the districts are

nearly imperceptible, and the school's location does not feel remote.) Currently, the charter

organization is working off of the assumption that the school will move into a larger and

permanent building that belongs to the school district for which it is an instrumentality. This is

also the same building where the program began as "just" a strand. The school district approved

building a new school nearby, and the community currently in that building will move into a new

building to make way for La Escuela Midwest to return and take over the entire building. The

plan is that this may happen in a year, although pandemic shortages and supply chain issues may

interfere with the timeline.

Being a charter school is a significant way in which La Escuela Midwest is unique among

dual language programs. It is key that the school is an instrumentality and is staffed by educators

who are the wider school district's employees. Many of these are also union employees, making

it a charter unlike many charter schools reported on in the news. Another prominent and unique

feature of the school is how students gain admittance. Students gain entry to the school via

lottery, which is a much talked about topic among parents who want their children to attend a

dual language program. New students are admitted such that half are "native speakers" of

English and half are "native speakers" of Spanish. Admittedly, this notion of "native speaker" is

a problematic and artificial distinction. This is true partially due to increasing simultaneous

bilingualism and partially due to White families who maneuver to be labeled as native Spanish

speakers to gain advantage for their students in the lottery system. (It is easier to be admitted if a student is labeled "Spanish speaking" because there are few applicants in that category of the lottery pool). However, the school administration attempts to accurately identify and break hopeful enrollees into two such groups using a Spanish language assessment called preLAS to evaluate students who apply to the program. In this sense especially, the school is unique. Another unique element of La Escuela Midwest dual language elementary school relates to the design of math instruction, which occurs daily in both languages during different periods of the day. Yet another unique element of instruction is the prevalence of technology, and how its use is deeply integrated in various elements of the day. This was true before the pandemic, although the pandemic has brought about a significant increase in technology use, especially in kindergarten, first, and second grades.

In addition to the concrete differences, such as in instruction, a visitor would be struck by the unique climate of the school. One element of that unique climate is that La Escuela staff members hail from a wide array of backgrounds; several are from Colombia, Spain, Venezuela, and several are from other states such as Texas and California. Many of the staff members have spent time teaching abroad, including one of the earliest teachers on staff who has since become its principal. Spanish and English are heard in various conventional (the grammatical language taught in schools) and unconventional combinations (sometimes called Spanglish, codeswitching, and/or translanguaging) everywhere from the lounge to the playground to the classroom. Another element of the unique climate is that many of the staff have brought their own children to attend the school, giving it a more familial feel than other public schools where I have worked. These are some of the main reasons that the atmosphere at La Escuela Midwest is unique and unlike the experience of walking into most other public school buildings.

Examining how bilingual DLBE educators understand, enact and acquire their understand of critical consciousness is particularly meaningful given the unique elements I just listed, but also in light of recent local developments. The school has been the site of recent published research on language use, privilege, and equity (Hamman, 2018b) that found consistent social pressure exerted by the dominant group, "native English speakers", on the minoritized group, "native Spanish speakers". This finding provides a renewed impetus for reflection and change. The lopsided-ness in how academic and social benefits seem to be accumulated in different amounts by the different demographic groups has been a growing focus of team meetings and professional developments at the school. A curricular task force was established last year to examine and possibly overhaul elements of the curriculum. The public school district that administers (but does not control) the charter program at La Escuela Midwest is engaged in similar work to examine privilege, power, achievement and intersections with race, especially. The district's efforts, which have been called "Black Excellence", have influenced formal and informal conversations at La Escuela Midwest.

I also collected data from a second site, La Escuela Southeast (pseudonym). It is a dual language magnet elementary school in a small university town in the U.S. Southeast. It is roughly double the size of La Escuela Midwest, but similar in many other demographic, curricular, and organizational ways. La Escuela Southeast began in 2004 as a strand inside a traditional monolingual elementary school, and in 2013 moved into its own building. Of note is the fact that the building La Escuela Southeast moved into what was previously a traditional monolingual elementary school, and that the takeover as a dual language magnet was contentious and fraught. In addition, the building that today houses La Escuela Southeast was originally built as a segregated Black-only school during the 1950s, and the legacy of its beginnings influences

55

the lives of those who attend today. I have sometimes wondered if quality of original workmanship, in addition to aging facilities, may have been behind the plumbing issues I recall during my five years at the school.

La Escuela Southeast houses pre-kindergarten through fifth grade, with approximately 150 staff members and 600 students. On average, depending on enrollment and attrition, six classroom teachers each dedicated to kindergarten and first, four teachers dedicated to second, three dedicated to third grade, and two classroom teachers each at fourth and fifth grade levels. As with La Escuela Midwest, various types of support and specialized staff work with students across classrooms and grade level lines. This school loosely follows the 90-10 model, using the partner languages Spanish and English. This means that in kindergarten, teachers deliver instruction 90 percent in Spanish and 10 percent in English. In first grade, the balance shifts to 80 percent Spanish and 20 percent English, then in second grade the balance shifts to 70 percent Spanish and 30 percent English. From third grade onward, instruction is delivered 50 percent in Spanish and 50 percent in English. Furthermore, the school makes use of features of Beeman and Urow's biliteracy unit framework (2013) as well as features of project-based learning.

Being a magnet school is a significant way in which La Escuela Southeast is unique among public school programs. As a magnet program in a university town that is nestled in a region where the farming, logging, meatpacking, and textile/furniture industries are prominent, the mix of students is similarly stratified to the mix of students at La Escuela Midwest. Also similarly, students gain admittance to the school via lottery, which is a much talked about topic among parents of means who want their children to attend a dual language program. New students are admitted such that half are "native speakers" of English and half are "native speakers" of Spanish. Just as is the case in La Escuela Midwest, this notion of "native speaker" is

a problematic distinction due to a gradual increase in simultaneous bilingual students and also due to white families who maneuver for their students to be labeled as native Spanish speakers to game the lottery system. However, the school administration attempts to identify and break hopeful enrollees into two such groups using language assessments. In this sense especially, La Escuela Southeast is unique among public schools and yet also similar to La Escuela Midwest. Another unique element of La Escuela Southeast DLBE elementary school relates to the prevalence of technology, and how its use is deeply integrated in various elements of the day. Students have had 1-1 access to laptops for the upper grades for at least five years, and in the lower grades in the last several years. This was already true pre-pandemic. In addition, there are many iPads for staff and student use, as well as Smartboards and projectors. The school and district overall are well financed in comparison to other schools in the region, given that the property taxes in this university town are double what the taxes are in surrounding areas. In fact, the tax rates are similar in the district where La Escuela Southeast finds itself and in the district in which La Escuela Midwest finds itself.

In addition, the climate of La Escuela Southeast is unique in comparison to traditional monolingual schools, and yet also similar to the climate of La Escuela Midwest. Staff members at La Escuela Southwest hail from a variety of backgrounds, such as Colombia, Spain, Venezuela, Argentina, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Costa Rica as well as various U.S. states. Many of the U.S.-born staff have spent time teaching abroad, and/or have spouses from another country. Spanish of several dialects, English, and unconventional linguistic combinations, sometimes referred to as codeswitching and as translanguaging, are heard everywhere from the hallways to the lounge to the playground to the classroom. In comparison to La Escuela Midwest, Spanish is most frequently used as the default language and staff operate

according to more Latin American cultural norms - or at least this was my perception from the time I worked there. As is the case at La Escuela Midwest, a unique element of this school is that many of the staff have brought their own children to attend the program, giving it a much more familial feel than other public schools where I have worked. These are some of the main reasons that the atmosphere at La Escuela Southeast is unique and unlike the experience of walking into most other public school buildings, but also similar to La Escuela Midwest.

Examining how bilingual DLBE educators enact and understand critical consciousness is particularly meaningful given the characteristics I just listed, but also in light of the history that the district and region has with dual language research. It is in this area of the country that Thomas and Collier (2004) did their groundbreaking research that suggested dual language instruction could have "astounding" impact on "ELLs'" academic achievement. More recently, research at the school has explored power, privilege, and equity (Cervantes Soon, 2014). Similar to Hamman's (2018b) findings at La Escuela Midwest, Cervantes-Soon found that native English speakers exercise more power despite the supposed equitable nature of DLBE programming. This finding provides a renewed impetus for reflection and change. Like at La Escuela Midwest, the lopsided-ness in academic and social benefits has been a focus of team discussion and professional developments at the school. The public school district in which La Escuela Southeast is located is engaged in equity work to examine privilege, power, achievement and intersections with race, especially. The district's efforts have centered on Black students and have influenced formal and informal conversations at La Escuela Southeast.

Participants

Purposive sampling guided participant selection, as my study targeted DLBE educators for recruitment. In order to reach potential participants of that group, I used homogenous

snowball sampling (Plano & Creswell, 2010, p. 253). I began by emailing all teacher or specialist educators that were listed on the schools' websites. I did not email anyone who was labeled teacher assistant or a title that suggested they were not certified staff members. In my recruitment email, I gave a brief introduction of my research, background, and the purpose of the study. This is the text I used:

Hello, buenos días!

My name is Caroline Hesse, and I am a graduate student in curriculum and instruction in bilingual education at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. I'm also a bilingual resource teacher at [La Escuela Midwest] school, a Spanish-English dual language charter school in [small midwestern college town]. In addition, I spent five years on the staff of [La Escuela Southeast] in [small southeastern college town]. I am preparing to conduct my dissertation research around the notion of critical consciousness in dual language immersion/two-way immersion (DL/TWI) education. I am interested in how the notion shows up in DL/TWI teachers' work. I am inviting you to participate because you work in the DL/TWI setting. If you agree to participate in this study, you will participate in one or two interviews via Zoom. You will have the opportunity to share your teaching materials, plans, or sample assignments with other educators in similar positions and with a similar mission. I will collect copies of those items, in addition to recording oral responses and discussion. You will remain anonymous as a participant, and will have the opportunity to choose your pseudonym. Your time commitment will be about an hour for an initial focus group interview discussion via Zoom. If you agree to a later individual interview in which I would clarify some of your points and follow up on others, then your total commitment would range from one and a half hours to longer, depending on how

59

much you feel that you want to clarify and add on. While I can offer no financial

compensation, you may find it useful and rewarding to share ideas and materials with

colleagues in very similar dual language settings across the nation. I will also provide

each participant with a copy of a novel that I have used to teach students in the Spanish

language setting and which started me on the journey to where I am now. I will mail this

item at the conclusion of the interview process.

Will you participate? Thank you for your consideration and your reply,

Caroline Hesse

carolineahesse@gmail.com or caroline.hesse01@utrgv.edu

[cell phone number]

I recruited potential participants by emailing a call for volunteers, in conjunction with the

participation criteria, to each staff member listed online in the schools' staff directory. I sent the

recruitment email to all those whose job titles suggested that they might be what I was seeking:

educators who had a certification or credential for their position. This means that I emailed

"teachers" but not "teachers' assistants". I also emailed other staff for whom I believed a

credential was necessary, such as "specialists" and "resource teachers." Those who responded,

confirmed that they met the criteria, expressed a willingness to meet with me on Zoom, and

returned the consent forms became the participants in the focus group. I accepted potential

participants' own reporting in relation to the selection criteria. For example, I asked for

participants who had sought out employment in a DLBE program and not, for example, legacy

staff members who continued in a program that had changed from monolingual to bilingual

while they were employed there. I also sought participants who had three years' experience or

more, in order to have participants who had had time to think more deeply than the typical

harried and overwhelmed first year teacher. In the end, a range of educators from both schools

responded and committed to the interviews. Several held positions other than what is typically

thought of as a "teacher", though their work often involved teaching, either directly or indirectly.

For this reason, I use "educator" to describe participants, instead of "teacher".

In the end, I had seven participants commit and follow through with at least one

interview. Six participants were available for both the focus and individual interviews. One

participant was not available for the focus group but was available for the individual interview. I

conducted a focus group interview with six participants followed by an individual interview with

each of seven participants. I conducted each interview by Zoom, recorded, then transcribed the

audio file "by hand". The video function of Zoom was turned off during all interviews such that

only audio was in use and only audio was recorded. In addition, participants logged in to the

meeting using a previously chosen pseudonym as a screen name, and also removed identifying

background photos. In addition to interviews, I asked participants to share with me an artifact

that they felt exemplified what they strive to accomplish at work, reflects critical consciousness

in some way, or inspires them. Three out of seven participants shared an artifact. One shared a

print-out that contained parental guidance for conducting speech therapy with children, one

shared an anthology of parent narratives that had been collected by students and used as a staff

book study, one shared a bilingual Spanish-English poem created and read aloud by various 5th

grade students for a graduation ceremony, one shared a unit plan document, and several

participants did not share or send me a particular artifact.

Dannie is a DLBE educator whose duties include teaching in an upper elementary

position. Dannie is energetic and found that she had a lot that she wanted to say. She is one of

the younger educators in the group, having graduated within the last decade. She grew up in the

U.S. and speaking English and studied Spanish in school and through experiences abroad. She

has several years' experience working in her DLBE current program, as well as several more

years' experience working in a previous DLBE program in another city. That prior experience

with the other DLBE program was instructive for her, in the sense that it taught her a lot about

what she now believes DLBE should not be. In other words, the prior position was in a program

that she felt exemplified the opposite of critical consciousness, and the impressions from that

experience have clearly informed her thinking about her work in her current position. She also

has worked for a summer camp for kids that made social justice a focus and drew on this

experience during interviews. International travel, including a stint working in a South American

country, also made an impact on her and informs her thinking about her work. In addition,

experiences she has had with colleagues in her current DLBE program have also made a positive

impact on her and inform her thinking about her work. She participated in the focus group

interview on April 12, 2021, and an individual interview on July 14, 2021.

     Ana is a DLBE educator and social worker whose duties include providing social

emotional support and curriculum to students and classroom teachers. Ana is extremely

passionate about her work and its intersections with social justice and had a lot that she wanted

to say during the individual interview. She grew up in a Spanish speaking region, speaking

Spanish and English, before pursuing higher education and work in English in the U.S. She has

approximately two decades of experience in DLBE, having worked as both teacher's assistant

and social worker. She also runs a unique after-school program for Latinx girls from her school

and their families, on which she spends a significant amount of time and passion. Her

background in journalism, as a Latinx person in the U.S., and as a parent of bilingual children all

informs her thinking about her work in DLBE. Her longtime interest in and dedication to social

justice also informs her thinking about her work in DLBE. She was not available for the focus group interview on April 12, 2021 but participated in a lengthy individual interview on July 11, 2021.

Amee is a DLBE educator and librarian whose duties include providing library services in a DLBE setting. Amee is quiet and extremely reflective and had quite a bit she wanted to share during the individual interview. She has several decades of experience working in library settings and worked in monolingual English settings before coming to her current position several years ago. She grew up in the U.S. and speaking English, having been adopted from abroad. Her experiences feeling like a "third culture kid" as well as her international travels inform her thinking about her work in DLBE. Her longtime interest in improving representation of non-dominant identities in library books also informs her thinking about her work in DLBE. In addition, experiences she has had with colleagues in her current DLBE program have also made an impact on her and inform her thinking about her work. She participated in the focus group interview on April 12, 2021, and an individual interview on June 14, 2021.

Toni is a DLBE educator and speech and language pathologist whose duties include providing speech therapy services in a DLBE setting. Toni is quiet and is measured in her words, and often took time to consider her answers. She has over a decade of experience working in bilingual settings and worked in monolingual English settings before coming to her current position. In fact, she began doing bilingual speech therapy work in pre-kindergarten when doing such work was a relatively new endeavor in her district. She grew up in the U.S. and speaking English. She participated in the focus group interview on April 12, 2021, and an individual interview on June 8, 2021.

Esmeralda is a DLBE educator whose duties include teaching in a lower elementary position. Esmeralda is open and engaging and seems most focused on the practical. She grew up in a South American country and speaking Spanish, before coming to the U.S. as a teenager and learning English. She has several years' experience working in her DLBE current program, as well as several more years' experience working in traditional programs in the same district. That prior experience with the other DLBE program was instructive for her, in the sense that it taught her a lot about what she now believes DLBE should not be. That experience has clearly informed her thinking about her work in her current position. International travel, including a stint working in a South American country, also made an impact on her and informed her thinking about her work. In addition, interactions she has had with colleagues in her current DLBE program have also made an impact on her and inform her thinking about her work. She participated in the focus group interview on April 12, 2021, and an individual interview on July 14, 2021.

Brandy is a DLBE educator whose duties include teaching upper and lower elementary students in small group settings. Brandy is talkative and energetic and had a lot she wanted to share in the interviews. She grew up in the U.S. and speaking English and identifies as monolingual. She has several years' experience working in her DLBE current program, in several capacities, as well as about a decade of experience working in a previous traditional monolingual program in another town in the same state. That prior experience in the previous town was instructive for her, in the sense that she observed examples of how she believes public education should not be. That experience has clearly informed her thinking about her work in her current DLBE position. In addition, experiences she has had with colleagues in her current DLBE program have also made an impact on her and inform her thinking about her work. She

participated in the focus group interview on April 12, 2021, and an individual interview on June 4, 2021.

Lara is a DLBE educator whose duties include coaching and teaching upper and lower elementary students in small group settings. Lara, like a number of her co-participants, is talkative and passionate, and had a lot to share. She grew up partially in the U.S. and speaking English, but also spent significant time during her childhood attending school in a Spanish speaking country. She has several decades of experience working in bilingual settings and in several capacities, including as a principal. She worked in a transitional bilingual program in a big city in another state and has worked in her current program for about a decade. That prior experience in the previous program and city was instructive for her, in the sense that she observed examples of how she believes bilingual education should not be. That experience has clearly informed her thinking about her work in her current DLBE position, as does her religious faith. In addition, experiences studying and living in Spanish speaking regions, raising a family with a spouse from South America, and interactions with colleagues in her current DLBE program have also made an impact on her and inform her thinking about her work. She participated in the focus group interview on April 12, 2021, and an individual interview on June 9, 2021.

In this section, I have described the more specific two DLBE sites from which participants were recruited, La Escuela Midwest and La Escuela Southeast. I have elaborated on what makes them unique from the average U.S. school, and yet similar to each other. I have given context that frames my realization that those who work in DLBE [could] do more than teach academics in students' first and second (or additional) languages. In the next section, I

address the particulars of participants, the participant selection process, data collection, and other aspects of this study's methodology.

Data Collection

In this section, I describe the data collection tools, procedures, and analysis and show why they are appropriate for my study. Data collection included in depth ethnographic interviews and document analysis, using open coding for analysis.

Focus Group Interview

In depth ethnographic interviews with participants allowed me to understand participants' biography and perspectives. First, I conducted a focus group interview with all participants but one present. That participant had been unavailable at the time. Second, I conducted follow up individual interviews with each participant. All interviews were conducted and recorded by Zoom. The infectiousness of Covid made the physical separation between myself and participants a necessity and precluded in-person interviews at both sites. The use of videoconferencing technology made it less burdensome for participants to share their thoughts with me, given the busy and tight professional and personal schedules of the majority, many of whom are parents and some of whom may be students at night. Zoom, specifically, was an appropriate tool as many educators are familiar with its use and functions, making it less intimidating and burdensome for participants to use. I provided written questions to participants at least one week prior to the interviews. This allowed participants to consider the questions, then articulate and reflect on their answers before providing me with oral responses. Participants were instructed to turn off the video function, which protected participants' privacy.

My first source of data stemmed from the focus group interview. I chose this starting point for several reasons. Although groupthink in a group interview is a potential factor, so is the

reassurance of peer presence and the possibility of stimulation of recall (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Interviewees may feel more comfortable in an interview session with me if they are among a peer group (Cukor Avila & Bailey, 2001). In addition, I considered that I may have a better chance of securing interviews with busy adults - many of whom are parents - if there is a group meeting where collegiality and companionship awaited them. I considered that they may look forward to sharing thoughts with colleagues of similar values and appreciate being asked for their professional input and hearing others' answers. Finally, I considered that participants may appreciate being brought together safely (via videoconference) during the height of lockdown and social distancing, potential isolation and loneliness. I also considered that follow up, individual interviews would provide a private venue to explore either notions that arose in the initial session or issues that did not arise because of privacy concerns. I considered that having one of each type of interview was the best approach.

Participants had indicated to me what times and days they could make themselves available for the initial, focus group interview, and I found a slot that all had in common except the participant who had been unavailable at the time. I sent participants an invitation to the Zoom meeting and requested that they share a pseudonym with me if they had not done so already. Several asked me to assign them one, and I used a random name generating website to create the few missing pseudonyms necessary. Then I shared those pseudonyms with the corresponding participants so they would know what screen name to use. When we met on Zoom, I first double checked that identifying imagery was removed, and that the screen name reflected the chosen or assigned pseudonym. In some cases, participants had forgotten this step and needed to correct their screen name or remove their imagery. Once this was done, I let participants know that I was turning on the Zoom recording feature. Then I again briefly outlined the topic of the study,

67

reminded them of the written questions they received prior, and shared with the participants an order of response so that the responses to questions could go more smoothly in spite of the lack of visual cues. This order was inverted around the middle of the interview.

Individual Interviews

My second source of data stemmed from data collected during individual, semi structured interviews with participants. Participants had selected the day and time of their follow up interviews, and I emailed them each a corresponding Zoom link invitation. When we met on Zoom, I first double checked that identifying imagery was removed, and that the screen name reflected the chosen pseudonym. In some cases, participants had forgotten this step. Then, I let participants know I was turning on the Zoom recording feature. Then I again briefly outlined the topic of the study, reminded them of the written questions they received prior, and in some cases double-checked personal descriptive information. Then I shared a simple and an in-depth definition of critical consciousness in order to guide the conversation; I had not shared such a definition in the focus group interview. As we spoke, I used participants' previously chosen or assigned pseudonyms, and referred to a transcript of the focus group interview and the material that I had requested from participants in the weeks prior - if they had sent me anything. (About half did send me a document of some kind, and about half did not.) I had pre-selected passages from the transcript that contained ideas I hoped participants would elaborate on, or notions I felt needed clarification. This had the benefit of allowing me to prompt reflection based on their own thoughts and provide a tool for me to jog participants' memory for a thicker response. Then I interviewed each participant using the protocol and recorded responses and any ensuing discussion using the Zoom recording feature. Prior to beginning recording, I reminded participants to turn off the video function, in the few cases when they forgot. I later transcribed

all audio from these recordings for analysis, including both words and expressive sounds such as "ugh" and "ahhhhh!" Data from recordings and transcripts were stored in my university One Drive and personal Google Drive respectively, and manipulated on my personal laptop, all of which are password protected. The raw data was, therefore, not accessible to any individual but myself and thereby participant confidentiality has thus been protected.

The interview protocol was guided by interview questions I had prepared and shared via email in advance of the first interview. (See Appendix A for the protocol). In all cases, "educator" means credentialed staff who teach or support student learning in a DLBE setting. Participants may have varying official titles, from "teacher" to "resource specialist" to "social worker" to "librarian" to "speech language pathologist", but here they are all included under "educator". In all cases, my questions were aimed at understanding their work in relation to a subset of culturally and linguistically diverse students often called emergent bilinguals and sometimes by other historic and common educational terms. The questions are:

1. How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?

2. How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in that DLBE setting?

3. How do DLBE educators acquire their understanding regarding critical consciousness in a DLBE setting?

Document Analysis

I had intended to collect varying types of documents from each participant at the time of the interviews, for example contextual documents, instructional documents, and inspirational documents. I had requested that each individual consider and share such a document with me when I emailed them the interview questions. I had hoped that they might select meaningful

material that speaks to them and illustrates what they strive to accomplish as a teacher. I did not use the term as such, but my hope was that what they bring may illustrate their critical consciousness and that bringing these materials to the interview session would prompt authentic opportunities for rich discussion about practice and resources. This would not only allow me to collect richer data for my study, but also allowing participants to feel that they are getting something concretely useful from the session. However, only about half of participants shared a document or file of some sort with me. One shared a recording of a bilingual poem read by students and a file outlining a curricular unit of study, another shared a Spanish-language parent guide to providing basic speech therapy at home, and another shared a district created anthology of personal stories collected from a group of immigrant parents in the district which was used as a sort of staff book study or professional development. Another started to list and describe a number of books and websites that she found useful and meaningful to her work, but because she spoke about them at length in the interviews and I did not receive any one document in hand to analyze I decided to exclude this potential set of artifacts. In the case of other participants several said something to effect of "there are so many documents/books/possibilities that I'm not sure what to send you". In one case, a participant told me she felt that what she might share is the collective work of many people, and that she didn't feel certain about sharing it given that she didn't feel it was hers to share. In this way, the document collection did not turn out as I had imagined. In hindsight, I feel that my question was too vague and too all encompassing. Were I to repeat this research study in future, I would be more specific about what I was asking for, or eliminate this portion of the data collection altogether. As it turns out, participants seemed to have plenty they wanted to say even when they did not provide me with a document.

Data Analysis

In this section, I explain how I handled and analyzed the data collected. In addition, I show why these means are appropriate for my study. Data collected were analyzed through open coding taking place in several rounds. Data was first coded within each individual data source. Then it was cross compared-coded within each category: focus group interview, individual interviews, and documents. Subsequently, the data was cross compared between categories.

Analysis of Focus Group Interview Data

The interview responses were audio recorded using Zoom, which I then transcribed by hand, listening to a portion of recording and typing, listening to the next portion and typing, and so on. Transcribed interview data was saved in my Google account as a Google document. I checked the accuracy of transcripts by reading them multiple times while comparing them to the Zoom audio recordings to check transcript reliability (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002). Document and interview data were coded, or "themed" (Saldaña, 2013). I began by combing through and highlighting thematically important sections of text, then writing a preliminary code (Layder, 1998) that matched the text. Then I went through again and bolded the most key portions of the text and began writing themes in an appendix of each transcript. I reviewed my initial analysis a second time, reflected on it, and either collapsed similar categories, identified new categories, or renamed existing categories for more clarity. This process was an ongoing process (Saldaña, 2013) as data was collected. I considered how data may develop into categories, after reflecting on what I heard and read during data collection. I approached coding as a hunt for words or phrases that can be seen as emerging categories or "families" (Saldaña, 2009, p. 3). This is how I came up with the themes by which data is organized in Chapter IV.

Later, I reviewed the sets of data with each research question in mind, searching for ways that the data may lend insight into each. This is how data was organized in Chapter V.

These are also appropriate methods for the analysis of qualitative data, as the themes and illustrative anecdotes that emerged aligned with the goal of collecting thick data, insight, and the human experience. The varying steps I took to verify information also assured accuracy and data reliability.

Analysis of Individual Interview Data

Analysis of the individual interview data went much like that of the focus group interview data. The interview responses were audio recorded using Zoom, which I then transcribed by hand, listening to a portion of recording and typing, listening to the next portion and typing, and so on. Transcribed interview data was saved in my Google account as a Google document. I checked the accuracy of transcripts by reading them multiple times while comparing them to the Zoom audio recordings to check transcript reliability (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002). Document and interview data were coded, or "themed" (Saldaña, 2013). I began by combing through and highlighting thematically important sections of text, then writing a preliminary code (Layder, 1998) that matched the text. Then I went through again and bolded the most key portions of the text and began writing themes in an appendix of each transcript. I reviewed my initial analysis a second time, reflected on it, and either collapsed similar categories, identified new categories, or renamed existing categories for more clarity. This process was an ongoing process (Saldaña, 2013) as data was collected. I considered how data may develop into categories, after reflecting on what I heard and read during data collection. I approached coding as a hunt for words or phrases that can be seen as emerging categories or "families" (Saldaña, 2009, p. 3). This is how I came up with the themes by which data is

organized in Chapter IV. Later, I reviewed the sets of data with each research question in mind, searching for ways that the data lent insight into each. This is how data was organized in Chapter V.

Analysis of Artifacts

I analyzed documents that teachers selected and shared with me electronically, which included unit outlines or plans, a recording of a student poem, and an anthology of parent narratives collected and printed as a book. First, I transcribed the student poem. I continued by combing through and highlighting thematically important sections of text, then writing a preliminary code (Layder, 1998) that matched the text. Then, I read, re-read, and initially coded, or "themed" (Saldaña, 2013), material within each category (unit plans, the poem, and the anthology). Then I went through again and bolded key portions of the text and began writing themes in an appendix of each transcript. I reviewed my initial analysis again, reflected on it, and collapsed similar categories, identified new categories, or renamed existing categories for more clarity. Then I compared categories across sources. This process was ongoing (Saldaña, 2013) as data was collected. These are appropriate methods for the analysis of qualitative data, as the themes and illustrative anecdotes that emerged aligned with the goal of collecting thick data, insight, and the human experience. The varying steps I took to verify information also assured accuracy and data reliability.

Analysis Across Modes of Data

After analyzing sources within each mode of data, I compared the codes and categories across the modes of data. I compiled a list of categories from all data sources, and then began to collapse and combine those that were alike. In the end, I was left with 8 thematic categories.

Trustworthiness/Positionality

In this section, I address questions of trustworthiness as well as my own positionality. I show how I engaged in ethical research and how I assured safety of participants' data. Central to trustworthiness is recognizing and acknowledging one's positionality. I recognize the challenge and potential danger in being a white, female, middle class, adult, and researcher who is also a current staff member at one of the research sites. The intersection of my identities can represent potential for abuse when collecting and analyzing data from participants who are current or former colleagues and participants with a wide array of life experiences that may have led them to have experiences and perspectives very different from mine.

In addition, as an insider I have both greater potential for a better understanding of participants' context while I also have greater potential for overreach and blurring boundaries. In some cases, I teach, or taught, their children in one context or another. In some cases, I work or worked in their classrooms with students that we share or shared at varying times of day. In some cases, I have been their instructor as they pursued bilingual certification and a master's degree in bilingual education. The potential for undue influence, and whether I was doing all I can to counter it, was constantly present in my mind as I conducted research. It is my challenge as a teacher-researcher and participant-observer in the school where I work and also where I collected data (Brewer, 2000) to collect data without causing change in responses and therefore impacting subsequent data, interpretations, and insights. I feel reasonably confident that participants felt at ease with me based on their affect during the interviews and how much they spoke. I also noted that all participants knew me personally; none of those whom I had emailed with the recruitment email and who did not know me even responded to that email. I suspect that had I not had personal connections to both sites, I might not have secured any participants at all.

Member checking through clarification of statements made during the focus group interview, collection of data through multiple avenues, and underlying intent is another element of trustworthiness. I acknowledge that an interview is not a neutral tool guaranteed to collect "the truth" and that any interview is likely to be "influenced by the personal characteristics of the interviewer, including race, class, ethnicity, and gender" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 643). I aimed to use a feminist interview approach, such that the interview felt like a conversation of important issues, and that the interviewees felt like they were being carried out between equals (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In addition, I checked data collected in the focus group interview by asking for clarification and elaboration about what I had transcribed from participants during the individual interviews. With this research, I intended to draw out and channel interviewees' voices into my final writings, such that their stories and counterstories about the intersections of language, identity, education and social justice become accessible to an audience of interested educators and ethnographic case study researchers. For this reason, I share extensive quotes in Chapter IV. I hope I have been successful in amplifying the stories and counterstories. Finally, confidentiality is key to trustworthiness. Throughout all interviews and transcriptions, I have maintained the use of pseudonyms for all participants, which were of their own choosing except in the cases in which participants asked me to assign them one. I detailed the way I stored data for safekeeping in the previous section.

Limitations

Being a case study means that it is not possible to generalize the results of the study. However, it can still be extremely meaningful to stakeholders in DLBE programming, especially to educators who are either currently practicing or preparing for practice in such a setting. It is

also possible to inform educators of preservice teachers who are pursuing work in DLBE settings and with students labeled as emergent bilingual.

Conclusion

In this section, I have laid out my research questions and their relevance. My question centers on critical consciousness and how it shows up in DLBE teachers' work. Such a topic is both relevant, as the literature has shown, and my rationale and approach to that topic fill a void in the research. Taken together, this makes my study relevant and appropriate. The context of the study, my plan for data collection, my criteria for sampling were doable in the circumstances I found myself at the time I was conducting research, and thus were reasonable. I have shown that document analysis and interview data are appropriate tools to collect data for this qualitative study, given the geographic and personal circumstances of participants. I have also shown that collection via electronic means, such as Zoom, is appropriate for the limitations of the participants and given the specter of the pandemic. Finally, I have shown that the participants' time, anonymity, and interest has been protected in exchange for providing their insight and information for this study. I also acknowledged my own positionality and its role in my research, extending the ethical nature of this work. My study was therefore appropriate, feasible, and ethical. Together, these tools and process have provided the thick data I sought, and lead to meaningful findings and insight into the question of how DLBE educators teach for critical consciousness

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter I present findings from my study. As a reminder, the purpose of this study has been to gain insight into how DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual or by other related terms. Several broad questions guided my ethnographic investigation. They are as follows:

1. How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?

2. How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in that DLBE setting?

3. How do DLBE educators acquire their understanding regarding critical consciousness in a DLBE setting?

The data that form the basis of this study stem from three sources: a focus group interview, individual interviews, and artifacts. In subsequent sections of this chapter, I first talk about the experience of conducting focus groups. Then I talk about the experience of conducting individual interviews. Then I discuss the collection of artifacts. Then the rest of the chapter is organized primarily by eight themes. I organize the discussion of the data into subsections dedicated to those themes, in the same order they are listed. Finally, I conclude the chapter by highlighting ways that themes converge, diverge, and meaning to be gleaned from those relationships.

For the first interview, participants and I met by Zoom on a late spring day after work hours. We gathered, virtually, at a time when both schools' communities were just emerging from close to a year of virtual schooling brought on by the Covid pandemic. The pandemic, and its impact on schools and communities, had brought up intense questions, emotions, and needs for many educators, parents, and other community members. I was grateful that those who committed their time that day did so, because no doubt that energy and enthusiasm for Zoom was in short supply.

At that meeting, participants logged in to my Zoom room using their pre-agreed pseudonyms, having removed their Zoom images, and using only the audio function so that we could not see each other and the recording would not register their image. (I remindED one participant to change her screen name and another to remove her imagery.) The exception was Ana, who was not present that day because she was unavailable at the time but was able to make herself available for the individual interview at a later date. I welcomed participants and went over a few logistics, such as how we would know whose turn it was to speak and whatnot. I explained that they would answer the interview questions in a random order that was inverted for approximately the second half of the interview. The questions I asked were the same ones I had sent them ahead of time in an email, so they had had time to consider their answers prior to hearing them during the Zoom. I gave participants the time to speak as much as they felt necessary to answer each question, cutting nobody off. Nonetheless, some participants said more, and some said less. The interview, start to finish, took about an hour and 45 minutes, and unsurprisingly two participants (Brandy and Toni) were not able to stay until the complete cycle of questions were complete. (The questions can be found in Appendix A.)

For the second interview, I met with each participant individually on Zoom. After I had

transcribed the first interview, and a time and date of their choosing. In most cases, the school

year had just ended, and I was again grateful that they gave me yet more of their time and

energy. Just as with the first interview, participants logged in using their pseudonym, having

removed their Zoom imagery, and using only the audio function so that we could not see each

other and the recording would not register their image. After welcoming the participant, I began

the second interview by reading aloud two definitions of critical consciousness such that

participants and I could have a discussion knowing that we were talking about the same concept.

One definition of critical consciousness shared with participants was more complex and detailed.

It was as follows:

> Three components are theorized to comprise critical consciousness: (1) critical reflection,
>
> which refers to youths' critical analysis of current social realities and recognition of how
>
> social, economic, and political conditions limit access to opportunity and perpetuate
>
> systemic injustices; (2) sociopolitical efficacy, which encompasses the perceived ability
>
> to act to change these conditions; and (3) critical action, which is the extent to which
>
> individuals actually participate in individual or collective action (Diemer & Blustein
>
> 2006; Diemer, Kauffman, Koenig, Trahan, & Hsieh, 2006; Diemer, McWhirter, Ozer, &
>
> Rapa, 2015; Watts et al., 1999). (p. 19, Godfrey & Burson, 2018)

The second definition of critical consciousness that I shared at the outset of the second

interview was more straightforward and came from Paolo Freire: "[Critical consciousness

means] learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions and to take action

against the oppressive elements of reality" (Freire, 1974, p. 4).

Again I gave each participant as much time to speak as they felt necessary to answer each question, and again the length of their answers varied. However, I noticed that a few participants answered more at length in the second interview than in the first. This could have been due to not feeling the time pressure of the expectations turn taking, or it could have been due to differing comfort levels when speaking a group versus individually. In addition to the questions listed in Appendix A, I asked additional questions to clarify statements participants had made in the first interview.

In part because of the clarifying questions I asked about the first interview, participants' answers varied widely in the second interview, and as a result the second interview took on the tone of a conversation. Because answers varied so widely, the length of the second interviews also varied widely, from an hour to two and a half hours. In addition, the conversational nature of the interview and the answers to my clarifying questions meant that I did not always ask the protocol questions in the exact order, or with the same wording, as planned. Sometimes participants had already answered an upcoming question by their response to a prior question, or a question became a moot point in the course of their responses. In some cases, certain questions were not asked at all because their time available to dedicate to more interview times was running short.

In preparation for the first interview, I sent participants not only the list of interview questions but also the request to bring an artifact: something, anything that they might be proud of, that might represent what they aim for in their work, is representative of their work, or is emblematic of their or a student's best work. I asked participants to speak about their artifacts during the first interview, and as it turns out none had brought something although most had something in mind that they said they would send me later. Brandy mailed to me an anthology of

some of her students' parents' stories which were printed in Spanish and dealt with the immigration experiences that these parents had lived through. She and some of her colleagues had read the anthology as a form of professional development after it was printed. Lara electronically shared several curriculum files that stemmed from her work as a coach, and about which she spoke at length in the second interview. She also electronically shared a recording of a mosaic of student voices reading a bilingual poem for her school graduation ceremony. Students had clearly written the poetry themselves. Toni electronically shared a Spanish and English language speech therapy guide for parents that she provided in order to encourage and empower them to provide additional, at-home therapy themselves. Amee suggested several books that she found achieved the representation she felt children's books should aspire to, and a website, and considered aloud sending me a list of such materials. I may have misunderstood that intention because such a list did not materialize. Nevertheless, since she spoke at length about the materials she mentioned in the interview. In the end I did not conduct document analysis on artifacts from Amee and felt her point about these materials came across clearly in her commentary. Other participants did not share or send me an artifact, in part because they saw sharing a whole folder of curriculum files or presentations as too much, did not feel they could narrow down the material to one thing, or felt uncertain about sharing what they felt were jointly created materials that did not belong to them entirely. It may also be that some participants could not choose between what they saw as myriad meaningful, emblematic artifacts, or perhaps forgot to. My instructions may also have been too vague and general to be helpful.

  Once I had transcribed all of the individual interviews and collected participants' artifacts, I began to analyze the data. I used open coding to analyze by participant and by data source. I began by reading and re-reading the transcript and highlighting sections that struck me

as containing key insights and/or answering the research questions I had hoped to answer through this study. After highlighting, I re-read those sections and selected especially striking or concise phrases to change into bold font. Then I began to write codes that emerged from the noted sections of text. However, writing codes quickly turned into writing themes and so I abandoned codes before having written codes for each participant. It occurred organically: I changed codes into themes by expanding the phrases by which I named code categories into complete sentences. I wrote themes for each data source and participants. Then, when analyzing across data sources and across participants, I noticed repetition and similarity in numerous theme "families". Therefore, from an initial 189 theme statements, I collapsed the numerous categories of similar nature together until I finally had 8 themes. These themes are listed below in the order they appear in each subsequent subsection:

Humility and a Growth Mindset Are Key Assets

Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key

Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness

DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition

Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price

Standardized Testing Constrains Critical Consciousness

A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough

Being Bilingual or Latinx Is Not Synonymous with Critical Consciousness

Initial Findings

In the following subsection, I lay out analysis of the data and initial findings divided by thematic category. Each theme is elaborated and supporting data laid out. Importantly, I selected and included lengthy quotes in the spirit of preserving and amplifying participant voices. I also

attempted to order the subsections in terms of importance, from important to most important, although this endeavor was extremely difficult to try to determine importance because of the interwoven nature of the ideas and practices participants described. I am not entirely sure I landed on the best order.

Humility and a Growth Mindset Are Key Assets

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that a key element in their work is humility and a willingness and interest to grow, learn, and be vulnerable as well as being exposed in doing so. Sometimes participants discuss this humility, learning, growth, and/or vulnerability as something they experience in the presence of colleagues, sometimes with students, and sometimes both. Sometimes participants discuss it as an inner vulnerability that comes from questioning oneself and allowing doubt about pedagogy or assumptions to creep in. The thread that ties the following participants' comments together is the willingness to engage with the moments and materials that are humbling to them, that make them learn and grow (sometimes uncomfortably.) These are not participants who expect to fulfill the stereotype of the old-time teacher was the omnipotent, omniscient expert who filled others' brains with golden wisdom. Every participant in this study made comments that show they are ready and willing to tackle discomfort, change, and grow. As mentioned in Chapter II, critical pedagogy is "fundamentally committed to the development and evolvement of a culture of schooling that supports the empowerment of culturally marginalized and economically disenfranchised students" and "seeks to help transform those class structures and practices that perpetuate undemocratic life" (Darder, 2003, p. 11). Taken in light of Darder's writing, these participants can be seen as critical pedagogues enacting critical consciousness by their persistence and openness. Furthermore, participants' comments also reflect the scholarship

discussed in Chapter II on the heavy sociopolitical and socioemotional baggage in bilingual classrooms (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Fitts, 2009; Flores & Clark, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Guerrero et al., 2017; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer et al., 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Valdez et al., 2016).

Brandy, who described herself as monolingual, embraced the significant discomfort, vulnerability, and learning that came along with accepting a position in a DLBE program. She, like other participants, embodies Darder's (2003) describes critical pedagogy as "fundamentally committed to the development and evolvement of a culture of schooling that supports the empowerment of culturally marginalized and economically disenfranchised students". She said:

> …the big catalyst for change is bringing humanity to any topic right? You can…teach about things all that you want to but when I came to [this} school…instead of being the…majority I am the one with the deficiency because everyone around me is bilingual and I am not and I'm going home with a headache every day because I'm the one who doesn't know what people are saying that just by itself was a learning experience [and] I got invited to spend time with my co-workers and uncovered all sorts of things that I didn't know that I thought about the Spanish-speaking culture and I learned a lot about Spanish-speaking culture by spending a lot of time with my Spanish-speaking coworkers and listening to my students and a lot of that is on the job and like literally just with people I work with and…it's not always comfortable!

Brandy's recollections reveal how she experienced the humbling feeling of being the minority for the first time in her DLBE setting, and the ways that being in a minority position can be disorienting, exhausting, and painful. The fact that she persists in this socially very

challenging position, and embraces it instead of fleeing from it, speaks to the ways she embodies

Darder's (2003) qualities of a critical pedagogue who seeks to empower culturally marginalized

students, even, you might say, at her own expense. She could have sought out an easier teaching

position than the DLBE position she holds, yet she is committed. Brandy further noted that some

of her discomfort and vulnerability stems from her experience that at least part of what she

needed to learn was not available to her in traditional sources such as books and articles. Instead

of being able to reassure herself by spending a weekend reading a book or article to shore up her

knowledge and fill in her gaps, she found she had to be patient and wait for particular

interactions to learn what she needed to learn. She found she needed to persist throughout many

opportunities to fumble and stumble. Brandy said:

> It's ..."spend time with people"…I mean you can read all of the books and magazine
>
> articles that you want to and sit in all the meetings that you want…going to Hispanic
>
> heritage night at school…eating empanadas with parents that made them…doing this
>
> book study…one of the writers of the book attend[ed] a session and talk[ed] about her
>
> immigration story during which she was separated from her four-year-old daughter for
>
> weeks and didn't know where she was. Those aren't feel-good stories and you don't hear
>
> them unless you seek them out kind of or just to take the opportunity to hear them when
>
> it's presented to you to learn something…it's just been a matter of stepping outside of
>
> your comfort zone and your box and when you're invited over on Friday night, you go!
>
> …I don't feel like it's something that you can do without some kind of training. Like we
>
> can't just have a staff meeting in the beginning of the year and be like, "Hey guys, guess
>
> what, this year we're all going to be more critically conscious! Super, have a nice day"…
>
> it doesn't work like that...you can't just like wake up and decide that your school is gonna

value…its most fragile learners and decide to go do it, because most people think they're

doing it and they are just not doing it…I learn something every day that I'm like oh my

god you really suck as a human, how could you not know this? But you just don't know

what you don't know.

Brandy found that, as a monolingual educator, she was suddenly a minority when she

joined her DLBE school. In addition to language, she had much to learn about the community

and enacting critical consciousness. An experienced teacher, she found herself nonetheless in a

position of not knowing instead of knowing - and her comments suggest she embraces such

experiences as part and parcel of being a critical DLBE educator. In this way, her experience

reflects prior research (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008) that teachers do recognize that they

are not serving certain marginalized groups of students well with their current set of skills and

that they indeed wish to correct this gap in their knowledge. Brandy's comments are evidence of

the need of a critical DLBE educator to accept humbling, uncomfortable, vulnerable experiences

as paths to learning and growth. The humility and willingness to persist through uncomfortable,

vulnerable experiences is a hallmark of a critical DLBE educator. Her awareness of her

perceived as a deficit and her desire to improve both reflect prior research (O'Neal, Ringler, &

Rodriguez, 2008) and can also be seen as a critical strength and as an echo of Darder's (2003)

description of what it means to enact critical pedagogy. Her comments also reflect the awareness

of heavy sociopolitical and socioemotional baggage in bilingual classrooms that many other

scholars have previously noted (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Fitts, 2009;

Flores & Clark, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Guerrero et al., 2017; Heiman, 2017;

Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer et al., 2019; Ramirez &

Faltis, 2020; Valdez et al., 2016).

Similarly, Amee's comments are evidence of the need a critical DLBE educator has to accept humbling learning moments. This is especially true for DLBE educators who don't speak the partner language, like Brandy and Amee. While Amee is not monolingual, she does not speak Spanish and thus finds herself consistently working through moments of discomfort in her position in a Spanish-English DLBE program. Amee said (upper case indicates her emphasis):

> I'm not wholly fluent in Spanish and I'm aware of that every single day. I'm at a good level for reading in elementary school books…more complex than that would be difficult for me and I am AWARE that that is a liability, that hampers me every day. I TRULY wish we had a fully fluent librarian, and own voices librarian...and…I believe they looked for a long time…and just weren't getting [one] and…I think it might happen but it can't happen soon enough.

Amee's comments show she experiences regular humbling moments and understands what she sees as her deficits as a DLBE educator. And yet, her recognition of areas in which she could grow and her willingness to discuss them shows her critical stance, which in turn is a key asset to a DLBE program. Such humility and willingness to persist through uncomfortable, vulnerable experiences is a hallmark of a critical DLBE educator. Her awareness of what she perceives as a deficit both reflects prior research that educators of marginalized students know about and want to fill their knowledge gaps (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008) and simultaneously can be seen as a critical strength and as an echo of Darder's (2003) description of what it means to enact critical pedagogy. In addition, Amee's comments about the need for own voices librarians and staff who can speak the minoritized language proficiently reflect an awareness of heavy sociopolitical and socioemotional baggage in bilingual settings that prior scholarship has previously explored (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., & Choi,

2017; Guerrero et al., 2017; Fitts, 2009; Flores & Clark, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer, et al., 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Valdez et al., 2016).

Similarly, Dannie recounted experiences of humility, vulnerability, and discomfort and she learns and grows as a critical DLBE educator. In contrast to Brandy and Amee, however, her humility, vulnerability, and discomfort in growth stemmed not from her own language abilities but from an uncertainty in dealing with the direction of critical student conversation that she had initiated but then became uncomfortable with and uncertain about how to respond to some students' expressions. She recalls:

> …one time some students, we were talking about...people giving things to homeless people...this was during morning meetings, during like one of those books we read and we're [supposed to be] building empathy but somehow we were talking about giving things to homeless people and several of the students start…to say like "oh, well they might use it to buy drugs or use it to buy unhealthy food so you shouldn't give things to homeless people" and I didn't know how to interrupt but I wanted to redirect that and so I said "Well, guys, I'm not totally comfortable with that I'm not exactly sure why, I'm not sure, but like I want to talk about it about it again tomorrow so let's table this conversation...and then I got off work and I called these colleagues and I said "what should I do?" right?, and like talked through with them a strategy to like, interrupt that thinking and…help build a different kind of consciousness around that issue…

Dannie elaborated that she felt that "what I'm really saying to them is like oh, I'm a human and oh, these things are complicated and I don't have all the answers". This aligns with the notion that having generous helpings of humility and a growth mindset are key to teaching

88

marginalized students (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008) and also to critical consciousness in DLBE. Her comments also align with the Freirean (1968) notion of a teacher not being the absolute expert and master of knowledge, but a facilitator, a co-learner, a "teacher-student" who learns and changes as they spend time with the "student-teachers". Dannie's next comment extends this notion of the teacher as a co-learner instead of the knower of all. She said:

> …the conversations that adults had around how to define this word ["colonizer"] is an example of critical consciousness among adults that then also makes a curriculum critically conscious…because we also had a long conversation in which we all had to Google...cuz…this text I saw said American Indian but I thought that that was not a word we were supposed to use so then we researched it and then we came back to the kids and we told them "okay guys, we're not sure if this is a word we should or shouldn't use, so just to be safe we're going to use indigenous or Native American, however …", and then this is where that identity work comes in because we've been doing our social emotional curriculum all year, we said "Remember the beginning of the year when we talked about who gets to define your identity?" and they were like "you do!" and we were like "right, so the best way to find out is just to ask them what they want to be called", and we told them, or at least I did, and I listed the other teachers, "we were Googling it and some people say that they are offended by American Indian and some people say they are, so this is what, these are what, we just wanted you to, to see all these words, and then the kids were using indigenous because it's a cognate and they like that one best, um, but, anyway, I don't know if that answers your question…the adults in the room know that language is important, the adults in the room want to write a curriculum that is critically conscious and the adults in the room are willing to spend the time to like admit they don't

know and learn and then present that back to the children, transparently. And I feel like

that's what critically conscious curriculum development looks like or should look like.

Dannie's comments highlight the importance of humility, and a willingness to let

students observe the thinking and moments of critical reflection in order to enhance the level of

critical consciousness of the DLBE curriculum. Dannie also reflected on a missed opportunity,

and embraced the discomfort as a path to learning:

…we had some students in that group, on that team that year who identified as

Indigenous, like indigenous Mexican or indigenous Central American, and we had

thought about like bringing in that connection but because we were full virtual and we

weren't sure how the parents actually felt and we didn't have a good way to get those kids

in an affinity space, to like see like where their own sense of self was before we like

brought in that topic, I don't think we were as able to tap into that as we would have liked

to...Because we were only teaching half an hour a day, 4 days a week online…And so I

do think we didn't do a good job of letting some students who…identified as indigenous

…connect to that identity. So I feel like that was a failing of this particular year in this

particular curriculum.

Dannie can admit to herself, her colleagues, and her students that she experiences

moments and opportunities she wished she could have done differently. This willingness to be

humble, vulnerable, and examine herself and her work suggests the critical stance that is key to a

DLBE program. Dannie embraces moments of humility, discomfort, vulnerability, in both the

presence of students and colleagues, and as a result grows as a critical DLBE educator. While the

details of these moments differ in some way from those of Brandy and Amee, because they are

not connected to Spanish language proficiency, they are connected because all three educators

reveal a similar willingness to live with humility, discomfort, vulnerability and learn from it when they could likely have sought out positions and work that was easier, more comfortable, and less discomfiting than their current position. Dannie's comments align with Darder's (2003) description of what it means to enact critical pedagogy. They also reflect research that suggests educators of "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013) students are aware of their knowledge gaps and also want to fill those gaps (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008). They also reflect the awareness of heavy sociopolitical and socioemotional baggage in bilingual classrooms that many other scholars have previously noted (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Fitts, 2009; Flores & Clark, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Guerrero et al., 2017; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer et al., 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Valdez et al., 2016).

Similarly, Esmeralda's comments suggest she also embraces moments of humility and discomfort, acknowledging that growth as part and parcel of the DLBE educator journey. However, in contrast to Brandy and Amee, her challenges do not arise from not speaking Spanish. Likewise, her experiences diverge from Dannie's in the sense that she finds the greatest opportunities for humility, discomfort, vulnerability in the myriad roles a DLBE educator must play and in the ever-changing curricular demands of teaching in a DLBE program for which, in her mind, no preservice program could totally prepare her. She said:

> …curriculum…changes throughout time so it does have to get updated…I feel like education is constantly evolving, is constantly changing and we need to change with it…you have to think outside the box ...try to think like a Mom and as a psychologist, there's a lot of that in teaching...you have to…wear many hats and… teaching is not something that you just read a book and you do...Like, you do need to go to school and

learn all the necessary things …but in reality I think it's the practice and experience that you have in the class that makes you who you are as a teacher and you learn that as you go so …I remember my first year I had no idea what I'm doing! I was like "what??" "They didn't teach me this!" "I didn't know I was supposed to do that", "I didn't know I was supposed to be that", "I didn't know I was supposed to face that"…

Esmeralda's comments reflect a willingness to engage with work that causes regular moments of doubt, the requirement to change and adapt, and to discuss those challenges openly. In this way her comments align with prior research that suggest teachers of emergent bilingual students are both aware of their knowledge gaps, and desirous to fill them (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008). In addition, where she might have decided to choose a position with a less challenging workload, instead she persists year to year in the face of constant change, vulnerability, and occasional discomfort. Esmeralda's comment suggests a critical DLBE educator stance, which is key for a critical DLBE program, and echoes Darder's (2003) description of what it means to enact critical pedagogy. On the other hand, her comments also reflected an honest appraisal of the dizzying and exhausting DLBE teacher experience made all the more challenging by unique sociopolitical and socioemotional baggage in bilingual classrooms.

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that a key element is humility, willingness to be vulnerable and uncomfortable, and interest to grow and learn. Sometimes this humility, learning, growth, and/or vulnerability is experienced in the presence of or through colleagues, sometimes students, and sometimes both. These teachers' comments align with prior research in the sense that they know they have much to learn in order to do right by their "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121)

92

students, and they want to learn it (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008). They also can be seen as fulfilling the call to be critical pedagogues, when one considers Darder's (2003) description of critical pedagogy as "fundamentally committed to the development and evolvement of a culture of schooling that supports the empowerment of culturally marginalized and economically disenfranchised students" and "seeks to help transform those class structures and practices that perpetuate undemocratic life" (p. 11). Taken in light of Darder's writing, these participants can be seen as critical pedagogues enacting critical consciousness by their persistence and openness. They could have chosen to leave their jobs or situations in order to avoid such feelings and experiences - but they instead not only continue in their positions but also highlight the same unforgettable experiences in their interviews. Participants' comments are tied together by the willingness to engage with the moments and materials that are humbling to them and that make them learn and grow (sometimes uncomfortably.)

Indeed there is much work for a critical pedagogue to do and to learn, and the comments of participants reflect the awareness of unique sociopolitical and socioemotional baggage in bilingual classrooms that was noted in Chapter II (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Fitts, 2009; Flores & Clark, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Guerrero et al., 2017; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Urrieta, 2019; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, 2010; Palmer et al., 2019; Ramirez & Faltis, 2020; Valdez et al., 2016).

Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element is collaboration, communication, and collegiality. Sometimes this interaction is with a team of colleagues, sometimes with one particularly motivating or supportive colleague, sometimes it is with peers in distant locations,

sometimes it is with students and community family, and sometimes a constellation of interactions with all such individuals. At times, these interactions are formally structured, as with team meetings, and at other times informal or spontaneous, as with social gatherings or unexpected or unplanned conversation. These DLBE educators could have chosen to refrain from any of the myriad interactions described, they could have chosen to plan instruction by themselves, or they could have decided to spend their time in ways other than talking with peers, community members, or colleagues in order to grow their critical consciousness. After all, there is more than enough extra work for DLBE educators to do (Amanti, 2019b). Instead of closing their classroom doors and working in isolation, however, participants sought out and spent the time and energy to engage in meaningful and transformative interactions that made them better critical DLBE educators. Participants' comments are tied together by the willingness to engage regularly and meaningfully with other people, in ways that make them learn and grow (sometimes uncomfortably) and by the belief that doing so makes them better critical DLBE educators.

Ana's comments in particular show the importance of creating teams to revise curriculum, instead of working in isolation. Her comments also highlight the importance of the support of an administrator in initiating and carrying on with meaningful teamwork. She describes the various ways that teamwork takes center stage in her work, not only because teamwork can reduce the invisible workload DLBE teachers face (Amanti, 2019b) but because of how such work promotes critical consciousness. She said:

> …our principal decided to get a group of teachers to start writing the new unit with the new standards, and the new standards include words like racism and discrimination and prejudice and, and gender…gender identity, and…she integrated me to help this team of

people as they write the units write them from a critical conscious lens and from an anti racist and from an equity lens as well. And so…that's gonna be one of the priorities this year, is that collaboration…I started this last year working directly with PLCs and helping them integrate that social emotional learning in the classrooms. So now I'm part of the coaches' team at [school]…because you cannot integrate socio emotional learning if you don't have a person that's an expert at that at the table, right? With the people that are coaching the teachers and the administrators and writing the curriculum.

Ana's comments reflect prior research that suggest humanizing education and critical consciousness is not only an individual but also a group endeavor (Salazar, 2013). I also see a connection to culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), of which one tenet is to promote a more fully democratic society. What more democratic activity than working together as a team to develop a program that is more fully critically conscious? Furthermore, given that the DLBE staff in Ana's school come from diverse backgrounds but that many are from Spanish speaking countries or "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) identities for which dialogue and cooperation are common norms, it makes sense that working as a group represents a culturally sustaining as well as culturally responsive (Gay, 2002) move for staff members themselves. As noted in Chapter II, research (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) suggests that attending to cultural relevance is key in successful, critical dual language literacy instruction and culturally relevant pedagogy (Alfaro et al., 2014) may be central to students' academic improvement in DLBE. Why not apply these concepts within staff, and not just with students?

Similarly, Dannie worked in a team and found she grew as a DLBE educator in doing so. In fact, she feels that it would be impossible to work fully for critical consciousness if not by

working as a team. This is not only because being a DLBE teacher is so much extra work (Amanti, 2019b) but rather for philosophical reasons. Dannie said:

> …I think yes...all lot of different adults at the table who…are all coming from…the same background foundation of like what is what are we wanting to do, right?…I said to my, the other fifth grade teacher who was writing the curriculum with me, "okay, I want to use the word colonizer and not settler" and…he said great…let's change the settler slide into a colonizer slide". And then…four of us who spent a very long time trying to define colonizer...we spent a long time trying to decide the vocabulary for the unit. And yes, I think that's a critical part of critical consciousness because…nobody can do it by themselves, you need…colleagues, you need structure to support you, and you need colleagues to support you so you're…all growing in the same direction…

Dannie's comments, like Ana's, reflect prior research that casts humanizing education and critical consciousness not only as an individual but a group endeavor (Salazar, 2013). As with Ana, I also see connections to culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), of which one tenet is to promote a more fully democratic society. What more democratic activity than working together as a team to develop a program that is more fully critically conscious? What more democratic activity than to debate with a team of coworkers the sociopolitical implications of certain terminology, find the terminology to be biased or outdated, and determine the best way forward? Furthermore, given that the DLBE staff in Dannie's school come from diverse backgrounds including from Spanish speaking countries or "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) identities for which dialogue and cooperation are common norms, it makes sense that working as a group represents a culturally sustaining as well as culturally responsive (Gay, 2002) move for staff members themselves. Furthermore, research (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell,

96

2017) suggests that attending to cultural relevance is key in DLBE literacy instruction and culturally relevant pedagogy (Alfaro et al., 2014) may be central to students' academic achievement in DLBE. It makes sense that staff live by the critical, democratic, culturally attentive practices they utilize with students.

I also find the notion of working in the same direction to be key. If critical DLBE colleagues were to work in isolation, not only would the workload be higher on each individual as is often the case for DLBE teachers (Amanti, 2019b), but it would be so much harder to assure that all were philosophically in sync or at least understood each other's varying curricular choices. Lara also found team work to be key. She said:

> … we just had an amazing discussion between the school counselor, the principal, the other coach and myself where we were coming up with the design for new curriculum for the social studies standards in [state]....in the past social studies was taught in the curriculum pretty much from a white male perspective and…we struggled…the counselor talked and I took what she said and…helped us to deliver the information to the teachers that are going to be writing the curriculum…our goal is to integrate the social emotional learning and…social justice curriculum that involves …hearing the different voices from the different groups and looking at the injustices and the oppressions that have happened with…and…thinking about actions because you know this is project-based learning that we're working towards and it makes me so excited because that's always what I felt like education should be about. It's like you reflect on your current reality...you build an internal sense of care and compassion for, you know, each other as human beings and then you see, well, wait a second that's not happening for everybody, what are we going to do about it, and then you act on that.

Lara's comments reflect prior research that casts humanizing education and critical consciousness not only as an individual but a group endeavor (Salazar, 2013). As with other participants, I see connections to culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), of which one tenet is to promote a more fully democratic society. What more democratic activity than working together as a team to develop a program that is more fully critically conscious? What more democratic activity than project-based education that promotes fully critically conscious? Furthermore, I see elements of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) in the cycle of reflection plus action cycle that Lara describes. Finally, given that both students and DLBE staff in Lara's school come from diverse backgrounds including from Spanish speaking countries or "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) identities for which dialogue and cooperation are common norms, it makes sense that working as a group or in project-based learning represents a culturally sustaining as well as culturally responsive (Gay, 2002) move for both students and staff members. Furthermore, research (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) suggests that attending to cultural relevance is key in DLBE literacy instruction and culturally relevant pedagogy (Alfaro et al., 2014) may be central to students' academic achievement in DLBE. It makes sense that staff live by the critical, democratic, culturally attentive practices they utilize with students.

For some, the "team" can mean a book club or other group, not just the immediate professional learning team. Toni said:

I think a major thing that's creating the space for learning together...I think we all have …very good intentions in regards to critical consciousness and wanting to...be intentional in our interactions and learn more about what that means and I feel like there's often times not... the time or space given to do that. In the last several years at my school there

has been dedicated time to, to look at what racism...in our state…has looked like over the last 50 years…systemic racism and oppression…devoting the time and space to do that as a group is really powerful…As opposed to like, just, reading a book on your own. For example, we had a book club... "Stamped from the Beginning", and we all read that …and then we'd have…meetings and discussions about it afterward. So I think...me doing it and isolation and then me doing it as part of a group where we have to discuss and hear other people's takeaways and like meld it all together I think is even...it's just much more powerful.

On the other hand, sometimes interactions that lead to meaningful growth and change can be on a smaller scale. Amee's comments suggest that even interactions with just one pivotal colleague can make a difference. Amee said:

I think that having the privilege to work with people who have that critical consciousness and who are determined to incorporate it in all aspects of their work. That's priceless. And I don't know how you get to be like [a respected colleague], but I want to be like her when I grow up...it's amazing, it's inspiring, it makes me want to do better from my end. It also makes me glad that I have this particular role and that I can help in that effort by saying "hey have you thought about this book, hey look at this great book that's come out"...we're not single units, we are way more effective when we work together …and…we don't know what we don't know and so it's better to talk to other people.

Lara also experienced the power of a relationship with a particular colleague, in addition to other with whom interactions made a difference in her trajectory as a critical DLBE educator. She said:

…definitely other teachers, oh my gosh, big time, other teachers. So working with one of the, one of the co-teachers that I had early on when I was at the other school, she and I got to go to Dual U together with the administrator and, um, she and I just like took off with it, we were on fire, you know, all the way 5 hours back from [city]. She has been a crucial part of, of how I've developed my understanding of, of biliteracy and dual language because she ended up becoming a consultant for them, so, she's helped a lot. Other teachers that I've watched, especially this year, I've been able to observe a lot more … So, really just talking with other teachers, going through professional development with them...talking to others, collaborating with others, talking with [you], and other people at the school…super smart people who, who have lots of really good ideas and...even came to my classroom and …showed some really great lessons.

Esmeralda also experienced the benefits of interaction with specific colleagues from whom she ended up learning and growing. Esmeralda said:

…I would say to… to advocate for going into other classrooms to see what other teachers are doing and ask "hey you know I really want to go see that teacher I want to see her teach this specific lesson". I think that's something that…helped a lot when I first arrived there because…I was coming from a monolingual school and it just looks very different…and it really, really helped…to see the reading lesson with different students of different levels… observing what other teachers are doing …teachers that have been there longer than you have…I think everything that we like to learn throughout the years comes from observing others…you're like I'm going to try what she did…but it's something that you're always learning and the more you observe and the more you see others the more you ask the more you go put yourself out there asking for feedback you

100

know can you come and observe me can you tell me what I'm doing well and what I'm not doing as well because that's what's going to make you good at what you're doing…

Toni also talked about the importance of peer observation and what might be termed mentor observation, underscoring the importance of such resources:

So much of my practice has changed from seeing what other people in my building are doing and how they are making change has impacted how I...teach as well...

I've learned so much and changed so much of my practice based on incredible colleagues...so much of what I've changed in my practice is directly related to what I see amazing teachers doing, amazing [instructional resource teachers].

DLBE educators interacting with each other can be powerful as we have seen from these comments. Having an administrator, not just an immediate peer, can also be key for a critical DLBE setting, as prior research (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020b) suggests. Ana said:

…we have a principal that has made it a priority to integrate this type of socio emotional learning, which is, it's the socio emotional learning umbrella that includes critical consciousness, includes culturally responsive teaching, and includes anti racism.

In addition, to people inside the school, people outside the school can provide beautiful moments and interactions to DLBE educators. Amee noted the importance of interactions with not only colleagues but people in the community. She said:

I had kind of a big epiphany last year…before our campus was closed…I realized that we can do so much more for our students when we are partnering across our school community and our town…including local vendors…when we all work together for a project and we had an American author…and our wonderful school counselor who helped facilitate a large district group of mostly Hispanic Latinx girls and another group

101

and African-American affinity group that's parent lead together to run a series of evening workshops paste around this author's work and racial identity and representation in all her picture books that culminated in getting to meet with the author and interview her…I think it was a meaningful project and it was just wonderful to me…and [I] realize[d] oh I really, really need to reach out more and not get…siloed …

Brandy recalled a previous teaching position she held, and compared it to her current setting, then noting that not only colleagues, but students, district staff members, and parents have contributed to her growth as a DLBE professional. She said:

…I was happy to get out of there for sure, a totally different political and educational [experience] there. No one there was ever going to say to me let's build curriculum together that center the voices of our Hispanic students [like in the current school]…Every person that I work with that comes from a different country has a different story, kids have stories and some of them are sad and a lot of them are triumphant, so but you don't get exposed to stories like that unless you're working with people who've experienced them so I'd say I've learned the most by interacting with humans that are different than me and then there have been attempts by the district you know they have some Equity department and…they've done some PD on culturally relevant practices and…I've worked with the equity advisory council, that's been volunteer work and the racial equity impact assessment, and again making friends with parents that don't look like me and talking to them.

For some, interacting with people not only outside the school but also outside the physical community brings about learning and growth as a critical DLBE educator. Ana also said:

102

Well, here's where I've done my share of learning...being part of the Teaching Tolerance

Advisory Board, and going down there every summer for the last 6 years, provided me

with immense opportunity to learn from other people who were doing the work…at a

high level, and at way higher levels than I am, and so being exposed to that for sure…as

I'm part of…a [State] Latinx Ed fellowship, I'm participating with a group of 15 other

leaders from around the state, we just took part in a retreat for two days, and I did

immense learning, immense learning, because when you're exposed to…surrounded by

people who are doing in depth work in critical consciousness, in community organizing,

in anti racism, in equity and social justice, and…when you spend time with those people

the conversation reach levels and depths that…it's just phenomenal. You don't enter

these spaces with superficial conversations…Because these people…these people are

leaders, you know? These people are creators, these people are innovators. So, when you

enter these spaces, particularly when I entered the Southern Poverty Law Center in

Alabama with Teaching Tolerance I was blown away by that, like, I did not expect to sit

for example at a table of people that it was almost like an encyclopedia of knowledge, uh,

organizing, and about critical consciousness, and you know anti racism and all that and

so…when you get the opportunity to bounce ideas of other people and bounce strategies

and bounce projects and bounce visions with people that have that type of depth, you

grow...There is also this other dynamic of courage and fierceness and risk taking that

these people bring to the table that you don't necessarily get exposed to when you're

doing your day to day job in your district and in your school. I mean these are people that

have risked, in many cases, their lives, to do what they do…and so when you hear those

stories, those stories help you kind of receive that affirmation...that I can take it to that

level too. That means I'm at this table so I'm capable of doing the same thing as that person. And so to this day I still have a core group of people, my good friends, that we constantly communicate to each other and these are people that are nationally renown in this work, and you know keep in touch with each other on a weekly basis, um and I continue growing through them. These are my encouragers, these are the people that, you know, that are there no matter what and that I can come to them with any issue, you know, of organizing or creating or thinking innovatively and…they are able to give me feedback. And so those, those are my mentors, and I suppose I serve as the same thing for them.

Ana's experience reflects the research of Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño (2019), who argue that "no one teacher can shift a school culture on their own, thus intentional, focused collaboration to support teachers' linguistically and culturally sustaining pedagogy will be critical for significant changes to occur" (p. 16).

While many participants noted the importance of various colleagues and peers in their critical DLBE work, the importance of collaborating with and integrating families into critical DLBE programming also arose. Brandy briefly touched on the role parents of her student had in her learning, and Dannie's comments highlight the important role families can play in a more critical DLBE program as a whole. She said:

> …before talking about systems of inequality, we should be building up a strong sense of their identity and like their sense of self, right?…in third [grade] we...had them write poems about their personal culture after they like learned about elements of culture…and then a couple years into that curriculum…we invited families to come and share and so that was really cool. Like a bunch of parents brought in like songs and art and food and

maps and…taught us about where they're from and…put it all on a map...building up their sense of identity through language arts instruction and social studies instruction…and…letting them bring like their whole self like linguistically and like culturally into the classroom and like elevating that and celebrating that.

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element in efforts to enact critical DLBE is the role of individuals who are not "just" the "teachers. In many cases, participants' comments highlighted the role of community members, students' family members, and non-classroom teacher staff members in meaningful and transformative interactions that characterize a more critical DLBE program. This reflects Salazar's (2013) argument that a humanizing, critical education is not only an individual but also a community endeavor. Participants' comments are tied together by the recognition that a more critical DLBE program is supported by myriad individuals not only within the school but without.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key*) does not find much footing with prior scholarship on culturally relevant pedagogy in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, there are intersections in the literature on culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and forms of bilingual education (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Alfaro et al., 2014; De La Trinidad, 2015; Freire, 2014; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Kabuto, 2017; Ortiz, 2009; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017). But the prior scholarship tends to focus on what teachers do or don't do for students, and how they do it. Participants' responses that fell under this theme focused on what they did with each other and other stakeholding adults. On the other hand, the data that gave rise to this theme (*Collaboration, Communication, And Collegiality are Key*) does find footing in prior scholarship on culturally responsive pedagogy in

DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, prior research (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020a) suggests that culturally responsive school leaders are key in creating a supportive experience for minoritized students in DLBE settings. In fact, DeMatthews & Izquierdo (2020a) link the implementation of such conditions to the pursuit of social justice in DLBE. The thread that connects prior scholarship and the data from this study is the need of a solid DLBE program for partners in "crime" beyond "just" the teaching staff.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key*) aligns with prior scholarship on culturally sustaining pedagogy in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, Paris (2012) writes that

> Culturally sustaining pedagogy...has as its explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers. That is, culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling. (p. 95)

Notice that Paris (2012) expands on the concept of that which might be understood strictly "cultural" to include the linguistic element. Notice also that while he does not say "culturally sustaining pedagogy requires more than just teachers to participate", he does note that students and teachers are all part of the project, and that the project is to bring about a more democratic society. This suggests that there is room to integrate the notion of family members, community members, and other stakeholder groups in the pluralistic and democratic project of critical DLBE programming. As Salazar (2013) notes, the pursuit of a humanizing, critical education is not only an individual but a great endeavor. Such a project at hand is best pursued by more than just individuals and individual teachers laboring alone in their classroom. It

106

requires the input of teams of individuals and of more than just teachers, in order to be most successful.

Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element of their experience is insufficient preparation in critical theory in their university coursework or credential program. Not a single participant stated that they felt their preparation for the DLBE role was sufficient in the areas of social justice, critical consciousness, etc. These DLBE educators all noted that they received their learning and growth around critical consciousness from sources other than their university preparation programs. Instead of coming to their positions ready to do critical work, instead they arrived unprepared and upon realizing this they sought out and spent the time and energy to engage in meaningful and transformative interactions that made them better critical DLBE educators. Participants' comments are tied together by the woeful inadequacy of their university experiences in making them ready to enter their chosen line of work as well developed critical DLBE educators. In this way, participants' comments reflect research that preservice programs are not sufficiently preparing candidate in areas such as critical consciousness or similar skills and dispositions (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro, et al., 2014; Patel, 2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019; Varghese & Snyder, 2018).

This is of particular concern because Rodriguez-Mojica and Briseño (2019) recommend critical consciousness be part of state standards for teacher preparation because "providing opportunities for bilingual teachers to develop critical consciousness is particularly important in the current context of gentrification of TWI programs, where only "symbolic integration" of language groups may occur..." (p. 15). Furthermore, research noted in Chapter II (Rodríguez,

2014; Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) suggests that cultural relevance and responsiveness is key in DLBE literacy instruction and culturally relevant pedagogy (Alfaro et al., 2014) is key to students' academic achievement in DLBE. Furthermore, Rodriguez-Mojica and Briseño (2019) warn that "bilingual candidates prepared with traditional understandings [c]ould…replicat[e] the white-washed pedagogies" (p. 15-16). How could critical and culturally attentive pedagogies not be central to preservice programs that prepare DLBE educators?

Ana noted that she didn't have educator credentials when she was hired, and in fact "my interests did not start in education, my preparation in undergrad wasn't an education, I come from a sociopolitical background". In this sense, her experience departed from Patel (2019) in that she was not necessarily an underprepared teacher because she had not gone through a teacher preparation program at all. Rather, she made what is sometimes termed a lateral move into education when she decided to take a position as a teacher's assistant in a DLBE school. However, her experiences since she embarked on a career in education - as an educator and as an educator of educators - have led her to conclusions that echo Patel's (2019) criticism of teacher preparation programs and their lack of attention to preparing teachers for anything remotely like critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003). Ana said:

> …you gotta teach people how to think critically, and it all goes back to preservice teaching…we're trained to teach math and reading. And we're not trained to teach humanity…my biggest advice for preservice teachers would be they, they need to glean the knowledge…and they need to read about history, they need to read about socio-political context, they need to read about immigration, they need to read about policy, they need to read about inequities in housing, inequities in health, they need to read about poverty, they need to read about power, they need to read about economics, in order to be

able to understand the context that the children live in so that they can then explain it to them at a developmentally appropriate way and integrate that reality into what they're trying to do with their children and so that is my biggest advice. In my opinion there is a minority of preservice programs that do it right and so because they're very, very focused on pedagogy and they don't focus on the sociopolitical and history and all the contexts that impact children and students which at this point in time we know that the majority of students in public school are black and brown students and so what are we doing here, you know?...you know they're teaching them to be great teachers and to have command of their classroom but what are we doing when we're not teaching them to be able to analyze and to be able to understand the lives of these kids that's where things are falling behind and so that would be my biggest advice: to redesign these programs and create courses that will fill that gap so that when these teachers, these future teachers graduate they can go in a room and they can look at kids, whether they're black, brown, white whatever, and they know the context that they're growing up in and they know the context that they're developing in.

Significantly, Dannie did attend a university preparation specifically for education, and still her experiences and perceptions align with Ana's observations that educators are underprepared for the sociopolitical elements of their work. Dannie's comments also align with Patel (2019) observations about a lack of preparation for educators to address and disrupt racial and other inequities in their work. Her preparation was sufficient in terms of teaching content, she stated, but was wholly insufficient to prepare her to be a critical DLBE educator. She said:

I think my university did a good job of exposing us to EL strategies, right? There was a lot of time spent helping us know how to help an…English speaker acquire English but I

109

think that...that it sometimes came from…a place of deficit thinking...[The concept of] 5 to 7 years for academic language [was] something we were explicitly taught in my teacher ed program, but we weren't told "and therefore be patient with them because they have the knowledge in their brain they might already know about the water cycle and they just need to acquire the language", so…[the problem is] the framing of it as a deficit when it's not…we…had a lot of explicit instruction around wait times and call strategies and…letting kids write before they speak…using images...hav[ing] a text rich environment…label everything in your room…those were things we were explicitly taught...but I feel like what was missing was…an appreciation for like what the student had to bring to the table, I feel like the focus was on what they couldn't do…

It is striking that Dannie's experiences and noticings about a lack of critical preparation in her university preparation programs suggest these programs may actually actively discourage criticality in students/future DLBE educators. This goes beyond Patel's (2019) criticism regarding a lack of attention and preparation, to an active dismantling of what critical thought and action a preservice educator may be nurturing and considering. It reflects Rodriguez-Mojica and Briseño's (2019) concern that preservice teachers are [still] receiving a "white-washed" (p. 16) preparation. Dannie recalled:

Well …[in] my supervising program…we had like one supervising teacher who...we had seminar with her once a week and she arranged our internships and she arranged our...she observed us and helped us do our like teacher licensure stuff…and my like final exit interview with her before I graduated, she told me "you know I don't really have any feedback for you, everything's going great but I just want to remind you that you probably shouldn't be so political, I wouldn't want you to get fired".

Similarly, Amee also commented on the lack of preparation for her work in DLBE. Her experiences align with what both Patel (2019) and O'Neal, Ringler, and Rodriguez (2008) write in the sense that she especially felt underprepared for the linguistic element of serving linguistically and culturally diverse students. Her experiences also harken back to Rodriguez-Mojica and Briseño's (2019) warning that "bilingual candidates prepared with traditional understandings [c]ould…replicat[e] the white-washed pedagogies" (p. 15-16). Her comments reflect not only an interest in and passion for working to disrupt racial and ethnic misrepresentation and underrepresentation, but also an aptitude for it. Interestingly, it wasn't clear to me that her knowledge about ways to counter white bias and challenge systemic underrepresentation of certain groups of students came from a university preparation program. Rather, it seemed to stem from a mix of her own experiences as a "third culture kid" and from her own exploration and learning on the job. Nonetheless, her preparation to be DLBE librarian was insufficient by her own description. She said:

> …it would have been wonderful to have done an internship or practicum in a dual language library, an already established dual language library, yes. That would have been wonderful. It would have also been wonderful if there were more coursework, more published materials, and yes, a best practices guide...for doing this kind of work, yes...I do the best I can, as do we all…but…I wish I had more resources and guidelines.

Similar to Amee, Toni's comment clearly reflects research that educators of emergent bilinguals are not sufficiently prepared (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008) as well as Patel's (2019) observation that preservice programs are insufficiently preparing future DLBE educators for the critical pedagogy elements in their jobs. However, as with Amee and with Ana, Toni's

comments suggest an overall insufficiency in her program because she noted that most key

learning took place not in her university preparation but on the job. She said:

> I would say that the bulk of my learning has not been from my graduate program by any
>
> means. It has definitely been working side by side in a dual language program with other
>
> teachers and learning from them and learning from the students.

> Interestingly, her observations reflect an openness to learning not only from other

adults in her orbit, but also students in her orbit. This reflects an attitude that echoes Freire's

descriptions of student-teachers and teacher-students.

On the other hand, Esmeralda's experiences departed from Patel's (2019), Ana's,

Dannie's, and Amee's observations in the sense that her insufficiency of preparation was

connected to unrealistic expectations instead of insufficiency of sociopolitical pedagogical

knowledge. Like Dannie, Esmeralda had similar experience in the sense that she was prepared

for certain job technicalities, such as lesson planning, but that her university preparation

overemphasized this concept (and left other concepts out). She said:

> …I did my regular ed and then I did my ESL-bilingual program which are very different.
>
> I feel like...I mean they taught us a great deal…but I think when I first started teaching in
>
> the dual language I felt lost in the beginning you know like, like there wasn't a connection
>
> …when…I started actually teaching and…I remember having to do…lesson [plans in
>
> university coursework] and they're like so specific and so needless because…in real
>
> life…you only have 30 minutes to teach a lesson…I'm happy that I got that experience
>
> [of writing ten page lesson plans] in school because it makes you think okay these are all
>
> the components that I need to have in a lesson…but…it's kind of like the expectation
>
> versus the reality…

In this way, Esmeralda's experience reflects prior research that teachers of emergent bilingual students are often underprepared to teach them (Patel, 2019), know it, and wish for things to be different (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008).

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element of their experience is insufficient preparation in critical theory in their university coursework or credential program. Not only that, but the preservice experiences of participants seemed to lack preparation in concepts related to culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2002), and culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012). This is of particular concern because, as noted in Chapter II, research (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) suggests that attending to cultural relevance is key in DLBE literacy instruction and culturally relevant pedagogy (Alfaro et al., 2014) may be key to students' academic achievement in DLBE. Furthermore, prior research also suggests that culturally responsive texts (Rodríguez, 2014) and culturally responsive teaching (De Jong & Bearse, 2014) are a crucial element of a DLBE program. How could critical pedagogies and culturally attentive pedagogies not be central to preservice programs that prepare DLBE educators?

Although no participant stated that they felt their preparation for the DLBE role was sufficient in the areas of sociopolitical matter, social justice, critical consciousness, etc., two (Dannie and Esmeralda) seemed satisfied with their preparation to teach academics in DLBE. All but one participant noted explicitly that they received their learning and growth around what can be seen as critical consciousness from sources other than their university preparation programs, whether from interactions with peers or students or otherwise. Instead of coming to their positions ready to do critical work, instead they arrived unprepared and upon realizing this they

sought out and spent the time and energy to engage in meaningful and transformative

interactions that made them better critical DLBE educators. In a sense, they were forced to

explore humanizing and critical methods (Salazar, 2013) outside the system that supposedly was

designed to adequately prepare them for their work. Here it becomes clear why so many teachers

of emergent bilingual students or otherwise "hyphenated" students (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) feel

that they lack the knowledge they need to appropriately serve their students (O'Neal et al., 2008),

especially in skills related to critical consciousness (Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro, et al., 2014; Patel,

2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019; Varghese & Snyder, 2018).

Participants' comments are tied together by the woeful inadequacy of their university

experiences in making them ready to enter their chosen line of work as well developed critical

DLBE educators. In this way, participants' comments reflect Alfaro's (2019), Patel's (2019), and

other scholars' criticism that

Preservice teachers are underprepared to address the needs of racially, linguistically, and

culturally diverse students in their daily practice. They also report difficulty in countering

white bias as it appears in daily teaching. As a result of this lack of preparation, many

teachers do not have the capacity to challenge systemic inequities and institutional

barriers once they become credentialed new teachers in classrooms. Many researchers

have called for teacher education programs to focus on developing critical consciousness

and teaching for social justice to disrupt this phenomenon. (Patel, 2019, p. iii)

As noted in Chapter II, critically conscious DLBE teachers can challenge dominant

ideologies (Alfaro, 2019) and can even represent a potentially healing tool of decolonization

(Garza, 2010). On the other hand, "bilingual candidates prepared with traditional understandings

[c]ould…replicat[e] the white-washed pedagogies" (Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019, p. 15-

16). Palmer et al. (2019) and others (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020) argue that attending to bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, is not sufficient, but that DLBE programming must attend to a fourth goal: critical consciousness for all students. In fact, Palmer and her colleagues (2019) argue it should be a "fundamental goal" of such programming. And yet, between participants of this study, Patel's (2019) research, and other studies cited in this chapter it can be argued that there is evidence that preservice university programs that aim, or claim, to prepare critically conscious educators for DLBE work still have much work to do.

DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element is that DLBE includes language, and yet is about far more than just language. While language matters significantly, data from both this study and the literature (Palmer et al., 2019) suggest language acquisition or linguistic proficiency should not be *the center* of DLBE, but rather *a pillar* of DLBE. As noted in Chapter II, simply using Spanish for instruction does not make the instruction high quality or critical (Diaz et al., 2013; Valdés, 1997) and it could be seen as racist to consider bilingual education as "inherently culturally relevant" for Latino students (Chávez-Moreno, 2021). In particular, Chávez-Moreno (2021) notes that a myopic focus on language can actually push out considerations of critical consciousness. Participants' comments downgrade the importance of simply using Spanish in instruction, and their ideas are tied together by the notion that language *and* examination and attention to systems of power, representation, culture(s), and historical and contemporary inequities make for a more critical DLBE program. They also echo prior scholarship (Palmer et al., 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer,

115

2020) that attending to bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, is not sufficient, but that DLBE programming must also attend to critical consciousness.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition*) also aligns with prior scholarship on cultural relevance in DLBE education that suggests attending to language issues is insufficient and cannot be seen as synonymous with critical consciousness. As noted in Chapter II, attending to cultural relevance is key in successful, critical dual language instruction (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) and commitment to culturally relevant pedagogy are hallmarks of successful DLBE programs (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Alfaro et al., 2014; Freire, 2014). This suggests that far from being a peripheral issue, cultural relevance and the critical consciousness it implies is a central issue in DLBE education. The thread that runs through both the data in this study and the scholarship cited in this section is that attending to just language of instruction, and not the host of other issues that arise in DLBE settings, is nowhere near enough for anyone to pat themselves on the back and "now we have a good and critically conscious educational program, problem solved".

The data that gave rise to this theme (*DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition*) aligns with prior scholarship on cultural responsiveness in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, cultural responsiveness is a crucial elements of a quality bilingual program (De Jong & Bearse, 2014; Rodríguez, 2014) This echoes what participants in this study observed, for example when Amee commented on the importance of reflecting culture – not just language - in literature. The thread that runs through both the data in this study and the scholarship cited in this section is that attending to language, and not the host of other issues that arise in DLB settings, is nowhere near enough to be able to call it "critically consciousness".

The data that gave rise to this theme (*DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition*) also aligns with prior scholarship on culturally sustaining pedagogy in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, "culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project" (Paris, 2012, p. 95). Providing elements of a culturally sustaining education in DLBE is key (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020a; Di Stefano, 2017). Di Stefano (2017) can be seen as advocating for attention to critical consciousness when she writes that "DLI programs are not simply an instrument to facilitate Latin@ students in their acquisition of English, [rather] DLI programs [based on culturally sustaining practices] can…dismantle power relations based on race and socioeconomic status [and lead to] a more equal distribution of resources" (p. 175). Furthermore, DLBE teachers must be intentional about addressing and integrating sociopolitical elements into DLBE programming in order for the program to be a truly humanizing, liberating experience for minoritized students (Freire, 2020). I see echoes of cultural sustenance in Brandy's realization that her work involved much more than teaching fractions. In this sense, some participants' wish to truly improve society as a whole through their work in DLBE aligns with Paris (2012) and can be seen as an element of critical consciousness. The thread that runs through both prior research and the data from this study is that there can be no room for notions such as "our students are acquiring two languages, that's social justice" nor "this book comes in Spanish, so it's culturally relevant". This reflects Amee's comments on how simply identifying and purchasing Spanish language books does not address the problem of under- or misrepresentation of minoritized groups in curricular materials.

Ana's experiences are in line with prior scholarship that suggests her work is, or should be, about much more than language. She is very self-aware that she is motivated to teach much

more than language, and passionate about her belief in that concept. Ana's words align with

Chávez-Moreno (2021), who observed that focusing on language can result in pushing out

considerations of critical consciousness. Her words also echo those of Paris (2012) in calling for

culturally sustaining pedagogy to make for a more authentic democracy. Ana sees her role as

helping improve society by helping students develop critical skills, not just language skills. For

example, Ana said:

> …language is not the end-all be-all of the end of the dual-language program. it's
>
> obviously one of the four foundations, core pillar...but my responsibility as a dual-
>
> language educator or any…educator...is not strictly to turn kids into fully bilingual
>
> people. My responsibility is to develop these kids into adults that can observe, analyze,
>
> and act to better their lives and better the lives of others…in the end, language is
>
> language, language is only going to facilitate communication. It is what we do with that
>
> language to better society and better our lives what I'm shooting for…You know when
>
> we look at the data for Latino and black right all across the United States it's pretty
>
> abysmal. So if I give them a second language right is that enough? Absolutely hell no…

Ana's comments also challenge the notion that an educator of a certain perceived identity

will automatically have the tools to enact a DLBE program that is about more than "just"

language. In some ways this reflects what Chávez-Moreno (2021) writes that it is racist to

consider bilingual education as "Inherently Culturally Relevant" for Latino students. Applying

Ana's experiences to Chavez Moreno's analysis suggests that considering Latinx educators as

inherently providers of culturally relevant curriculum for Latino students is a racist notion. Ana

said:

…we have a pretty high percentage of Latino educators bilingual, bicultural educators... some of them are international teachers that arrive…with no sociopolitical context, no racial context of what's going on in the United States and that has historically been a challenge in our school, especially when it comes to trying to integrate…critical consciousness or equity or social justice into the program…The lack of knowledge of the socio-political context in the United States...teachers that show up with their lens strictly on language acquisition and not necessarily equipped or focused on…this vision of...developing bilingual bicultural students [and] developing students that can reflect and act on social inequities both in their lives and the lives of others. So their focus is strictly on creating students that will be fully bilingual…without addressing…the issues that are impacting these kids.

Ana's remarks also harken back to Flores and Clark's observation that that one should not assume that "teachers will have sociocultural knowledge or a critical consciousness simply because of shared identity, cultural group, or languages" (Flores & Clark, 2017, p. 5).

Amee's comments suggest a critical DLBE educator takes not only language but also representation into consideration. Her words can be seen to align with those of Paris (2012) in calling for culturally sustaining pedagogy to make for a more authentic democracy in the sense that a more democratic representation of students in the curricular materials can be seen as a more democratic and thus more culturally sustaining education. Her comments also connect with findings that suggest culturally responsive texts are key to DLBE programming (Rodríguez, 2014) and culturally relevant pedagogy key to DLBE literacy instruction (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017). She said:

…who is getting represented and who's getting represented *authentically*…which is all tangled up in our dual-language library with authentic Spanish children's books…we want to have more authentic Spanish books instead of just relying on translated works because…there are mistakes in translations…[and] when we have books that are translated into Spanish we are missing the cultural piece…[it] gets super super complicated when I'm looking for authentic Spanish children's books from Hispanic countries because…the book publishing industry in Hispanic countries, just as…in the US, is disproportionately white and privileged, the same power structures exist for the exact same historical reasons. So the more authentic Spanish children's books that I purchase from Hispanic countries the actual less diversity I have in terms of race, ethnicity, etcetera. That's a direct conflict right there and it drives me crazy.

Amee clearly sees her work as more than just procuring texts for students in a particular language or of a particular language or reading level. She sees her work as dealing with issues of representation and, one could argue, cultural relevance (Ladson-Billings, 1995), cultural responsiveness (Gay, 2002), and culturally sustenance (Paris, 2012). As noted in the literature review, research suggests that cultural relevance (Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017; Alfaro et al., 2014) and culturally responsiveness (De Jong & Bearse, 2014; Rodríguez, 2014) are crucial elements of a DLBE program. In this way, Amee is pursuing a critical path, though clearly a challenging and at times lonely one.

Like Amee, Dannie also sees her works as going beyond teaching language to address representation. Her comments align with Chávez-Moreno (2021), Diaz et al. (2013), Di Stefano (2017) and others in that she also sees her work as far more than language teaching. Dannie also noted the importance of attending not only to language, but representation. She said:

120

…I have them set some little goals, like, I wanna read more stories about this person, I want to hear more stories about that person…I specifically tell that we're gonna read more stories about…these people because in the past their stories…haven't been heard and that's not fair and then the kids start to do that by themselves…So, I guess the long answer is that it's not just that Spanish is around them by osmosis, it's that we should explicitly be telling them, this is why we're doing this.

Like Amee, Dannie sees her work as dealing with issues of representation as much as other concepts, language structures, or content matter. One could argue that this disposition aligns in some with each of the culturally attentive pedagogies discussed in this study, cultural relevance (Ladson-Billings, 1995), cultural responsiveness (Gay, 2002), and culturally sustenance (Paris, 2012). As noted in the literature review, research suggests that cultural relevance (Alfaro et al., 2014; Kabuto, 2017; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) and culturally responsiveness (De Jong & Bearse, 2014; Rodríguez, 2014) are crucial elements of a DLBE program. In this way, Amee and Dannie are pursuing a critical path and in living up to Salazar's (2013) call that educators work for humanizing education - which entails moving toward critical consciousness.

Like Amee and Dannie, Lara's comments align with Chávez-Moreno (2021), Diaz and colleagues (2013), and Di Stefano (2017) in that she also sees her work as far more than language teaching. On the other hand, she notes that language is the basis for expression and conceptualization and sees certain elements of language teaching not as secondary but as primary to discussion about critical matters. She said:

Yeah you know so to get to the critical consciousness…you also need to have that vocabulary to be able to have those discussions so I feel like the unit organizer helps the

students have the vocabulary so that when they have their discussions about the books and, "okay who is represented in these books and who's not in the story and why, why is this important to me, why is it important to people that look like me or you know, act or feel like me, why is it important for the Earth"…

Lara's comments highlighted the role of attention to representation for a critical DLBE educator, while at the same time bringing to the fore the issue that, if students are to have the discussion about representation and other critical matters that critical DLBE educators might want to foster, they still need the linguistic instruction to be able to do so. This shows how complicated it can be to be a critical DLBE educator, consistently trying to juggle and reconcile multiple important issues, skills, and concepts in their work - in many cases more than monolingual teachers in monolingual programs must face. This harkens back to Amanti's (2019b) findings that there is a heavy burden of extra responsibilities on a DLBE educator. An educator could certainly choose an easier work life than a career in DLBE, and I am constantly reminded of how fortunate the world is that some critical DLBE persist in their DLBE positions, despite all the added challenges of their position.

For some educators, the question of representation, as opposed to language, maintained a prominent place in their minds as they went about their work. For others, the question of culture, as opposed to language, maintained a prominent place in their minds as they went about their work. Although the two concepts may intersect, representation and culture are not identical and did not show up the same way in participants' comments. For example, Brandy's comments suggest a critical DLBE educator takes not only language but also culture and ethnicity into consideration, as well as respect. In this way, her comments reflect findings by Chávez-Moreno (2021), Diaz and colleagues (2013), and Di Stefano (2017) in that she also sees her work as far

more than language teaching, but social work in some ways. Her comments also align with

scholars of cultural attentive pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002; Paris, 2012)

addressed in this study in that she sees culture as a center of her work and a lens for teaching - it

is not peripheral. Brandy said:

> I noted the importance of culture is heightened in dual language so there is a lot more
>
> appreciation for the funds of knowledge that families bring in and for the family
>
> traditions that are tied up in the culture each child is a part of and I think it results not
>
> only…both languages [being] elevated to an equal status…which is unusual in the United
>
> States for the Spanish language to be elevated…but also it has resulted in just a really
>
> accepting environment where all students are allowed and encouraged to be themselves,
>
> um, and to experience spending a lot of time with people that they might not spend time
>
> with outside the school environment so I feel that results in…a laboratory...a microcosm?
>
> is that the word? I'm not sure...of life that you just don't experience normally...I think it
>
> results in a lot more respect for language and culture and ethnicity than students who
>
> don't get to experience [DLBE].

Not only do Brandy comments align with prior scholarship that highlights the importance

of a constellation of issues besides language in DLBE, but they also relate to notions of

culturally attentive pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay 2002; Paris, 2012). Brandy's

comments suggest a thinking about DLBE that centers culture, instead of seeing it as a peripheral

issue. In my view, her description most closely mirrors the tenets of culturally sustaining

pedagogy (Paris, 2012) in that student and family culture is celebrated, elevated, and sustained

through the schooling experience.

Like Brandy, Dannie also sees her works as going beyond teaching language to address representation. Her comments align with prior scholarship by Chávez-Moreno (2021), Diaz et al. (2013), and Di Stefano (2017) in that she also sees her work as far more than language teaching. Dannie also noted the importance of attending not only to language and culture, but ethnicity. Dannie's comments also highlight the importance of culture in addition to language:

> …your ethnicity and your culture and your language essentially make up who you are and everything you do in your classroom needs to meet the students where they are based on who they are so... right from their relationship to their teacher to their peers to themselves...what kind of things they are reading, what kind of activities you're doing, what are the expectations for behavior and respect, all of those things are tied up in culture, ethnicity, and language so I would say everything but I do is directed by those things.

Like previously quotes participants, Dannie's comments reflect the belief that language is not the center of DLBE, but a center - in conjunction with other elements of identity. Language remains an important curricular focus, but language and other related elements of identity such as culture and ethnicity take up similar spaces of importance. In addition, by centering culture and ethnicity as much as language, her comments reflect elements of culturally attentive pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay 2002; Paris, 2012). I find that her comments align most especially culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2003) since she describes its importance as central to teaching and learning. This notion aligns closely with Gay's description of culturally responsive pedagogy as the application of students' culture as a lens for instruction.

For some educators, the question of social justice and (in)equities, as opposed to solely language, maintained a prominent place in their minds as they went about their work. For

124

participants who are quoted in this section, their comments suggest a critical DLBE educator

takes not only language but also questions of historical injustices, current inequities, and into

consideration. In this way, their comments align with Chávez-Moreno (2021), Diaz and

colleagues (2013), and Di Stefano (2017) in that she also sees her work as far more than

language teaching, but a form of social work in some ways. Brandy's comments show how

historical and current inequities are centered by critical DLBE educators. She said:

> …my biggest takeaway from dual language teaching has been that the investment in
>
> family engagement...and classroom environment, and like the elevation of bilingualism in
>
> itself...if you don't engage in those things you're just spinning your wheels with academic
>
> content...the two are inseparable...I feel like the experiences of my native Spanish
>
> speakers…[and] I'm not classifying all of them as immigrants from a different country
>
> with traumatic immigration experience although that's some of them but for others it's the
>
> simple act of existing in the United States Of America that's provided enough trauma of a
>
> lifetime. It was the hardest thing for me to learn that it doesn't matter how much academic
>
> content that I know…it doesn't matter that I had like 10 years of training on how to be
>
> really good at teaching fractions, that isn't what gives anyone any success here…it's
>
> making sure that everyone's voice is heard, it's making sure that no one feels invisible
>
> that there's an atmosphere of respect and, and risk-taking and error analysis that's good
>
> and we can make mistakes and we can make mistakes and learn from each other and one
>
> group is not smarter than the other teachers aren't smarter than students but it's like this
>
> collective learning experience…I thought for many, many years that if I could just get
>
> good enough at learning the best pedagogical way to teach to teach a topic that I would
>
> be successful and then I came here…I learned…it is beneficial to know your content

but….one thing is not useful without the other. So it was like an unlearning for us in some ways.

By centering question of social justice and "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students' and their families' lived experiences of marginalization as much as questions language, Brandy's comments reflect elements of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012). I find her comments align with the third tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy, critical consciousness, in that she acknowledged the breadth of injustice experienced by some of her students and their families, reflected upon what that meant in her teaching, and changed - unlearned - certain assumptions she had about teaching and pedagogy. I find that her comments reflect culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012) in that the reflections and efforts she describes to support marginalized and sometimes traumatized students to take on the identities of success scholars and society members can be seen as moves toward a more democratic society.

Like Brandy, Dannie's comments also suggest that a critical DLBE educator takes not only language but also social justice and historical and current inequities into consideration. She said:

> …this last year the counselor at our school has been writing, social emotional curriculum [SEL] around sense of self and identity and we've been doing half an hour of SEL time every day because we were virtual and the principal felt like it was important to like build community and a sense of self and so…we would read a book and talk about it, the importance of names…feelings, books about different types of justice…during Hispanic Heritage Month we talked about that and…about Black history, and we did a month for Asian American Pacific Islander history and we like had events…[it's important] being in

126

a school that has Spanish and all of the cultural like things that come with that, right? [But] it's not just about language, really.

By centering question of social justice and "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students' lived experiences through carefully thought out social emotional learning curriculum, and not just centering language, Dannie's comments reflect elements of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995). I find her comments align with the third tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy, critical consciousness, in that she acknowledges the breadth of identities and experiences of her students and their families in the variety of materials chosen by her and the counselor which serve as the "mirrors and windows" that Amee mentions seeking out in her purchases of materials. By engaging with such curriculum, critical DLBE educators show they are not only acknowledging the historical injustice of invisibility and erasure but engaging in culturally relevant pedagogy. Esmeralda's comments also highlighted the role of social justice in DLBE. She said:

> …now with the whole like Black Lives Matter and the Welcoming Schools
> curriculum…we're teaching students to understand systemic racism, right? And we're
> providing them opportunities to learn about it and tools for them to…understand where
> we're at right now, in the world and socially, so then when they have to go out into the
> world they can…navigate themselves and be socially empathetic towards others and
> engage socially…we're giving them like real world explanations like things that are
> actually happening right now so the more relevant [things]...opportunities to make them
> think about their country and their communities and how those issues are happening in
> our communities and in our country affects them right? And how they can take action to
> kind of change it…How do those economic forces work and how do they contribute to

inequality or inequity as well…I think we've become more conscious about materials that we're using in the classrooms...to represent the students that are in the classroom...we're more aware…trying to include...authors and…literature that reflect who they are right? Especially like ELL students and our Latino community…So you know, when you teach the language…and vocabulary they need to learn to be critically conscious, right? That's... and it is part of the curriculum, you know? You are teaching specific language that will help them…engage...into what critical consciousness is.

By centering question of social justice and "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students' lived experiences through carefully thought out social emotional learning curriculum, and not just centering language, Esmeralda's comments reflect the third tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), critical consciousness, in that she acknowledges the breadth of identities and experiences of her students and their families in the variety of materials she uses to that her students see themselves in their schooling. In addition, she specifically works toward preparing her students for both reflection and action to challenge the unfair conditions they learn about. Furthermore, I find that what she describes is an effort to promote a more democratic society, which aligns with the notion of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012). By engaging with curriculum that far surpasses "just language teaching", critical DLBE educators show they are not only acknowledging the historical injustices of invisibility and erasure but engaging in culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogy.

In fact, for one participant, DLBE in and of itself could serve as a step towards social justice. Lara said:

 …transitional bilingual is really not doing these kids any favors…they were so isolated and so ostracized by the kids who spoke English…they weren't in the same class with

them, they were pushed around…it was just terrible…when I found out about dual language immersion and how it had both sets of kids in a 50-50 program...talking to each other, learning from each other, becoming friends…I was like "that's…the one I want."

Not only does Lara's perceptions about DLBE reflect a belief that DLBE aligns more with social justice than other "bilingual" program models, but her comments also suggest ways that DLBE can also represent a more humanizing education (Salazar, 2013). Lara said:

This year the counselor and the entire school administration decided we want to ask every single child in the school to do something for this…social emotional curriculum - that you're going to express yourself through art…because the theme of the year was "I matter" and…"why do I matter?"…So the poem…is a girl who is talking in Spanish about why she matters…"yo importo porque…" and…she explains all the different things that make her important and a member of the community that is valuable and,...the world won't work the same without her…what we're trying to get at is that every single child there is important.

In seeking ways to inculcate students - especially those who may be emergent bilingual and whose identities are "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) - with the understanding that they are valuable and capable members of society, critical DLBE educators like Lara are doing more than engaging in humanizing pedagogy (Salazar, 2013). They are also engaging in culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995) by taking action to challenge longstanding inequities and culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012) because they are working toward a more democratic society.

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that key elements in DLBE includes language, and yet is

129

about far more than just language. Sometimes, the question of language has dominated discussion about DLBE and in DLBE: what language is X subject in? What language will the assessment be in? What language(s) do the staff speak? What language(s) do the teachers speak? What language(s) are the signs in the school posted in? What materials at what grade and on what subject are available in what language? What language should the "specials" classes such as art, gym, etc. be in? At times, these questions and discussions are formally structured, as with team meetings, and at other times informal or spontaneous, taking place in unplanned hallway conversations. While language matters significantly, it is also not *the* center of DLBE, it is *a* center of DLBE. educators could have chosen to refrain from any of the myriad interactions described, they could have chosen to plan instruction by themselves, or they could have decided to spend their time in ways other than talking with peers, community members, or colleagues in order to grow their critical consciousness. Instead, they sought out and spent the time and energy to engage in meaningful and transformative interactions that made them better critical DLBE educators. Participants' comments are tied together by the notion that language *and* examination and attention to systems of power, representation, culture(s), historical and contemporary inequities, etc. make for a more critical DLBE program. They also echo prior scholarship (Palmer et al; 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020) cited in Chapter II that suggests that attending to bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, is not sufficient, but that DLBE programming must attend to critical consciousness. In fact, Palmer et al. (2019) argue that critical consciousness - not language proficiency - is, or should be, a "fundamental goal" of DLBE programming.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition*) also aligns with prior scholarship on cultural relevance in DLBE

education that strongly suggests attending to language issues is nowhere near enough. As noted in Chapter II, Kabuto (2017) and Souto-Manning and Martell (2017) found that attending to cultural relevance is key in successful, critical DLBE literacy instruction. Furthermore, Alfaro and colleagues (2014) found that culturally relevant pedagogy was a central tenet of DLBE teachers' work at a DLBE charter school in California that is described as "one of the highest performing" (Alfaro et al., 2014, p. 19) in the school district. It has even won awards for closing achievement gaps. Some scholars (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Freire, 2014) have found that commitment to using culturally relevant pedagogical practices are hallmarks of successful DLBE programs, though unfortunately other research (Freire & Valdez, 2017) suggests that some DLBE teachers decline to use or believe they cannot implement culturally relevant pedagogy. This suggests that far from being a peripheral issue, cultural relevance in education and especially DLBE is a central issue. Data in this study, then is reflected in prior scholarship. The thread that runs through both the data in this study and the scholarship cited in this section is that attending to language, and not the host of other issues that arise in DLB settings, is nowhere near enough for anyone to pat themselves on the back and say "ok, now we have a DLBE program, great, equity problem solved".

The data that gave rise to this theme (*DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition*) aligns with prior scholarship on cultural responsiveness in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, culturally responsive texts are crucial elements of a quality bilingual program (Rodríguez. 2014) and culturally responsive teaching is a crucial element of a DLBE program (De Jong & Bearse, 2014). This echoes what participants in this study observed. Like the participants in this study, (De Jong & Bearse, 2014) found that efforts at cultural responsiveness and elevation were constantly challenged and undermined by colonial features of

the traditional school system that housed the DLBE program. The thread that runs through both the data in this study and the scholarship cited in this section is that attending to language, and not the host of other issues that arise in DLB settings, is nowhere near enough.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition*) aligns with prior scholarship on culturally sustaining pedagogy in DLBE education. Paris (2012) notes that culturally sustaining pedagogy includes working for a more democratic society, that participants of this study in many cases can be seen to be working for just that. In addition, as noted in Chapter II, some prior research suggests that DLBE schools that have successfully addressed inequities have done so not by a myopic focus on questions of Spanish language materials, proficiency, or whatnot. Instead, prior research suggests they have done so partially by providing elements of a culturally sustaining education (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020a). Furthermore, Marialuisa Di Stefano's (2017) ethnographic study of a third grade DLBE classroom found that culturally sustaining pedagogical practices to be a key element in DLBE curriculum that supported students' identity. Indeed, she noted that students' identity, sense of belonging, language practices and cultural factors were intertwined and can be integrated into the DLBE curriculum. Stopping at language is not enough. Di Stefano (2017) writes that DLBE programming must be appropriately conceived, designed, supported, and delivered in order to create humanizing experiences for language-minority students. Attending simply simplistic conceptualizations of DLBE as simply teaching in two languages misses great opportunities to enact social justice. Di Stefano (2017) argues

> DLI programs are not simply an instrument to facilitate Latin@ students in their
> acquisition of English, but rather a twofold opportunity for Latin@ students to nurture
> their community language and culture, and for white students to embrace that community

and develop a sense of belonging and membership through the language. DLI programs can become a counter-hegemonic instrument because they dismantle power relations based on race and socioeconomic status, among other elements. The use of Spanish as the language of instruction is not enough to develop a suitable DLI program. Students need a culturally sustaining practice that allows all to engage in conversations, where minority groups can have their voices heard and students from the majority group can advocate for a more equal distribution of resources. (p. 175)

Crucially, she notes that sociocultural elements may not always be addressed in a DLBE setting because they may not be formally integrated into the curriculum. The degree of culturally sustaining pedagogy, then, may depend upon DLBE individual teachers' awareness and ability. This conclusion is supported by Freire (2020), which found that DLBE teachers must be intentional about addressing and integrating sociopolitical elements into DLBE programming in order for the program to be a truly humanizing, liberating experience for minoritized students. The thread that runs through both prior research and the data from this study is that there is no room for the attitude "I'm bilingual, so I'm delivering quality DLBE education" nor "this school is bilingual, so it's doing a good job" nor "this book comes in Spanish, so we're good to go". This reflects what participants in this study have observed: there is a lot of extra work for them to do in order to live up to the DLBE legend. This theme is further explored in the section dedicated to the theme *Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*.

Scholars of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2002), and culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012) education present powerful arguments that those pedagogies are a step toward the pursuit of equity and social justice. It is evident that humanizing pedagogy (Salazar, 2013) and culturally attentive

133

pedagogies explored in this study (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002; Paris, 2012) in bilingual education and in the service of social justice influence participants' work as DLBE practitioners. Taken together, existing scholarship plus the data from this study points to the importance of attending to matters that go far beyond "just" language when a DLBE is in question.

[Standardized] Testing Constrains Critical Consciousness

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element is that efforts to enact critical DLBE is frequently and consistently frustrated by standardized and/or required testing. Prior scholarship on the impact of standardized testing in and on DLBE programs (Palmer, Henderson, Wall, Zúñiga & Berthelsen, 2016) suggests it is highly detrimental to the spirit of DLBE. In fact, it can even "dismantle" a DLBE program (Palmer et al., 2016). Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) also warned that "the influence of standardized testing and the desire for a quick transition to English overpowers teachers' best intentions and ultimately sabotages the program" (p. 316). The requirement to spend the time and energy to prepare for testing reduces the time and energy left over to engage in meaningful and transformative interactions that characterize a more critical DLBE program. Prior research and data from this study are tied together by frustration of DLBE educators with testing expectations and traditions, which they see as incongruous with a more critical DLBE program.

The data that gave rise to this theme *([Standardized] Testing Constrains Critical Consciousness)* aligns with prior scholarship on cultural relevance, cultural responsiveness, and cultural sustainability in DLBE education in the sense that none of these pedagogies are defined by testing nor do the definitions mention it. This omission can be seen as suggesting that practices related to standardized testing are not culturally relevant, responsive, or sustaining.

Considering that an element of cultural relevance is critical consciousness, then it can be argued that testing is antithetical to criticality. The data in this study is reflected in this prior scholarship. For instance, Ana commented that testing curbed the possibilities for community action projects. The thread that runs through both the data in this study and the scholarship cited in this section is that testing and the application of culturally attentive pedagogies in DLBE are almost mutually exclusive. If community action projects are interpreted as engaging in the action portion of critical consciousness, then testing can be seen as impeding the development of deeper and deeper levels of critical consciousness.

Ana's experience reflects Palmer and colleagues' (2016) findings that standardized testing is highly detrimental to the critical spirit of DLBE. For example, Ana said:

the action piece [of critical consciousness] is really difficult to do because as you know in public school we're very focused on test taking and so we usually don't have enough time you know to fit in that practical kind of "get involved with the community" project because we're more focused on instruction and getting the kids up to a certain...you know, standard, and getting the kids to meet certain academic expectations that usually there's not that much time to get them involved in those community projects or...or action, activism oriented projects.

Brandy's experience also reflects Palmer and colleagues' (2016) and Alanis and Rodriguez's (2008) findings that standardized testing is highly detrimental to the spirit of DLBE - even to the point that it can dismantle or overpower parts or whole DLBE programs to the extent it "sabotages the [DLBE] program" (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 316). Brandy finds that standardized testing in some ways weakens or contradicts her efforts to elevate Spanish and Spanish speaking culture because of how it emphasizes English and English-speaking culture.

Her comments also suggest that, especially in the upper grades, the DLBE model gives way bit by bit to English or a less authentic version of DLBE, just as Palmer et al. (2016) write about. Similarly frustrated by testing and its consequences as Ana, Brandy said:

> the most important thing to me and the most challenging is keeping the status of both languages elevated to the same place because even though we are in a dual language environment, so many practices, like systemic practices, like scream the importance of English and…my favorite moments in teaching, especially being sort of monolingual, is we teach each other, is to look at the languages side by side and to use one thing to bridge over to the other...and…yet every single standardized test the government presents to you in in English...I try to keep the focus on my ELs because…the environment can so easily become "you are in an English school and also there is Spanish" when really it should be...our goal should be to emphasize that we are here to learn both, and they are equally important and equally useful….Let's take 4th grade…it's all the science is in Spanish and all of the social studies is in English and then you get to 5th grade and you have an English science test, right...And then the other big frustration I see is that as students move up even in the dual language school is becomes a huge stressor to teach it all in English, so I'll see that Science in the last quarter or half of the year is supposed to be in Spanish but it will flip to a whole lot of English because all of the students are about to be tested in [English]...those are the things I find most frustrating, is trying to meet the federal and state government mandates at the same time we are trying to… elevate those two languages...

Brandy's comments directly support prior research that standardized testing "sabotages the [DLBE] program" (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 316) in practical and philosophical ways. In

136

the practical sense, standardized testing requires Spanish language instruction to be replaced with English, thus undermining both the content area curricular scope and sequence, but also the perceived value of Spanish. In a philosophical sense, when staff and students know full well that all of the high stakes assessments of any given school term will be in English, it undermines the goal of elevating the status of Spanish, and thereby also Spanish speakers and cultures associated with Spanish language.

While the problem in some cases is the emphasis on English testing, in other cases the problem is that testing is doubled because it is conducted in two languages. In addition, the impact of the results can vary and represent inequitable outcomes for emergent bilingual students or otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121). For example, Dannie said

> …a problem [in] a lot of dual language…is we were testing them twice as much right? We were using at the time MClass and we were using like this reading assessment and we had to do it twice so the kids will be tested for the reading level in Spanish and their reading level in English and if their English was behind because they were a Native Spanish speaker they got put into the English-only in order to like improve their English faster.

Dannie's comments not only highlight the burdens and inequity of students undergoing testing in two languages and teachers having to administer testing in two languages, but also the unevenly applied results in which English speakers who are evaluated as doing poorly in Spanish are not penalized while Spanish speaker who are evaluated as doing poorly in English are penalized in the sense that they are removed from first language services. This situation highlights the ways that testing practices can "sabotage" (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 316) the critical efforts of a DLBE program.

137

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element is that efforts to enact critical DLBE is frequently and consistently frustrated by standardized and/or required testing. As noted in Chapter II, prior scholarship on the impact of standardized testing in and on DLBE programs (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Palmer et al., 2016) suggests it is highly detrimental to the spirit of DLBE. In fact, it can even "dismantle" a DLBE program (Palmer et al., 2016). Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) even warned that "the influence of standardized testing and the desire for a quick transition to English overpowers teachers' best intentions and ultimately sabotages the [DLBE] program" (p. 316). The requirement to spend the time and energy to prepare for testing reduces the time and energy left over to engage in meaningful and transformative interactions that characterize a more critical DLBE program. Prior research and data from this study are tied together by frustration of DLBE educators with testing expectations and traditions, which they see as incongruous with a more critical DLBE program.

The data that gave rise to this theme *([Standardized] Testing Constrains Critical Consciousness)* aligns with prior scholarship on cultural relevance, cultural responsiveness, and cultural sustainability in DLBE education in the sense that none of these pedagogies are defined by testing. Neither Ladson-Billings, nor Gay, nor Paris wrote that the success or implementation of the pedagogies whose names they coined can be measured by standardized testing. This omission can be seen as a rejection of standardized testing, and it suggests that governmental or institutional mandates straitjacket DLBE educators who attempt to integrate culturally attentive pedagogies into curricular decisions that are out of sync with the spirit of their programming and the spirit of those pedagogies. In this sense, the data in this study is reflected in prior scholarship. The thread that runs through both the data in this study and the scholarship cited in this section is

that testing and the application of culturally attentive pedagogies in DLBE are almost mutually exclusive. Focusing on the critical consciousness that is inherent in culturally relevant pedagogy, then it can be said that standardized testing and critically consciousness are mutually exclusive.

Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element is that efforts to enact critical DLBE exacts a toll on DLBE educators, in time and energy expenditure, and sometimes even in morale. The extra requirements to find or create not only academically and linguistically appropriate but also critical materials is exhausting.

Several participants' comments reveal substantial time spent working outside of typical work hours or harder within typical work hours. As noted in Chapter II, it is no insignificant feat to dedicate the extra time and energy to prepare meaningful and transformative curriculum that characterize a more critical DLBE program (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Amanti, 2019b) especially since simply using Spanish for instruction does not make the instruction high quality or critical (Diaz et al., 2013). Participants live that reality, and they pay a price in their time and energy in order to create high quality educational experiences for their DLBE context. Participants' comments are tied together by the exhaustion, and sometimes the frustration, of going the extra miles required for enacting a more critical DLBE program. It is evident that the participants in this study do a lot of extra work to do their DLBE positions, and their students, justice.

Ana's experiences reflect Alanis and Rodriguez's (2008) and Amanti's (2019b) research on the extra work DLBE educators face. For example, Ana said "…it has taken a huge toll, because it's, I still have to do my full-time job during the day, and then I do all of this extra

work…" Interestingly, Ana also commented that "public education for a critically conscious educator is a very suffocating, isolating, and oppressive space."

This is meaningful in two ways. First, her comments make clear that Ana is tired and overworked and isolated - but yet for some reason still willing to engage in her work as a critical DLBE educator. This may suggest the work as a critical DLBE educator is so motivating to her, and maybe others, that she persists in the face of myriad hardships. On the other hand, one could interpret her comments to mean that she is tenuously connected to a job in which she feels tired, overworked, suffocated, and isolated, and no one could claim to be surprised - least of all Amanti (2019b) - if she were to quit in spite of her passions for her work. If this is true for Ana, it could be true for other critical DLBE educators. Ana elaborated on her feelings of suffocation and oppression, saying that:

> …this is the other thing with critical conscious educators is like, we get tired, we get tired, of pressing the system, and the system keeps pushing you out, until it comes a point that, that you're tired, education is a tiring job, so you don't need more resistance from the system, so what you do and what happens with a lot of people is that they get tired of pushing and so they're like "ok, the hell with it, I'm just gonna create my own thing and leave me alone.

Her comments offer insight into what may keep Ana in such an exhausting job: a tidbit of autonomy and agency, sought out even on the periphery of her position. The importance of the tidbit of agency and empowerment is made evident by the fact that, as of the interview, Ana was still in her clearly very tiring DLBE position. Similarly, Amee also felt the weight of the extra work placed on the shoulders of critical DLBE educators (Amanti, 2019b). She described the extra efforts she must put forth in her work:

I had a grad library student who is interested in dual-language libraries and that's not addressed at all in library school and that's a problem. I told her that everything takes more time and more money and that you will have to advocate for your dual-language library program within the district context...

Amee's and Ana's experiences also reflect Amanti's (2019b) research on the extra work DLBE educators face. The extra effort is exacerbated not only by the extra effort to identify and create resources, but also by the lack of guidance for critical DLBE educators. For example, Amee elaborated on her situation, saying that:

…I think this is the piece that is really missing…there's NOT enough data, there's NOT enough conversation, there are not enough guidelines…there's a real dearth of information…librarianship in the US has long been acknowledged to be, you know, somewhat monocultural, largely, largely white, female, and middle class. That's long been considered to be a barrier for a lot of people in accessing libraries.

Amee's comments convey the extra effort - time, money, thinking, researching - a critical DLBE educator invests in their work. Her experiences reflect Amanti's (2019b) findings that there is much extra burden for DLBE educators. At the same time, Amee's comments also offer insight into what keeps her on the job despite these significant extra burdens:

…[the] whole danger of a single story…so that's a counterstory, isn't it? I mean...in the US we have this kind of dumb single story about Latinx people, right? We have this kind of cultural ignorance and…all we're thinking about is impoverished Brown immigrants, it's this very…awful narrative, right? And there's that danger of a single story and so, so maybe and I go back and forth about this in my mind maybe books by and about white middle-class people in Argentina or you know Spain or Chile...maybe that provides a

counter story to that single story. But they also reinforce the same power dynamics as we have in the US. And can also contain what we in the US would largely consider to be outdated or perhaps offense of representations of, say indigenous peoples, and there's that whole piece are we reflecting our Latinx students' families, lives, backgrounds, all together it's all of that, it's all of that together at once and I'm constantly juggling those things. Yes, budgeting and time...it takes more time to purchase, to catalog and categorize authentic Spanish materials from other countries…The US publishing industry for children has developed in a very certain way along broad categories of age and reading level. It's not right or wrong, it's just how it's developed in this country...But the children's book industry in Hispanic countries developed in a different way, they don't obviously conform to US categories…and content may not align to what we consider to be appropriate material for children. Or what we would consider culturally appropriate or culturally sensitive and...curriculum is unlikely to match up to US curriculum obviously...I end up relying on translated Spanish books…

And her further comments convey how much the work takes out of a critical DLBE educator:

 I think it is amazing that we are as a school, across grade levels…using books this way, consciously, in aide of developing critical consciousness for our students, for all of our students…and...it does take a lot of thought and reading and reflection and analyzing and weighing against other things and other needs…

In Amee's comments, I see a critical DLBE educator who is highly motivated by elements of humanizing education (Salazar, 2013) and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), of which the pursuit of critical consciousness are central tenets. This is evident in the time and energy and thought she places on each selection of each piece of material for

students. I also see an educator motivated by elements of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), in which the pursuit of a more democratic society is a central tenet. One can see the prioritization of accurate and sufficient representation, and the pursuit of materials that reflect counterstories and varied stories, as an element of democracy. Materials that reflect the full range of society members' identities and stories can be seen as a step toward Paris' (2012) more democratic society.

Esmeralda's comments reflect an experience similar to the other participants. In particular, her comments highlight the specific burden of constant translation that falls on DLBE educators, as well as the frustration of frequently changing curricula:

I would say the lack of authentic resources…is actually a huge part...the books that we're given or the materials that we're given are very outdated, the books are translated and [aren't] authentic…and then we're trying to read it to them to the kids and it's just sounds kind of weird so they're not really being exposed to authentic literature…I feel like it's gotten a little bit better, but… just the time that we spent trying to find resources and…Right now that we went virtual...we're translating everything, all of the resources that the district has given us are in English, we can't teach it in English, which means most of our planning time...most of our time outside hours are...becoming translators...and sometimes I wonder …the people who are on top, the people who are making decisions…they're spending a lot of money [on] resources…but I don't even know who's researching these things because sometimes it doesn't even make any sense…and then when you start teaching…then a year later they're like "okay we're going to change it now!" so you never really have...you never really have something that

143

you can actually work on or with for longer than a year or two because you know they're always changing it or switching it.

Esmeralda's comments reflect an understanding of the importance of culturally responsive literature, which harkens back to Rodríguez's (2014) findings that culturally responsive texts are key to good DLBE literacy instruction. The fact that she spends the time considering and attempting to address the issue of inadequate representation and linguistic-cultural authenticity suggests a critical DLBE educator who is moved by elements of culturally attentive pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002; Paris, 2012). At the same time, such material is exactly what Esmeralda and her colleague lack and find themselves struggling to obtain. In addition, in the many instances when she doesn't even have access even to poorly conceived or poorly translated materials, Esmeralda and her colleagues find that their time is taken up by the tasks of a professional translator. This situation reflects Amanti's (2019b) findings of the significant amount of extra, often invisible, work that DLBE educators face. Dannie's experiences also reflect the other participants as well as Amanti's (2019b) research on the extra work DLBE educators face. Dannie's comments, however, highlight the specific burden of the extra coursework and professional development that DLBE educators may face in their careers:

> …I seek out professional development and…independent reading and …colleagues… that's how I got involved in the anti-racism camp...I surround myself with other people who are doing this…I did an online dual language course through my alma mater and …I'm constantly in book clubs and like going to conferences and listening to lectures and reading books and…talking to colleagues and getting support.

Although she states at one point that she enjoys some elements of the extra work, it is nonetheless extra work and, in some cases, may also represent extra expenditures of her own funds. As all public educators know, it is more uncommon than not that an employee's coursework is paid by the employing school district. Dannie's comment reflects a Freirean (1968) understanding of what it is to be an educator: a teacher-student who has as much to learn as to teach and has never "finished" learning or "arrived" at a sufficient level of education. Strikingly, Dannie's comments put into relief the difference of burden for a DLBE educator and a traditional, monolingual educator:

> …sometimes I look at monolingual schools and I'm a little bit jealous of their ability to use their time more freely, more easily like…[if a] current event happened [they can] spend like 45 minutes on an activity on it because [they] can buy something on Teachers Pay Teachers or like Google it and so that is something that I find frustrating.

This comment reflects Amanti's (2019b) research on the extra burdens on DLBE educators, which specifically highlights the burden of constant translation and the assumption by powers that be that it is just a part of the job. Furthermore, Dannie's comments suggest that within the DLBE program there are extra burdens of teaching in Spanish language content areas, especially in smaller programs or schools where there are fewer colleagues on whom to lean and with whom to collaborate:

> …my co-teacher [who taught the Spanish language content areas] used to say that she felt like she was like the ghost of third grade because there were like three or two monolingual classes…and then her all by herself with no curriculum…making everything from scratch…translating everything by herself…fighting this fight to try to teach dual language.

This comment highlights a specific issue in DLBE that deserves more attention. That is, sometimes a bilingual individual is hired and assigned to Spanish language content and duties, while a monolingual or partially bilingual individual is hired and assigned to the English language content and duties. This can lead to the situation Dannie describes, wherein educators in charge of Spanish language content or materials are charged with higher workloads than educators in the same program who are in charge of English language content or materials. Under these circumstances, it is no surprise that there is a DLBE teacher shortage (Amanti, 2019a), and it should be more of a surprise that there are enough DLBE educators to maintain existing programs nationwide.

Notably, like Dannie, Esmeralda's statements reflect a certain enjoyment of the extra learning she makes. This reflects the Freirean (1968) view of educators not as pinnacle experts of a specialty but as lifelong teacher-students whose learning is continuous. It also suggests an adherence or belief in elements of the culturally attentive pedagogies discussed in this study, cultural relevance (Ladson-Billings, 1995), cultural responsiveness (Gay, 2002), and culturally sustenance (Paris, 2012). The participants in this study could have decided to seek out easier, non-DLBE positions in which the constant burden of extra work was not a factor in their work life - and yet, they are in the DLBE positions they are in, and in which they have been working in many cases for many years. This suggests a strong belief in what they are doing, and the persistence of a critical pedagogue (Darder, 2003). Still, agreeing to or enjoying the work doesn't take away from the fact that Esmeralda and other DLBE colleagues are, still, putting furth extra effort and likely extra money:

I've been taking classes since I started teaching. It's just a continuing thing, you know, I think that you know doing the bilingual program and the ELL..like getting those

146

certifications helped me like understand, you know, things that I can do to better help

students, um...especially students who are learning both languages or students whose

primary language is Spanish, or, you know, it doesn't necessarily have to be

Spanish but...any other language other than English. But…I have to learn…new skills,

new things that I can use in the classroom to better help them and…time changes

obviously, so you always have to adjust, adjust to those changes…when I first started

teaching...some of the things that we were taught are not the things we're doing now so I

think you just have to change with the job…adjust the curriculum that you're teaching

and the materials you're using and the resources…and especially right now when they're

going virtually, having to learn all the new skills to be able to teach virtually has also

opened the door to the virtual world…I really like the opportunity to like learn

something...new....[Teaching] is a constant cycle, you're constantly learning something

new, and constantly tweaking…

Reflecting on participants' statements, it becomes clear that being a critical pedagogue

exacts a price, even when the educators in question are willing to pay it. Unfortunately, Brandy's

comments reflect Esmeralda's experiences, other participants' experiences, and Amanti's

(2019b) research on the extra work DLBE educators face. Furthermore, Brandy's comments

suggest that there may be no end to the extra burdens of trying to be a more critical DLBE

educator in a more critical DLBE program:

…it's accepting that you'll always be learning, you'll never be done and it's like

curriculum writing, it'll just never be done. It's on going, that's a hard thing to accept.

With the prospect of unending extra work, it can be considered a wonder that so many

critical DLBE educators stay on the job year after year. I suspect the passion and calling of

enacting critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003) is what keeps such individuals in their positions. As we know, it is highly unlikely to be good pay that keeps them on.

Taken together, participants' comments suggest that extra efforts are required of them to enact a more critical DLBE program. In many cases, participants' comments highlighted the continuous search for materials that were appropriate in myriad ways, the burden of translation or attending to duties in two languages, and time spent in training, educating, and updating one's knowledge and skills set. Participants' comments are tied together by the thread that being a more critical DLBE educator in a more critical program places significant and long-term extra demands on the educators, and no apparent extra compensation or support in comparison to monolingual educators and programs.

The extra load on DLBE teachers that emerges from participants' comments also reflect prior scholarship that points to higher workload for the critical DLBE teacher Amanti's (2019b) research on the extra work DLBE educators face and an element of what Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) note, which is that

> The power of a dual language program is not just in its additive nature but in the pedagogical equity that exists for both language groups. It is not enough to merely adjust the language of instruction; teachers must adjust their philosophy, their teaching strategies, and their view of ELs. (p. 316)

Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) findings suggest that DLBE educators must do a lot of work to do their jobs such that they fulfill the positive potential of DLBE. It is evident that the participants in this study live that statement: they do a lot of extra work to do their DLBE positions, and their students, justice.

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that a key element in efforts to enact critical DLBE is the role of the extra work involved. In many cases, participants' comments reflected a willingness to do so. After all, every participant is a current, voluntary DLBE educator. But participants' comments also made clear they, too, get tired, frustrated, and overwhelmed with the often-invisible extra work of DLBE (Amanti, 2019b). This recalls Salazar's (2013) argument that a humanizing, critical education is not only an individual but also a community endeavor: it is quite the endeavor, indeed. Participants' comments are tied together by the notion that a more critical DLBE program is supported by the extra time, energy, and money that its DLBE educators consistently and persistently put forth, sometimes to their own detriment.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*) finds footing with prior scholarship on culturally relevant pedagogy in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, there are intersections in the literature on culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and forms of bilingual education (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Alfaro et al., 2014; De La Trinidad, 2015; Freire, 2014; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Ortiz, 2009; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017). The prior scholarship tends to focus on what teachers do or don't do and how they do it. I see the persistence of participants in their DLBE positions, despite all extra burdens, as a recognition of the absolute importance of culturally relevant pedagogy, and a reflection of critical consciousness. They are doing something about unfair conditions in society: they are putting forth heroic amounts of their time, energy, and money to support the DLBE cause. That is not just reflection, that is action if I ever saw it.

In the same way, the data that gave rise to this theme (*Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*) also finds footing in prior scholarship on culturally responsive pedagogy in DLBE

education. As noted in Chapter II, prior research (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020b) suggests that culturally responsive school leaders are key in creating a supportive experience for minoritized students in DLBE settings and culturally responsive texts (Rodríguez, 2014) are key to successful DLBE literacy instruction. In fact, DeMatthews & Izquierdo (2020b) link culturally responsive conditions to the pursuit of social justice in DLBE. The thread that connects prior scholarship and the data from this theme is the fact that educators are taking the extra time, putting in the extra energy, and spending the extra money to provide the most culturally responsive experience for their students that they can. Otherwise, they would be doing a much easier job whose burdens and costs were less exacting.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*) also align with prior scholarship on culturally sustaining pedagogy in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, Paris (2012) writes that

> Culturally sustaining pedagogy...has as its explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers. That is, culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling. (p. 95)

Notice that Paris (2012) expands on the concept of that which might be understood strictly "cultural" to include the linguistic element. While no participant explicitly stated that they adhere to notions of culturally sustaining pedagogy, their statements and actions can be seen as working for a more democratic society in which linguistic and cultural pluralism is sustained. And the critical DLBE educators in this study are sustaining not just their students' plural identities, but sustaining great effort over time, with little to no prospect of relief.

A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that a key element is that efforts to enact critical DLBE must include an examination of systems of power and that without such an examination, efforts to find or create academically and linguistically appropriate material and provide a humanizing education end up in "mission incomplete" for a critical DLBE program.

Participants repeatedly talked about challenging an inequitable status quo, sometimes by questioning terminology, sometimes by centering long overlooked and undervalued identities, and sometimes by upending traditional power structures. This can be seen critical consciousness in action. Existing scholarship supports this data. Enacting a critical DLBE programing and preparing a meaningful and transformative curriculum that characterizes a more critical DLBE program (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008) must center critical consciousness and criticality as a pillar of the program (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Di Stefano, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; Hood, 2020; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017: Palmer et al., 2019) not an afterthought, peripheral issue, or "bonus".

Participants' comments are tied together by the recognition that culturally responsive instruction is not enough, involving family in the curriculum is not enough, teaching in two languages is not enough if the goal is implementing a critical DLBE program. Critical consciousness (Freire, 1968) and elements of humanizing (Salazar, 2013) and critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003) are central to accessing the true social justice potential of a DLBE program. Toni noted that the program she is a part of is based on principles of social justice, showing that she is well aware that critical consciousness is a pillar of the program and also that this concept is clear and present in the minds of critical DLBE educators in the program. She stated simply:

…the school is founded on the basis of social justice, right? And elevating the status of the Latinos in our, in our immediate community.

Toni's statement shows that social justice is not an add-on, a bonus, but rather a pillar of the work carried out at this DLBE school. Her comments show an alignment with research that highlights the importance of centering critical consciousness (Salazar, 2013) particularly in DLBE (Alfaro, 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019). Like Toni, Ana's statements suggest she understands the overriding importance of DLBE educator criticality and how the lack thereof can "sabotage" (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 316) critical efforts of a DLBE program as a whole and individual staff members. Her comments reveal what can happen when critical consciousness is not part of all DLBE educators' preparation or ongoing training:

> …a lot of the Latino educators we get from other countries have worked in private schools in Latin America so they have worked for the elite in Latin America. They are not…used to working with populations with low SES or indigenous populations or AfroLatino populations across Latin America. They have worked for the cream of the crop and then they come and have to work with our families who are descendants of indigenous people [from] Mexico, Salvador…the majority of them, [of] extremely low socioeconomic status. So you're throwing them in an ocean…of issues, and they don't know how to swim those waters…The issues are never the students...no…the issues are our failure to touch, to reach, to hook to engage and to elevate and center the realities of those students, that's our biggest issue in elementary school and when we fail to do that we graduate students that go to middle school, in the margins, that are used to being

decentered, that are used to be invisible, that are used to be disengaged and that have

perceived the sidelines as the safest place to occupy…

Ana continues to explain the impact when elements of the broader community lack a

critical orientation and bring their ideas and systems to what is meant to be a critical DLBE

program. She questions systems of power and notices that some DLBE peers have not learned or

been taught to do so, and its detrimental effects on the critical efforts of the program.

Furthermore, Ana notes the ways in which community members, especially parents of privilege,

use and misuse systems of power, highlighting further the reasons why questioning and

examining them is so important if critical DLBE efforts are to be successful. Here we can see

another form of "sabotage" (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 316) of DLBE, and why centering

critical consciousness in a DLBE program is so important (Alfaro, 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al.,

2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019). I extend this notion to not only

the educators themselves, but the wider community, as the wider community has great power

over the goings-on in a school. Ana observed that:

> …dual language programs historically…were created for Latino students and for other
>
> traditionally marginalized and disadvantaged students of color. The benefits you know
>
> they're all well research and all of that, but traditionally what has happened is that when
>
> white families come into the equation, they appropriate, and they take a seat to drive the
>
> bus and…just like it happened across the nation and so many dual-language programs,
>
> it's happening in our school. So our enrollment of Latino students has gone down and
>
> what we're seeing now is white families particularly enrolling their kids as native Spanish
>
> speakers because they went to Spanish immersion preschool and so they go and they lie
>
> because they know that there is no waiting list on the native Spanish speaker side but

there is a long waiting list in the native English side so these families know how to power play, know how to navigate the system, know how to exploit their system for their own children's advantage and so they also have something to do with what we're seeing now in the classroom when we were making the list this year - the class list - it was a disproportionate number of white students in some classes…once that balance is thrown off the environment becomes completely different in a classroom because it will be an environment that will be heavily focused on…I'm going to be careful with the word that I use…with serving white students. It will be an environment heavily focused on white students acquiring in Spanish language skills as opposed to an environment centered on uplifting and centering the experience of our native Spanish speakers and elevating the language and elevating their culture and elevating their experiences. And so it becomes about something else completely different and so that's a huge threat for me and it's not necessarily an urgent threat for a lot of people in decision-making spaces…it was kind of depressing to see but because I know about the trajectory of dual-language programs it wasn't surprising. It's very much expected, as families you know they start seeing the benefits, the word spreads between these privileged families and so they're desperate to get their kids into the program and, and they are willing to break the rules you know and manipulate things.

Ana highlights the ways that DLBE programs can be sabotaged and gentrified in very concrete terms, highlighting the reason why a critical DLBE program cannot maintain a critical humanizing focus unless stakeholders center critical consciousness (Alfaro, 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019) and reexamine existing systems of power that counteract the ways in which critical efforts attempt to right the

wrongs of the past and present. Understanding that the actions of privileged and often white community members is a key element in the examination and upending of traditional systems of power. Dannie's comments show other ways in which an uncritical implementation of DLBE can sabotage (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 316) the critical and social justice potential of DLBE. Dannie recalled her previous DLBE position at a school she had left, unhappy with what she saw. Her comments explain why:

> …it was clear that the program was designed by and for wealthy white families who wanted their monolingual English students to learn Spanish, right, and that was like the goal of the program and so [what] would happen was any kind of problems they would pull the kid from the immersion program. They would say, "oh they can't read, they're behind, their below grade level in reading - well it's because the Spanish is distracting them, so pull them out; oh they're having behavior problems it's because they don't like Spanish, pull them out"…so by the time they got to the fourth and fifth grade it was essentially a segregated school…because no children with behavior problems, no children who were behind in reading, no children who had attendance issues…

Dannie's and Ana's experience reflect ways in which a lack of criticality can upend social justice goals of well-intentioned DLBE advocates and stakeholders, and why centering critical consciousness is so important for a DLBE program to reach its full potential (Alfaro, 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019). From their comments, it becomes evident that not all stakeholders, in this case parents of privilege, necessarily have the critical skills and habits to reexamine systems of power that counteract critical DLBE efforts, and that failure has a direct and negative impact on critical DLBE program efforts and in particular the emergent bilingual or otherwise "hyphenated"

155

(Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students that critical DLBE advocates sought to provide a more

humanizing education (Salazar, 2013). Ana explains how she works to counteract this reality,

and instill critical consciousness not only in "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students but in

white students:

> My priority when I'm working with elementary students is to…make them visible, make
>
> them feel valuable, help them realize that they do occupy a huge space in our community
>
> and that their narratives matter, that their stories matter. And so my priority is to be the
>
> antidote of everything that is seeking to push them out and to the margins. And also my
>
> priority is, for white students, that they see that, that they see me actively doing that:
>
> centering and decentering. And that they are aware that there is this power dynamic
>
> happening, in every single classroom, and in hallways, and faculty rooms. There's power
>
> dynamics, all over.

Like Ana, Amee's comments reveal the importance of considering, questioning, and

examining systems of power not just in the DLBE classroom or the community, but in industries

that provide materials to DLBE. She said:

> …[the] Cooperative Children's Book Center at the School of Education at the U-Wisc
>
> Madison [have] been collecting statistics on the race of the main characters in children's
>
> books…[and] they showed…showed that children's book characters were vastly,
>
> disproportionately white…white and…nonhuman characters like animals, cars, etc.
>
> …vastly out stripped all the BIPOC characters…[Also,] the authors, the illustrators, the
>
> editors, etc. have remained by and large white. That led to a call for Own Voices
>
> …#OwnVoices...for lots of reasons including, you know, not misrepresenting cultures,
>
> not repeating stereotypes, etc., etc. So as a librarian I'm consciously holding all of that in

mind when I'm purchasing books for a collection, when I'm reading books for race, religion, gender, ability and disability, socioeconomics, etc...and Own Voices. I just want to make sure that our kids have access to more and better representation and to realize, ah, you know, we are a mosaic, you know, I'm a valuable piece of this society, there are more ways to be than one, and I think that having those books available and making sure that the kids see them is one piece…

Amee, like Ana, understands the importance of centering critical consciousness in DLBE (Alfaro, 2019; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019). She sees that this is as important in the industries that produce materials for students as it is for members of the community, staff, and students themselves. Her comments also highlight the extra work a critical DLBE educator puts forth in order to counter noncritical, white-washed materials and industries. Dannie's comments reflect the importance of DLBE educators examining their assumptions, philosophies, and practices in order to identify uncritical and/or traditional influences they may want to challenge or eliminate:

…the "why" of what dual language…and who it's for…*should* like inform everything that you're doing and without that it very quickly becomes…this dual language program in name only right but it made the parents feel good because their kids are going to put it on their resumes that they can speak Spanish and…having been in like a school that was that kind of model - half the school is dual-language half the school is isn't - and the Spanish teachers have like no resources and, and you know there's no books, no curriculum, we have to follow all these mandates and then now being in a school where the whole building is an immersion program and it, you know there's specials in Spanish

and things like that, it's just it's a lot better and it makes a lot more sense when your "why" is about *everybody* being bilingual, not English speakers learning Spanish.

Dannie's experiences reflect what can occur when a DLBE program is not founded on the principles of social justice or is guided by stakeholders with an inadequately developed sense of critical consciousness" a school through which English-speaking students can "put it on their resumes that they can speak Spanish". This goal supremely uncritical and demonstrates how wrong an uncritical DLBE movement can go. Dannie also described what can happen when a DLBE program is guided by principles of a humanizing education and stakeholders with critical consciousness:

> …so we did caucus groups based on the kids racial identity and there was 3 options: white, people of color, or specifically multi-racial and we asked…the kids whose parents identified them as biracial, where they wanted to go and…[one] sibling who goes to the traditional school chose to be with the white students and the student who goes to the dual immersion school chose to be with the other children who identified as biracial. And...it made me reflect on that maybe some of the critical consciousness work that we're doing at our school is helping kids like effectively develop like a stronger sense of their whole selves.

The fascinating decision of one sibling – the non-DLBE attendee - to associate with white identity and the other sibling – the DLBE attendee – to associate with biracial identity suggests the power of a critical DLBE program that humanizes "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p.121) students. It also suggests what can happen to students who do not receive the benefits of such an education: in this case, a denial of self. Dannie also said:

158

I had some…students who were like really dominating the conversation and so I explicitly told them, you know, "hey, sometimes other kids need more chance to think, like, let's wait and then give them a chance" and like, the one student, there was like a very long drawn-out silence, and...she's, she's a Hispanic student, she was a native Spanish speaker, though she had placed out, she like wasn't receiving ELL services...and she unmutes herself and she says "I know the answer but I want to give someone else a turn, I just wanted you to know that". She couldn't stand to not tell them what the answer was but was like trying to do what I had asked…those are things that teachers do a lot that kids don't see and I think part of developing critical consciousness was like, explicitly telling them, I'm not calling on you because I already heard your voice four times and I want to hear other voices, too...I think it's important, to like explicitly tell children the why of what we're doing, so...that's where I was going with my story about picking their seats, when I explained this is the reason, you know, "we have to make sure everybody can see, you're too tall, you can't sit there"…I'm trying to like intentionally build like empathy, skills, and…the ability to see outside themselves and…think about... other people's experiences…Everybody needs to be rowing in the same direction and that direction needs to be, like, in a direction of celebrating and elevating rather than looking at language learning as some kind of deficit…Spanish can't be like a commodity…to like add sparkle to a child's education, it needs to be like, about….elevating...the status of the Spanish language for people who already speak it and bring their cultural knowledge and experiences with the language…like you can't look at language in isolation, language comes with culture and background and ethnicity and…programs need to be designed to elevate and respect that.

Dannie's remark that DLBE cannot become a purveyor of Spanish as a commodity for privileged students reflects a critical awareness of the power dynamics at play in the community around the school. DLBE educators' consciousness of, and challenging of, such dynamics, are key to the humanizing education for emergent bilingual students or student who may be otherwise hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p.121). Esmeralda observes that attending to students' needs as humans ought to receive priority, reminding us that language acquisition and content area achievement is only one goal of many for the critical DLBE educator:

> …the kids that you get in your classroom all come from different, you know,
> backgrounds, different cultures, different ethnicities, different languages...we do have to
> take into account all of that when teaching....not just teaching in a specific language...you
> do want to take into account that child's background in order for, for them to learn the
> best way possible so...many times we're so fixated on, ok, what do I need to do and...and
> we kind of missed those things as well, that creates relationships with the students and
> that will impact them on a personal level, right? As individuals and as human beings…

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that a key element in efforts to enact critical DLBE is examining and challenging systems of power that so influence and impact decisions and conditions around DLBE programs and stakeholders. Participants' comments highlighted how important it is that not only staff members but also community members, students' family members, and members of industries that supply schools with materials participate in meaningful and transformative examination of the power dynamics that are the background of life for those connected to a DLBE program. This reflects Salazar's (2013) argument that a humanizing, critical education is not only an individual but also a community endeavor. It also reflects Paris'

(2012) notion of culturally sustaining pedagogy, in that for him this means striving for a more democratic society and not solely language or cultural education. Participants' comments are tied together by the recognition that a more critical DLBE program is supported by myriad individuals working from a similarly critical philosophical base not only within the school walls but without. As noted in Chapter II, Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) argue that

> The power of a dual language program is not just in its additive nature but in the pedagogical equity that exists for both language groups. It is not enough to merely adjust the language of instruction; teachers must adjust their philosophy, their teaching strategies, and their view of ELs. (p. 316)

The data that gave rise to this theme (*A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough*) connects with prior scholarship on culturally relevant pedagogy, which emphasizes not only the "ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence" but also "the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 483). In this case, data revealed evidence of the need for the adult stakeholders of the DLBE programs and schools in general to develop their critical consciousness such that the program could provide the conditions for student stakeholders to receive a critical education. As noted in Chapter II, there are intersections in the literature on culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and forms of bilingual education (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Alfaro et al., 2014; De La Trinidad, 2015; Freire, 2014; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Kabuto, 2017; Ortiz, 2009; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017). Much of the prior scholarship focuses on what teachers do with or for students. This study highlights the importance of other stakeholders attending to and developing their critical consciousness.

On the other hand, the data that gave rise to this theme (*A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough*) is only tangentially connected with scholarship on culturally responsive pedagogy in DLBE education in the sense that prior research (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2020b) suggests that culturally responsiveness is a key to academic success in DLBE programs. However, there is close alignment between prior scholarship on culturally sustaining pedagogy in DLBE education and the data in this section. As noted in Chapter II, Paris (2012) argues that culturally sustaining pedagogy not only seeks to promote multilingualism and cultural pluralism but also a "democratic project of schooling (p. 95)". This definition suggests that education is about more than academic success, language fluency, or cultural wealth, it should make the stakeholders of a democratic society who have historically been marginalized have their full agency and powers of citizenry. In other words, a DLBE education and its stakeholders, including those who may not yet consider it their role or duty, must examine, challenge, and upend systems of power that maintain emergent bilingual and otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students and their families on the margins of society. If this were the case, then such students could be said to experience a truly humanizing education (Salazar, 2013) that righted longstanding wrongs (Freire, 1968).

Being Bilingual or Latinx Is Not Synonymous with Critical Consciousness

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical consciousness, it becomes evident that another key element in enacting a critical DLBE program is that being bilingual or being Latinx is not synonymous with a developed level of critical consciousness. This aligns with prior research noted in Chapter II that one should not assume that "teachers will have sociocultural knowledge or a critical consciousness simply because of shared identity, cultural group, or languages" (Flores & Clark, 2017, p. 5). And yet, in effect,

sometimes hiring professionals and administrators assume that a person who has a certain last name or language background will be an ideal fit for their DLBE program. In fact, sometimes the new hire can carry the same assumption, as can parents or other observers. However, possessing an identity is not a guarantee of possessing a critical perspective, as is necessary to enact a critical DLBE program. A DLBE applicant is not necessarily - simply by dint of identity - equipped with the education and tools to deliver the meaningful and transformative curriculum that characterize a more critical DLBE program. Participants' comments are tied together by the problematic nature of making such assumptions, and how disrupting them can make space either for an honest re-assessment of the state of the program, and for authentic and critical education of current DLBE educators. Disrupting such assumptions can also make way for the integration of well-equipped and educated, non-bilingual and non-Latinx DLBE but critical staff.

For example, Ana, who is a Latinx educator who is bilingual in both Spanish and English, said:

> …we have a pretty high percentage of Latino educators bilingual, bicultural educators...
> Some of them are international teachers that arrive to our school with no sociopolitical
> context, no racial context of what's going on in the United States and that has historically
> been a challenge in our school, especially when it comes to trying to integrate you know
> a lot of the critical consciousness or equity or social justice into the program…. The lack
> of knowledge of the socio-political context in the United States...teachers that show up
> with their lens strictly on language acquisition and not necessarily equipped or focused
> on the goals that...the vision that I had talked you know, about before, this vision of... in
> addition to developing bilingual bicultural students, developing students that can reflect
> and act on social inequities both in their lives and the lives of others. So their focus is
> strictly on creating students that will be fully bilingual…without addressing you know,

163

necessarily the issues that are impacting these kids…a bilingual educator does not equate

a critical conscious educator. That is one of the biggest myths that exist, and so... and one

of the biggest obstacles that there is. Because...an educator that doesn't have

sociopolitical knowledge about the issues that are influencing the students and the

families that they're trying to help is an incomplete educator…we see a lot of educators in

dual-language in my school that come in and connect quickly with our powerful

privileged families and students. And despite the fact that they're Latino, they don't

connect with our Latino students and families. Bilingual educators do not equal critically

conscious educators. As soon as we realize that, we're gonna start providing bilingual

educators what they need in order to become critically conscious educators. But as long

as we continue fooling ourselves, thinking that a bilingual educator automatically brings

critical consciousness into the classroom we are not going to move forward.

Ana's comment directly supports prior research that suggests the exact same thing - one

should not assume that "teachers will have sociocultural knowledge or a critical consciousness

simply because of shared identity, cultural group, or languages" (Flores & Clark, 2017, p. 5). Her

comments also connect the large body of research that suggests simply incorporating Spanish

into a traditional, uncritical curricular structure is insufficient if the goal is to create a truly

humanizing, culturally attentive and critical educational space (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008;

Babino & Stewart, 2018; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Diaz et al., 2013; Di Stefano, 2017; Freire,

2020; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; Hood, 2020; García-Mateus &

Palmer, 2017; Palmer et al., 2019). In other words, being a Spanish speaking DLBE educator is

not synonymous with possessing or providing critical perspectives.

While Ana argues that "being bilingual is not enough", some participants began their

DLBE careers without some of what might be seen as expected background for a DLBE

educator. For some, this included educational training and the ability to speak or use Spanish

fluently. Lara said:

> I'd been working in an office, I had a bachelor's degree and they were taking anybody
>
> who had any bachelor's to be a bilingual teacher if you spoke Spanish or any other
>
> language…so I stumbled into that position, um, as a first grade teacher absolutely no
>
> knowledge whatsoever about teaching…and, um, I just kind of winged it and…had to
>
> learn Spanish practically on the fly because I thought I knew Spanish but I really, really
>
> didn't know Spanish the way I needed to. So those first years I was just a mess but I
>
> managed to hold on.

Lara's journey to her current position as DLBE educator with coaching and instructing

responsibilities may sound familiar to some DLBE educators. In fact, elements of her

professional journey reflect my own. It is not uncommon that DLBE educators take a winding

path to their positions. While such a professional beginning might not satisfy scholars who argue

that Spanish ability or use is not anywhere near enough to boast a good DLBE program, Lara's

subsequent comments suggest how a DLBE educator can learn and grow into an ever more

critical role, even without necessarily checking the "bilingual" and "Latinx" boxes. Lara spoke

about her current work by noting that:

> [DLBE] is about social justice…about which voices are heard, which voices are not…we
>
> focused on texts that address disabilities, LGBTQ, Asian Pacific Islander, African
>
> American…a really diverse set of texts, um, by authors that identify as those groups...to
>
> have their voices raised…in such a way that…kids of privilege need to take a step back

and actually learn how to listen and the kids who don't have privilege will have a chance to speak up and share their voices.

As an initially English speaking and white educator, Lara's comments exemplify research that suggests identity, language ability, and criticality are unrelated (Flores & Clark, 2017). Her comments also connect the large body of research that suggests simply incorporating Spanish into a traditional, uncritical curricular structure is insufficient if the goal is to create a truly humanizing, culturally attentive and critical educational space (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Babino & Stewart, 2018; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Diaz et al., 2013; Di Stefano, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; Hood, 2020; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017: Palmer et al., 2019;). Lara exemplifies this by showing that her journey included learning Spanish and also learning what amounts to concepts about critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003), humanizing pedagogy (Salazar, 2013), and critical consciousness (Freire, 1968). Similar to Lara, Brandy's comments highlight the importance of criticality over identity traits, as well as the lack of an automatic relationship between the two. Brandy said:

> I find there are so many interruptions in the school day and because testing is almost exclusively in English it tends to happen that when there's a loss it's in Spanish, right? It's "we are going to put books in the hands of our students for the summer and everybody is going to go get those books that are in English during the Spanish block, because next month is [standardized testing] and we can't be using up English time, right?...I feel like white native English speaking students already see their language and their culture valued around them all the time …it's everywhere right? So then I, if I'm going to fulfill the mission of the school I'm working in I have to somehow... place the most importance on the idea that Spanish, the Spanish language and the English language have the same

166

value... if we are to produce bilingual, biliterate and bicultural students…And I think that

that's hard in an environment where the push is for you to demonstrate your success in

one language only... and where the money that the district is spending is in one language

only, and...so you just have to work harder at it…

Just as Lara was an initially English-speaking white educator, Brandy describes herself as

monolingual and white. Brandy's comments, like Lara's, exemplify research that suggests

identity, language ability, and criticality are unrelated (Flores & Clark, 2017). Her perceived lack

of abilities in the Spanish language are unrelated to her high level of critical reflectiveness and

action. In fact, I wonder if this perceived lack may have heightened her critical awareness. Her

comments also connect the large body of research that suggests simply incorporating Spanish

into a traditional, uncritical curricular structure is insufficient if the goal is to create a truly

humanizing, culturally attentive and critical educational space (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008;

Babino & Stewart, 2018; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Diaz et al., 2013; Di Stefano, 2017; Freire,

2020; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; Hood, 2020; García-Mateus &

Palmer, 2017; Palmer et al., 2019). Brandy exemplifies this by showing that her journey included

accepting the challenge of a DLBE position despite her self-described lack of Spanish, as well

learning what amounts to concepts about critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003), humanizing

pedagogy (Salazar, 2013), and critical consciousness (Freire, 1968) without the benefit of

adequate preservice coursework to prepare her. In fact, she even turned her perceived linguistic

deficit into a critical tool. She said:

…[there are] moments being monolingual is an advantage because [students] will just

laugh if I will say a word wrong so it levels the playing field some because we are all

teachers and we are all learners.

167

In this way, Ana, Lara and Brandy's comments support prior research that identity, language ability, and criticality are unrelated (Flores & Clark, 2017). Similar to Ana, Lara and Brandy, Amee's comments further highlight the importance of criticality over identity traits. Amee said:

> …I do speak another language…I was an English language learner and…I have memories of learning English, of knowing that my parent was not fluent in English, of realizing that English is the language of power in this country, of being a third culture kid, and I think a lot of that translates to the experiences that many of our students have. Yes, and also the feeling of not having my culture, my language, my background represented in books or being misrepresented when I came across it. And sort of like how hard it is to untangle all of that consciously, especially when you're a child…I think starting to talk about the way images affect us, how they make us feel and then questioning what does it means when you don't see that is the start of critical consciousness...and…our kids are growing up in the US and they absorb not only that English is the language of power but they come to absorb through, through many sources including the books they read for pleasure that white middle-class norms are considered both average and ideal. When you look at circulation statistics…the most widely circulated books in English in our elementary library and others, you're going to see the same titles over and over again...any of the Diary of a Wimpy Kid, the Dog Man series, Babysitter's Club - they're also the most popular books in Spanish, the translated ones, that goes regardless of whether the household language is in English or in Spanish. And that's because those kids are growing up here in the US. The cultural background of those popular books are white and middle-class US norms, they don't reflect the diversity of the

US or the world, but this is what kids are absorbing and [we've] got to…acknowledge that this is not the only way and…what are the alternatives. And...[consider] The Baby-Sitters Club and how often babysitting is represented in, in books for kids, how many of our kids come from cultures in which that's a norm? I'd venture to say for most immigrants it is NOT the norm to pay children to babysit unrelated children...but when you kind of swallow that without any kind of critical consciousness, that and a million other things…go to reinforce maybe that one is an outlier if one is not from that…and one is, is you know strange, or different or certainly not ideal.

Unlike Lara and Brandy, Amee was not initially English speaking or a white educator, but rather of a "third" language and culture. She describes herself as having elementary Spanish reading skills, but not being multilingual in Spanish. Still, her comments, like Lara's and Brandy's, exemplify research that suggests identity, language ability, and criticality are not automatically related (Flores & Clark, 2017; Rodriguez-Mojica & Briseño, 2019). Her perceived lack of abilities in the Spanish language are unrelated to her high level of critical reflectiveness and action and may have even contributed to her heightened levels of critical consciousness. Her comments connect the large body of research that suggests simply incorporating Spanish into a traditional, uncritical curricular structure is insufficient if the goal is to create a truly humanizing, culturally attentive and critical educational space (Alfaro, 2019; Alanis and Rodriguez, 2008; Babino & Stewart, 2018; Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017; Diaz et al., 2013; Di Stefano, 2017; Freire, 2020; Freire, 2016; Freire & Feinauer, 2020; Heiman, 2017; Hood, 2020; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Palmer et al., 2019; Valenzuela, 2016). Amee exemplifies this by showing that her journey included learning English, striving to learn to read Spanish at higher levels, and also learning what amounts to concepts about critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003), humanizing

pedagogy (Salazar, 2013), and critical consciousness (Freire, 1968) even without the support of

adequate preservice coursework or professional development to guide her.

When DLBE educators in this study talked about their work in relation to critical

consciousness, it becomes evident that a key element in efforts to enact critical DLBE is the

recognition that language fluency or ethnic identity cannot be thought of as signals of critical

consciousness. In fact, participants remarks show how this false perception in fact inhibits the

critical efforts of a DLBE program, because assumptions are made that staff members of certain

identities and skills possess critical knowledge and practices when they may not. In many cases,

participants' comments highlighted a belief among some stakeholders that possessing the ability

to speak Spanish fluently, and/or coming from a Latinx, Latin American, or similar background,

automatically implied an ability to engage in critical thought and transformative interactions that

characterize a more critical DLBE program. As Ana noted, this misperception is both common

and detrimental to critical DLBE efforts. Participants' comments are tied together by the

implication that administrators of critical DLBE programs should plan to engage staff members

in continuing education that attends to critical consciousness, no matter the language skills listed

on their resume, their place of birth, their identity, or their last names.

The data that gave rise to this theme (*Being Bilingual or Latinx Is Not Synonymous with

Critical Consciousness*) finds footing with prior scholarship on culturally relevant pedagogy in

DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995)

includes as its third tenet an attention to critical or sociopolitical consciousness. It is evident that

educators who are not sufficiently critically conscious themselves are not capable of promoting

critical consciousness in their students. Thus, recognizing the reason that DLBE staff may not yet

possess the knowledge and skills for high levels of critical consciousness, and then addressing

those gaps, can be seen as initial steps in implementing a more culturally relevant education.

While prior research explores intersections between culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and forms of bilingual education (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Alfaro et al., 2014; De La Trinidad, 2015; Freire, 2014; Freire & Valdez, 2017; Kabuto, 2017; Ortiz, 2009; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2017) most focuses on what teachers do or don't do instead of why they may not be able to do it or misperceptions about their skills and knowledge set.

   While the data that gave rise to this theme (*Being Bilingual or Latinx Is Not Synonymous with Critical Consciousness*) may have little connection to culturally responsive pedagogy, it does align with prior scholarship on culturally sustaining pedagogy in DLBE education. As noted in Chapter II, Paris (2012) writes that culturally sustaining pedagogy attends to the "democratic project of schooling" (p. 95), among other things. Attention to language fluency and multiculturalism matters but is not enough. However, to achieve different, better, more just circumstances in our society, DLBE staff must have sufficient knowledge and skill set in critical consciousness in order to challenge the myriad ways that current conditions are supremely undemocratic for the many "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p.121) students whose identity means they are kept at the margins of their citizenship. Stakeholders cannot assume that a set of language skills, a particular identity, or a family background implies that a staff member possesses the knowledge and skills with which to promote critical consciousness in their program. As Ana noted, recognizing this misconception is an important initial step to addressing the problem.

   Taken together, the evidence provided by DLBE educators in this study make it evident that a key element in enacting a critical DLBE program is disrupting the notion that simply being bilingual is sufficient to merit a specific new hire or to categorize a DLBE educator as

sufficiently equipped to promote critical consciousness in an existing program. Similarly, evidence from participants also suggest that, just as "being bilingual is not enough" (Ana), being identified as Latinx is not enough. A particular ethnic and linguistic background is not guarantee that a DLBE educator has the knowledge and tools to be a critical member of the program, and participants' comments both highlight and disrupt this myth. As previously noted, possessing or being assigned an identity is not a guarantee of possessing a critical perspective, as is necessary to enact a critical DLBE program. A DLBE applicant is not necessarily - simply by dint of identity - equipped with the education and tools to deliver the meaningful and transformative curriculum that characterize a more critical DLBE program. Participants' comments are tied together by the problematic nature of making such assumptions, and how disrupting them can make space either for an honest re-assessment of the state of the program, and for authentic and critical education of current DLBE educators. Disrupting such assumptions can also make way for the integration of well-equipped and educated, non-bilingual and non-Latinx DLBE but critical staff.

Conclusion

Evidence from this study yields a number of important themes at the intersection of DLBE and critical consciousness. One theme is that *Humility and a Growth Mindset Are Key Assets* for critical DLBE educators and programs. Those who accept positions in DLBE, and especially those who seek to be more critical, are bound to experience humbling and vulnerable moments again and again and again. Critical DLBE educators must be open to introspection, investigation, correction, and reexamining time after time what they thought they knew to be true. The old notion of being the king or queen of a classroom or the expert or the one who pours knowledge into empty vessels is not compatible with critical DLBE.

172

In fact, this connects with the theme *Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness* in that if a new DLBE educator started their career believing they had been sufficiently and appropriately prepared by their credentialing program, then they may soon find otherwise. In recognizing, accepting, and deciding to address knowledge gaps particularly in areas related to critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003), it can be seen as necessary to possess humility, an ability to deal with vulnerability, and a growth mindset. Moreover, not only should preservice programs address their own failures to prepare critical pedagogues, but they should also examine whether they are equipping their graduates with useful dispositions and thinking about their career journeys. Furthermore, the role of the theme *Collaboration, Communication, And Collegiality are Key* is evident in the sense that no DLBE educator could survive and thrive on the joy and also fully engage in critical efforts without the support of peers, mentors, and other critical stakeholders. It would be a step in the right direction not only to prepare future DLBE educators for critical work, but also prepare them to expect a lifetime of learning instead of seeing their graduation and diploma as an end stop. A critical DLBE educator would serve themselves and their students best if they were to be made aware that their preparation was unlikely to have been sufficient (Patel, 2019) through no fault of their own, and that in part therefore they should consider themselves an eternal teacher-student (Freire, 1968) who has as much to learn as to teach.

A second theme is that *Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key* for critical DLBE educators and programs. Whether it be conversation with a colleague or a team of colleagues, a formal training or a social interaction that turns educational, DLBE educators who strive for criticality must look to peers near and far for support, learning, and inspiration. In addition to peers, DLBE educators can find other important sources of support, learning, and

inspiration, such as from students' parents, community members, and individuals beyond the school gates. Teacher's assistants, librarians, social workers, coaches, specialists, speech and language pathologists, therapists, administrators, family members, community members, and even individuals distant from a DLBE school site all contribute important ways to the critical effort. Neither can "just" the "teacher" enact a critical DLBE program alone, nor should it be expected. This is especially true in light of the theme *Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness*, which suggests that likely no single DLBE educator has been prepared by their credentialing programs to adequately and completely and appropriately to fully enact elements of critical pedagogy (Patel, 2019). Therefore, working together to share workload, knowledge, materials, reflections, successes and disappointments can alleviate the burdens and surprises as DLBE educators encounter moments they were unprepared for and gaps they were unaware of. As Salazar (2013) notes, pursuing critical consciousness and working for a more humanizing education is not only an individual but a group effort. All hands that are connected to the DLBE community must be on deck for the efforts to be most productive and transformative, and bearable for those who do so much work to shoulder the critical efforts of the program.

A third theme is that *Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness*, at least not for critical DLBE educators and programs. Preservice programs may sufficiently prepare their students for the purely academic or technical requirements of their future positions. However, as Patel (2019) noted, they are not preparing DLBE for the critical elements of their work. Students who then become DLBE educators are left to flail and search and strive to find their own sources of critical learning, "drowning" as Ana described it. Furthermore, they often expend significant time and energy in the process or pursuing

knowledge and skills they in some cases had no idea they lacked, until they started their DLBE

jobs. Preservice programs must do better to prepare critical educators, especially since they

already are destined to bear an extra "invisible" workload (Amanti, 2019b) when they begin their

paid work lives. This connect not only to the theme *Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*, but

also the theme *Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key*. In conjunction with

acknowledging that they have not been adequately preparing graduates for the critical nature of

DLBE work, organizers of preservice programs that produce DLBE educators should examine

the beliefs and practices they promote as they relate to collaboration and cooperation. Not only

should they work to remodel coursework to focus on concepts related to critical pedagogy

(Darder, 2003), humanizing pedagogy (Salazar, 2013) culturally sensitive pedagogies discussed

in this study (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002, Paris, 2012). Preservice program organizers

ought to examine their curriculum to ensure they are instilling both an expectation to and

appreciation of consistent collaboration between DLBE educators and not only their direct

colleagues, but also role-alike peers near and far as well as community and family members

connected to the school. By taking such a multipronged approach, future DLBE graduates may

suffer less new-teacher shock, be able to persist through it more easily, and acquire the skills and

support they need to fully engage as critical DLBE pedagogues bringing critical consciousness to

their classroom, school, and wider community.

A fourth theme is that critical *DLBE Should Be About So Much More Than Just*
Language Acquisition. In fact, "dual language bilingual education" can be seen as an incomplete

and misleading sobriquet. Language matters, but it is only one of several important pieces of a

critical DLBE program. Language by itself is like a disembodied head. Language must be used

with curriculum, and that curriculum must be examined and transformed in order to be critical

and not simply reify existing social maladies (Palmer et al., 2019). A DLBE program cannot reach its social justice potential if stakeholders are thinking primarily and narrowly about language proficiency and academic achievement.

A fifth theme is that *Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price* for their efforts. They must spend more time and energy in all aspects of their work, from curriculum writing to materials selection/creation to translation. And this "extra" requirement is not just suffered in the first or second year of a DLBE position, but day after day, year after year. From continuous translation of all things to continuous search for representative and appropriate texts, the extra burdens on the critical DLBE educator are continuous, significant, and often unacknowledged (Amanti, 2019b). In addition, the extra workload connects to the theme of *Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness* in the sense that when well-intentioned educators start their paid work lives and then realize that they have knowledge gaps, they may seek to fill these gaps by spending their own time and money to pursue continuing education - likely an extra burden they had not expected to shoulder given they likely assumed they were properly prepared by their credentialing program. The teacher storage, and in particular the shortage of qualified educators who are prepared to work in DLBE settings (Amanti, 2019a), should lead DLBE stakeholders to question the workloads of DLBE educators and the assumption that they will just continue to power through and power on under these conditions. The working conditions and the invisibility of those conditions mean that we should be more surprised that as many educators dedicate themselves to working in DLBE as do. While working conditions remain the same, likely so will these shortages.

A sixth theme is that *[Standardized] Testing Constrains Critical Consciousness*, at least in a program that seeks to be critical. In some cases, this occurs because language of instruction -

176

always Spanish - is sacrificed on the altar of test preparation - always in English. In other cases, this is because testing is doubled, as district mandated literacy assessments are conducted several times a year in both languages for DLBE programs. Not only can this lead to lost instructional time, but it can also chip away at the status of Spanish and the DLBE mission to elevate it and the cultures associated with it. It also contributes to the extra burdens of DLBE teachers, for whom double the work is expected at certain testing times and for whom switching back and forth between languages of instruction is expected and often invisible extra workload. Furthermore, testing practices are connected to the themes of *A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough*; Testing is often connected to state, federal, or district funding. It is also connected to program prestige, or to recruitment and enrollment in that test results are often used as cudgels - or carrots - for students, staff, or community members to behave in a certain way or adhere to a certain practice. Failure to question or challenge the power and practices related to testing represents an impediment to the pursuit of higher levels of critical consciousness. Testing practices and mandates interrupt and curtail the critical activities that make a DLBE program transformative (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008; Palmer et al., 2016), and where testing practices and mandates receive priority, critical consciousness and its transformative power to changes the lives of emergent bilingual or otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p.121) students are diluted.

A seventh theme is that *A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough*, at least, not enough to raise or promote critical consciousness. To be critical, the program must encompass more than language and more than language plus academics. It must also do more than consider, advocate for, and teach for critical consciousness within the four walls of the DLBE classroom, because the systems of power that influence the world outside the

classroom can on a moment's notice upend all the work that critical DLBE curriculum and educators worked so hard to bring to students (Palmer et al., 2016). This means that critical DLBE stakeholders must consider systems of power that define life in our place and time, not only narrowly consider the school and those physically present. This also calls into play the theme *Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price* and the invisible extra workload of the critical DLBE teacher, for whom there are some may more considerations, duties, and demands than on the traditional, monolingual, non DLBE educator. This extra work goes beyond the constant translating and the smaller scale of the DLBE school setting, it extends to the large scale thinking around systems outside the school, historical context, and questions of racial and ethnic dynamics. Critical DLBE programs must consider, examine, challenge and disrupt large-scale power dynamics that influence students', staff, and community members' lives outside the school if critical consciousness efforts are to meet with a larger degree of success.

And finally, but not least importantly, the eighth theme is that *Being Bilingual or Latinx Is Not Synonymous with Critical Consciousness*. In other words, the possession of certain language proficiency or heritage, by themselves, do not equate to being an authentically critical DLBE educator. Language proficiency of an educator is not automatically connected to their potential possession of skills and knowledge around critical consciousness. Similarly, a DLBE educator being Latinx is not enough either - by itself - to be a critically conscious DLBE educator. Language ability, identity, heritage and a background in critical consciousness are unrelated and stakeholders should not assume that "teachers will have sociocultural knowledge or a critical consciousness simply because of shared identity, cultural group, or languages" (Flores & Clark, 2017, p. 5). Furthermore, the assumption that those things are automatically related is detrimental not only to the DLBE students who may not receive the benefits of a

178

critical educator capable of enacting a critical pedagogy (Darder, 2003), but the well-intentioned educators who don't know what they don't know and carry on without that critical knowledge and skills. Where educators do realize they may have a knowledge gap and seek to fill it, the invisible extra workload of DLBE educators as well as the failure of preservice programs to adequately prepare them in concepts connected to critical pedagogy comes into play. It can no longer be acceptable that to be a critical DLBE educator means to consistently and generously spend more time, energy, and money than non DLBE educators.

Taken together, the findings from this study converge in myriad ways, and diverge in none. The need for critical DLBE educators to harbor a willingness to learn, be vulnerable, and grow leads in part to the need for them to collaborate consistently with peers and other stakeholders. The need for them to collaborate consistently with peers and other stakeholders stems in part from the reality that most preservice programs are not adequately preparing their graduates for critical educational work. The reality that most preservice programs are not adequately preparing their graduates for critical educational work leads in part to the burdens of invisible extra work for the critical DLBE educator. The burdens of invisible extra work for the critical DLBE educator stem in part from the likelihood that they were likely insufficiently prepared for elements of their DLBE job that were outside the narrow scope of language acquisition or academics. The likelihood that DLBE educators were likely insufficiently prepared for elements of their DLBE job that were outside the narrow scope of language acquisition or academics stems in part from the emphasis placed on achievement testing in English and the impact of decisions made to accommodate standardized testing practices in English. The emphasis placed on achievement testing in English and the impact of decisions made to accommodate standardized testing practices in English represent one of the elements of systems

179

of power that influence the lives of DLBE stakeholders and a reason why it is so important for critical DLBE educators to consider and examine systems of power. Ways in which systems of power influence the lives of DLBE stakeholders is one reason why it is so important that stakeholders recognize that simply possessing a certain combination of heritage, identity, or language skills is not equivalent to being critically conscious - that being bilingual alone does not a critical DLBE educator make. And because "being bilingual is not enough" (Ana), and because many well intentioned and enthusiastic DLBE educators were insufficiently prepared for the critical elements of their job, and because there are so many elements to enacting critical work in DLBE, and because there is so much work, critical DLBE educators need to be prepared and willing to to learn, be vulnerable, and grow in collaboration with other DLBE stakeholders. All of the issues that have emerged in the data in this study represent key organs of the same body. Addressing the health and state of one invariably is linked to the health and state of another, and all must be considered and addressed to improve the health of the whole.

In this chapter, I presented findings from my study, which was designed to gain insight into how DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual or by other related terms. Using the data from a focus group interview, individual interviews, and artifacts, I discussed and analyzed the data in sections organized according to eight themes. Finally, I concluded the chapter by highlighting ways that themes converge, diverge, and meaning to be gleaned from those relationships. In the next chapter, I address ways in which the data lend insight into the three research questions that guided this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated three broad research questions seeking insight into DLBE educators understand and enact critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of students sometimes labeled as emergent bilingual. In this chapter, I discuss the findings of this study. Then I lay out the implications of my study's findings for practice and further research. Then, I make a call to action at the conclusion of this chapter.

The evidence is overwhelming that students often labeled as emergent bilingual, or by other related terms, need - have long needed - something from their formal school experience that they have not been getting in order to be successful in formal education (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Fry, 2003; Hodges et al., 2018; Kerper Mora, 2002; Olivos & Quintana de Valladolid, 2005; Samson & Collins, 2012; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Valenzuela, 2005; Young et al., 2012). Some more recent scholarship (Castro-Olivo, 2014; O'Neal, 2018; O'Neal et al., 2018) examines the relationships between social and academic elements of emergent bilingual students' educational experience and suggests that simply attending bilingual programming- even the much-hailed dual language model - is not a cure-all for the ills such students face in U.S. schools. Something deeper is needed for emergent bilingual students to gain educational parity and to have a truly additive school experience. According to Palmer et al. (2019), critical consciousness is closely linked to culturally relevant, responsive, and sustaining approaches and

humanizing pedagogy. Yet, according to Cervantes-Soon (2014) there is not enough research exploring critical consciousness as it is embodied by DLBE teachers.

This study responds to this call through its investigation of critical consciousness framed by three research questions seeking insight into how DLBE educators understand, enact, and acquire critical consciousness in their work, particularly in relation to a subset of students sometimes labeled emergent bilingual. The following discussion synthesizes findings discussed in Chapter IV, discusses the ways these findings lend insight into my research questions, and more broadly critical consciousness.

How DLBE Educators Understand Critical Consciousness

As noted in Chapter II, there are varying definitions of critical consciousness (Freire, 1974; Godfrey & Burson, 2018). Yet, there is very little research exploring how teachers understand critical consciousness. My first research question "How do DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting?" sought to gain some insight into how teachers, DLBE teachers specifically, make meaning of the term critical consciousness and the constellation of meanings the concept entails. In this section, data related to the themes of *Being Bilingual or Latinx Is Not Synonymous with Critical Consciousness*, *Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*, *Communication, Collaboration, and Collegiality are Key,* and *DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition* resonated most generatively with this research question. It is important to note that one of the most enduring finding related to how participants understand critical consciousness was the degree to which understanding critical consciousness became, in this study, collapsed with data regarding the enactment of critical consciousness. Focus group and interview data indicate that these participants understand critical consciousness as action as opposed to beliefs. Throughout

the study, the difference between understanding and enacting critical consciousness through DLBE work was consistently difficult to distinguish, and in some cases the two seemed inseparable. Most participants stated or implied that they enact, try to enact, want to enact, and strive to enact what they understand to be practices that promote critical consciousness in the program. Teasing out what represented an understanding, versus an operationalization, of critical consciousness proved extremely tricky. Dividing the data by how participants understand critical consciousness to be part of their work and how they enact these ideas became one of the biggest challenges of the analysis process. On one hand, this muddled my analysis somewhat. For example, some of the data in this section may fit equally well into the section dedicated to exploring how teachers enact critical consciousness in their work. On the other hand, it enriched my understanding of critical consciousness as praxis through which critical consciousness becomes a concept best defined through action (Darder, 2017). Drawing from my findings, DBLE participants understood critical consciousness as a praxis that is collective, ongoing, and connected to, but also irreducible to, identity, culture, language, and its acquisition.

A Collective Endeavor

Notably, participants in this study understood critical consciousness in their work to represent a collective endeavor. For example, Dannie commented on the importance of "rowing the same direction" as a DLBE staff. Several participants noted the importance of working together, either on teams or with other individuals, in working for critical consciousness, saying in various ways that critical consciousness is not found in isolation. This finding finds footing in Freirean (1968) notions of the importance of dialogue in critical consciousness, as well as Darder's (2003) reference to the importance thereof in critical pedagogy.

The findings of this study also lend fresh insight into the importance of dialogue in critical consciousness in DLBE settings, contributing to the literature on critical consciousness in DLBE in suggesting that a variety of dialogue partners and contexts are key elements of educators' understanding critical consciousness in that setting. As Salazar (2013) writes, "the journey for humanization is an individual and collective endeavor toward critical consciousness" (p. 128). If participants' understanding of critical consciousness is that of a collective endeavor, then by Salazar's definition they may also be seen as engaging in that element of humanizing pedagogy. This study extends existing research because in this case participants are demonstrating the perceptions of critical consciousness specifically in DLBE.

Moreover, not only do participants' comments suggest that their understanding of critical consciousness involves the collective, it suggests they also prioritize it over individual reflection. Based on participants responses, critical consciousness does not dwell in a single or several staff members who have some understanding of critical consciousness. Participants lingered on situations in which they were reflecting in conjunction with others, and much less on situations in which they reflected alone. The most notable example of extensive individual reflection stems from Amee, who recounted insights from her othering experiences as a "third culture" person. Still, Amee also recounted her "epiphany" about the importance of not getting "siloed" at work. Thus, it seems DLBE educators in this study mainly understand critical consciousness to dwell in the entire set of puzzle pieces [the staff] that make up a DLBE program and when these are in harmony, working together from the same understandings of critical consciousness and its value.

A Never-ending Journey

Perhaps just as significantly, participants in this study understood critical consciousness in their work to represent a continuous, ongoing endeavor instead of an endpoint or a destination.

This was particularly born out when participants discussed how they came to their understandings of critical consciousness, how their preparation programs had not prepared them in this area, and how much they realized they had to learn since beginning DLBE work. For example, Brandy commented on the experience of frequently realizing how much she did not know and had to learn, which sometimes made her feel that she "suck[ed] as a human." In fact, she reflected that the learning involved in being a critically consciousness DLBE educator will "never end". Ana talked about her ongoing learning through organizations and mentors as an endeavor that has spanned years and continues to this day. Amee, Dannie, Lara, Toni, and Esmeralda also all noted the multitude of ways they consistently pursue the development of their critical consciousness over the years. It bears noting most participants were educators with over a decade of educational experience (if not two or more), and in some cases had decades of specifically DLBE educational experience. Still, they noted their ongoing learning in relation to critical consciousness; the journey goes on.

This finding finds footing in Freirean (1968) notions of critical consciousness as cyclical. In Freire's (1968) conceptualization, critical reflection and action occur as a cycle, not a fixed or linear progression in which critical educators are someday "done" with the work. In fact, Salazar (2013) also writes about the "the journey" (p. 128) of critical consciousness and its link to humanization. The findings of this study align with this literature, but also lend insight into critical consciousness in DLBE settings by highlighting that participants in this study understand critical consciousness in DLBE settings also as an ongoing praxis of cyclically becoming critically conscious DBLE teachers.

185

Irreducible

Notably, most participants in this study understood critical consciousness in DLBE as irreducible to ethnic heritage or language skill. They understood critical consciousness in their work as unrelated to background such as preparation in academic content knowledge, classroom management, or other skills. They understood critical consciousness to be not a product or a skill that could be demonstrated through a certificate or degree, but as a continually developing skill that they strive continually to advance. For example, Ana forcefully and repeatedly stated that "being bilingual is not enough," giving several examples in which she had perceived Spanish-speaking educators demonstrated a lack of critical consciousness. Amee, bilingual but by her own description not fully so in Spanish, noted that nonetheless she could empathize with and find ways to represent the experiences of students who felt like "third culture kids"; she worked just as hard to find ways to [appropriately] represent students of all languages and identities. Brandy noted that her monolingualism at times represented a way for her emergent bilingual students to take the reins of a small group lesson and teach her using their language expertise in Spanish, centering and celebrating their identities.

Participants' understanding of critical consciousness can be seen to connect with the Freirean (1968) notion that lack of formal literacy (written or otherwise) is no sign of inability to develop critical consciousness. This study's findings contribute insight into how participants understand critical consciousness as related to identity traits or skills, but not reducible to them. It also contributes to our understanding of how DLBE educators understand the intersection of critical consciousness and DLBE endeavors: they see it as more than using a particular language. For example, when Lara talked about the bilingual poetry of her students, she focused most on the ways it helped students internalize their worth, not on the language they used to express

186

themselves. Furthermore, findings of this study problematize the notion that being bilingual necessarily means a DLBE educator is more critically conscious and therefore better prepared to challenge an unjust status quo. For example, Ana noted that bilingual and/or Latinx educators new to her school frequently lack important sociopolitical knowledge or "connect" quickly with white families. In the same fashion, this also suggests that we must problematize the notion that being monolingual necessarily means a DLBE educator is less critically conscious and therefore less able to challenge an unjust status quo. Most especially, findings of this study suggest that DLBE educators themselves must understand this complicated reality and consider carefully their understanding of their own critical consciousness, independent of any language, culture, other identity categories they identify with. Finally, the findings of this study serve to extend what is currently scant literature on how DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in relation to their work.

More Than Language Acquisition

As expected, DLBE educators have diverse understandings of what critical consciousness means in their professional context. Based on what they shared, DLBE educators in this study understood critical consciousness in DLBE as implying that the program should attend to much more than simply language proficiency or acquisition. Rather, they understood critical consciousness in DLBE as going beyond the narrow understanding of such programming as a "language program". For one participant, it was apparent that the existence of a DLBE program in and of itself represented at least a step towards critical consciousness because DLBE attended to not only language acquisition, but societal inequities. Lara commented that DLBE design resulted in two populations of students, minoritized and privileged, attending class together instead being segregated into separate classrooms as in other programs. She also was drawn to

187

the potential for students to build friendships with other students very different from each other, instead of setting up circumstances that in her experience lead to linguistically and culturally diverse students being isolated or "pushed around" by monolingual students. Dannie shared, above all and almost to the exclusion of other elements of the school day, moments of dialogue, reflection, and change in her classroom. Ana noted that she focused on "teaching humanity" more than content or language. These educators understood critical consciousness as being defined by more than language acquisition and content instruction.

This study also contributes to the literature (Freire, 1968; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019) on critical consciousness in several ways. One is to show how DLBE educators understand critical consciousness to be something that is not manifested through simply teaching language or content. Participants in this study do not understand critical consciousness to be inherent in just teaching "native Spanish speakers" in Spanish. Rather, participants in this study seem to see teaching language or content as a potential vehicle for development of critical consciousness.

Much like the discussion above regarding critical consciousness in DBLE settings as related to identity, culture, and language, yet not reduced to it, participants in this study understood critical consciousness as related to student background, but not reduced to it. For some participants in this study, critical consciousness in DLBE seemed to be understood as not just teaching students in Spanish, in English, or teaching them proficiency in any content area. Rather, they understood critical consciousness as knowing their students well and taking their backgrounds into account. Based on their comments, critical DLBE educators in this study understood this to be especially true of their students of minoritized or "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) background. For example, Esmeralda noted the importance of understanding her

188

students' backgrounds and offering extra support to certain students she felt needed it. Amee noted how she considered the needs of underrepresented and misrepresented students in seeking out literature to offer them. Brandy talked about getting to know families of her students and their immigration stories.

My findings contribute to our understandings of critical consciousness in the sense that participants' comments suggest that critical consciousness entails educators knowing their students and understanding (or at least trying to) the complexity of their lives outside as well as inside school. Furthermore, this study lends insight in critical consciousness in DLBE: in the DLBE context, critical consciousness may not be able to exist without thorough knowledge and understanding of, specifically, minoritized students and their lives. For example, Brandy noted the impact it had on her to hear a student's family member recount how she crossed the border and was separated for months from her child. Brandy lingered on this information and how it impacted her thinking and critical consciousness more specifically.

DLBE educators in this study understand critical consciousness as a never-ending journey and ongoing process instead of a destination or skill that can be verified by a certification. They further understand critical consciousness to be a process of development that involves dialogue, interaction, and collaboration with not only direct colleagues but also members of the community, especially community members whose perspectives and experiences have historically not been centered or valued. DLBE educators in this study also understand critical consciousness to be independent of identity traits, such as heritage, or skills, such as linguistic proficiency. However, they do understand critical consciousness on their part to mean that they learn about and reflect on their students' backgrounds and take information about them into consideration when they carry out their DLBE work. The findings of this study contribute to

our understanding of how DLBE educators understand critical consciousness in their work in that they provide examples of how such educators may define critical consciousness for themselves: as a never-ending process that is not necessarily dependent on their own background or skill, as a collective journey they embark upon with partners in thought, and as a process that does center consideration of their students' backgrounds. This lends insight into what DLBE educators might understand as by efforts to center critical consciousness as "pillar" of DLBE (Palmer et al., 2019).

How DLBE Educators Enact Critical Consciousness

The second research question was: How do DLBE educators enact critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting? To answer this question, data from the themes *Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key, A DLBE Program That Doesn't Examine Systems of Power Is Not Enough, Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price*, and *DLBE Should Be About Much More Than Just Language Acquisition* were especially useful. As discussed in the previous section, it is evident from focus group and interview data that participants understand critical consciousness to a large extent as praxis, as reflection enacted through pedagogy, with a profound emphasis on the latter. Across data sources and participants, there was a distinct emphasis on critical action instead of critical reflection inherent in the definition of critical consciousness. Findings from data related to participants' enactment of critical conscious in DLBE revealed that critical consciousness was enacted by DBLE in a variety of ways linked by the goal of serving - above all although not to the exclusion of others - emergent bilingual or otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) students. For some participants, enacting critical consciousness meant going above and beyond the historical understanding of a "bilingual education program". To them, enacting critical

consciousness in DLBE meant not just teaching students in Spanish, in English, or teaching them linguistic proficiency in both. Rather, participants saw critical consciousness in enacting specific dispositions or practices, particularly ones that considered students on the periphery of power in some way. For example, Dannie described her practice of having students themselves take the reins to create classroom seating plans that served each other's varying needs and preferences. Lara described the effort to have every single student in their DLBE program prepare and present a poem, in either language, about why they, the individual child, matters. Brandy described encouraging students to teach her Spanish as she taught them English. Several participants noted their constant search for materials that were both academically appropriate but also critically reflective. This aligns with the Freirean (1968) notion that critical consciousness action means a certain kind of reflection in action must be taken to correct unfair conditions, in this case, students who are struggling or marginalized ought to receive needed attention, thought, or support from the teacher. Participants describe how they act on their reflections, and thus they can be seen completing a critical consciousness cycle by engaging in action to improve conditions they perceive as problematic. These findings lend insight into how DLBE educators embody critical consciousness in their specific context.

Findings related to the ways in which teachers enact critical consciousness lend insight into the potential of culturally attentive pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002; Paris, 2012) to represent enactments of critical consciousness in DLBE. Given that critical consciousness is a tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy, participants' reflecting on students' background and circumstances and then acting in ways to support them can be seen as a culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and critically conscious pedagogical move. Furthermore, knowing student cultural background and changing one's teaching in response

191

aligns with culturally responsive (Gay, 2002) pedagogy, and can also be seen as enactment of critical conscious. Finally, since empowering culturally and linguistically diverse students is a tenet of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), one can view culturally sustaining pedagogical moves as simultaneously critically conscious actions. At the same time, the degree to which engaging in or adopting a practice qualifies as culturally attentive in some fashion depends on the same set of circumstances as the assessment of practices as critically consciousness. There is no single list of practices or dispositions that can be unequivocally categorized as culturally relevant, culturally responsive, culturally sustaining, nor critically conscious without knowing and critically reflecting on all the sociopolitical factors just mentioned. Unfortunately, enacting critical consciousness is not straightforward. If it were, Cervantes-Soon (2014) would not have had to make her call to action.

Updating Practices

For some participants in this study, enacting critical consciousness in DLBE meant not just teaching students in Spanish, in English, or teaching them linguistic proficiency. Rather, they do all these things, and more. It also meant more than using a checklist of practices with their students. They enacted critical consciousness by, in addition to other actions, updating understanding and pedagogy with the newest understandings of best practices. Significantly, there is no single list or set of practices to be updated; the key is in the educator's renewal and seeking of new knowledge, and openness to this process as a continuous and never-ending task. Esmeralda noted the importance of never adhering permanently to any single list of best practices and being prepared to keep learning. Brandy noted that she found it necessary to accept that she would always be learning, and that though she may have had many years of experience and training that she will never be done with learning. Several others recounted working in teams

long term to revise curriculum. This aligns with the Freirean (1968) notion of teacher-student who are not seen as exempt from learning and growth but rather experience it in tandem with student-teachers. In this model there is no master expert who pours a copycat package of knowledge – unidirectionally - into the empty vessel minds of the receiver. By updating understanding and pedagogy, continuously and with no expectation that this task will end one day, these DLBE educators engage simultaneously in the critical action portion, and the reflection portion, of the definition critical consciousness.

This finding related to the ways in which DBLE educators enact critical consciousness and helps flesh out literature on critical consciousness (Freire, 1968/1974; Godfrey & Burson, 2018; Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2019) which provides a rich discussion on critical consciousness as a concept, but stops short of exploring the way it is lived out by DLBE educators. Participants' insistence that enacting critical consciousness entails a renewal of one's understanding and practices on a consistent basis, and accepting that this is ongoing, fits both the reflection and the action portions of the definition of critical consciousness, which is also at the heart of humanizing pedagogy. Participants in this study described enacting critical consciousness through reflection in action. For example, Amee described how her considerations led her to select student literature with extreme care, Brandy shared how her reflections on her language ability led her to invite students to use their full linguistic repertoire with her during small group lessons, and Lara recounted how her reflections about transitional bilingual programming led her to turn to DLBE instead. By doing so, educators accept their own humanity and fallibility, take responsibility to act by valuing their students' humanity sufficiently to make the effort to seek new learning, and thereby provide students with the best, most equitable educational experiences.

The findings from the data related to enacting critical consciousness not only reflect but contribute to an understanding of intersections of critical consciousness and humanizing pedagogy (Palmer et al. 2019; Salazar, 2013) in DLBE. If longstanding practices, such as a traditional education, have robbed students of their humanity, then it stands to reason that DLBE stakeholders can potentially begin to return these students' humanity through the antithesis to traditional monolingual models - DLBE programming (and not simply "bilingual education" such as transitional programs.). Going a step further, the way participants understand the value of centering and making visible historically marginalized students' ethnicity in DLBE can be seen as critical consciousness embodied with and through elements of humanizing pedagogy. Given that DLBE programs in this study are constructed between English and a non-English partner language and culture(s), and the integration of students who identify with either or both of those languages and cultures, then critically conscious DLBE educators could be seen as supporting, extending, and/or institutionalizing an embodied form of humanizing pedagogy. It is important to note, however, that simply establishing a DLBE program cannot automatically be seen as the most fully embodied version of humanizing pedagogy. It must reflect critical consciousness, and this only results from intentionality (thus the "critical reflection" portion of the definition of this term). There are degrees to which a DLBE program may make visible and value its historically devalued and invisible students, their language(s), and their culture(s) – or fail to do so. It is crucial that DLBE stakeholders remain consistently vigilant, reflective, and critical regarding their programming, and not fall into the trap of believing their programming is humanizing enough simply by virtue of bearing the title "DLBE".

This study also extends our understanding of DLBE as a potential manifestation of the critical consciousness element in culturally relevant pedagogy. The third tenet of culturally

194

relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) is that it promotes critical consciousness: if we understand the elimination of unjust or subtractive circumstances and programs in favor of the establishment of more just and additive circumstances and programs, then we can understand the establishment of new DLBE programs or the support of existing DLBE (instead of transitional or monolingual programs) as a potentially [more] critical and also culturally relevant pedagogical move than if we were to fail or decline to support such programming.

Providing Equitable Attention and Opportunities

For some participants, enacting critical consciousness in DLBE meant not just teaching students content areas, or Spanish, or English, or updating their practices. Instead, they enacted critical consciousness in treating students of all identities with the same attentiveness in an attempt to make up for opportunities not previously received by certain students. Crucially, although the language participants used was that of "same" opportunities, the impression that participants' comments left me with was on of wanting to enact equity more than equality. For example, Lara described the effort to have every single student in their DLBE program have the same opportunities for expression through art by preparing and presenting a poem, in either language, about why they, the individual child, matters. Notably, the example she recounted was of a Spanish-language poetry performance. Brandy described wanting to elevate Spanish and Spanish speaking students such that they felt on the same level as English and English speakers. This emphasis on providing opportunities to center and celebrate identity and cultural wealth of those who have historically enjoyed the least such benefits lends important insight into thinking about how DBLE teachers embody critical consciousness in their work.

This study contributes to existing literature on critical consciousness, and especially how educators enact it in DLBE. The interpretation of the provision of equitable opportunity as

enactment of critical consciousness shows concretely how disruption of societal injustice can be undertaken: give those who have not had what they have not had. Similarly, the notion of providing the same attention and opportunity to all students, "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) and non-hyphenated alike, can be seen as having a relationship with the culturally attentive pedagogies discussed in this study. Since critical consciousness is a tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), providing all students of marginalized identities with the equitable attention and opportunities as compared to students of privileged can be seen as a both culturally relevant and critically conscious move. Furthermore, as empowering culturally and linguistically diverse students is a tenet of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), one can cast the provision of all students of marginalized identities with the equitable attention and opportunities as a simultaneously culturally sustaining and critically conscious pedagogical move. In this sense, the enactment of critical consciousness in DLBE through providing equitable opportunity to marginalized students can also be seen as culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and sustaining (Paris, 2012).

Empowering "Hyphenated" Community Members

Moreover, some DLBE educators in this study enact critical consciousness by examining, challenging, and disrupting the status quo by striving to empower "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) community members whose perspectives and experiences have historically not been centered or valued as well as integrate their stories and perspectives into the curriculum. For example, Ana talked about creating an external program that integrated emergent bilingual or "native Spanish speaking" students and their families into a group that together explored socioemotional and sociopolitical topics over a period of years. Toni described translating instructions into Spanish and showing parents how to take certain elements of their students'

196

therapy into their own hands. Brandy described learning from parents who were different from her, for example by reading about their immigration experiences. This conceptualization can be seen as aligning with the Freirean (1968) notions of education, which organize the learners and instructor in such a democratic manner that even the words used to describe them imply both roles (student-teacher and teacher-student). It also aligns with Freirean notions of what it means to be a teacher-student and a student-teacher, engaging in dialogue on equal footing with each other. By doing what they do, these DLBE educators engage not just the critical reflection portion, but also the action portion, of the definition critical consciousness.

This study contributes to existing literature on critical consciousness, and especially how educators enact it in DLBE. The notion of empowering marginalized families aligns closely with the notion of humanizing pedagogy as described by Salazar (2013). But the findings of this study also extend our understanding of the link between critical consciousness and humanizing pedagogy. Salazar argues that "the journey for humanization is an individual and collective endeavor toward critical consciousness" which can facilitate "liberation for all (Salazar, 2013, p. 128). Notably, Ana described herself as "teaching humanity" as she also leads a Latinx student and family advocacy group in her spare time. Empowering the students and families of emergent bilingual or otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, 121) students can be seen as both a manifestation of critical consciousness and simultaneously humanizing pedagogy. Furthermore, if making students identity and ethnicity invisible is the essence of dehumanization, then highlighting their identity and ethnicity through integrating the families into school life can be seen as an element of humanization.

In addition, given that teaching in ways that are relevant to students' lives is a tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), establishing connections and dialogue

with students' families can be seen as a potentially [more] culturally relevant pedagogical move. Furthermore, because empowering culturally and linguistically diverse students is a tenet of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), one can cast the application of a DLBE educator's time and energy amongst all students in a "same" fashion (as opposed to less time and energy directed toward those of marginalized languages and culture) as a potentially culturally sustaining pedagogical move. On the other hand, knowing student cultural background and using it as a teaching tool to improve their educational experience is the hallmark of culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2002), and the notion of treating all students the same does not seem to align with the idea of drawing on their culture(s) to enhance their education. In this sense, understandings of critical consciousness in DLBE as "same" treatment of all students does not seem to fit the notion of culturally responsive pedagogy. As with other topics, I wish I had probed this particular point further. And as I noted previously, interviewees gave me much more of their time than expected, in many cases two hours and longer. We spoke to the point of exhaustion, and so if I could go back in time with the knowledge I have now, I might have planned for a third interview.

Involving "Hyphenated" Community Members

Some participants felt that they enact critical consciousness in DLBE by reaching out to, including, and drawing upon members of the community to enrich and diversify students' DLBE experience in some fashion. Amee noted the important role of community members, in particular authors and bookstore owners, in events at the school that centered the stories of non-white people and elicited a strongly positive reaction from some non-white students who participated. Ana described the ways in which she reached out to people outside the school in order to integrate their knowledge and influence into her after-school community group, in particular, a

Latina Supreme Court Justice. Dannie shared ways that families, especially those traditionally

marginalized, were being invited to school and involved in certain events. This notion aligns

with Freirean notions of critical consciousness in education in the sense of taking action in the

face of unjust circumstances (Freire, 1968): critical DLBE educators who note an educational

gap, or a space in their program, that could be meaningfully filled by the wisdom and

contribution of external teacher-students can be seen as acting critically to correct an injustice.

This is especially true if they draw on members of the community who reflect the identities,

stories, values and ethnicities of their emergent bilingual or otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar,

2013, p. 121) or emergent bilingual students or if the actions they take are in response to the

needs of their emergent bilingual or otherwise "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p.121) students.

An alignment can be seen between the notion of reaching out to the broader community and a

humanizing education, especially as Salazar (2013) describes it. She argued that a humanizing

education includes not only the full development and liberation of the student/person, but also is

"an individual and collective endeavor toward critical consciousness" (Salazar, 2013, p. 128).

There can be no more full definition of a collective endeavor than one that draws on the full

range of community members and wealth. The alignment between these notions is most tight if

the community members who are called upon to participate in and contribute to elements of the

DLBE program are furthermore in philosophical alignment with the goal of liberation,

humanization, and critical action to right historical wrongs. It is crucial that DLBE staff and

other stakeholders consider who from the broader community is being invited to participate in

and contribute to the program, in what ways they do so, and what values, stories, cultures,

languages, and identities they reflect, support, value, and make visible with their participation

and contribution. As Ana's observations about the issue of privileged families dominating a

DLBE program suggest, an effort to bring in members of the community could turn into a parade of privileged in ways that underscore and reinforce, instead of challenge and disrupt, "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p.121) students' marginalization and invisibility.

Depending upon the ways in which community members draw on culture to help students access learning, reaching out to, including, and drawing upon members of the community to enrich and diversify students' DLBE experience could also be seen as a potentially [more] culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995), culturally responsive (Gay, 2002), or culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012) move. It would be key that community members know deeply the cultural backgrounds of the students they are speaking to and working with, especially students who are emergent bilingual or "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) in some way. Furthermore, they would have to be actively working to correct injustices they have deeply reflected upon in order for their efforts to be more critical and culturally relevant. Finally, given that a tenet of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012) is not only the maintenance of cultural and linguistic heritage, but the promotion of a more democratic society, the inclusion of various community members in DLBE education can be seen as potentially [more] culturally sustaining. This would of course depend on how such individuals would treat cultural, linguistic, and other issues. All this means that DLBE educators, administrators, and community members would do well to rethink who is responsible for "teaching the kids", who "the teachers" might be, and what is "worth teaching". A far more fluid and open school environment, one in which community members, educators, and students interact and communicate in regular and meaningful ways, could become a valid School Improvement Goal and goal of the next curricular revision session.

Rethinking Vocabulary

Some participants enact critical consciousness in DLBE by re-examining and revising vocabulary historically used in instruction. Dannie noted that she and her colleagues engaged in research and discussion with others and with students in order to select the most appropriate and respectful terms with which to identify or describe certain groups of people. Amee noted ways in which Spanish language children's publishing industry standards sometimes lead to stereotypical and outdated portrayals of marginalized peoples, and how she tries to avoid such literature. This aligns with the Freirean notion of teacher-students who, instead of being infallible master possessors of official knowledge, are reflective critical thinkers who challenge unjust circumstances they observe around them.

The data from participants that relates to enactment of critical consciousness also contributes to existing literature on educators operationalize critical consciousness, and especially in DLBE. Participants comments reveal how they enact critical consciousness in their setting, thereby making concrete Freire's ideals about challenging unjust conditions. This study also illuminates interactions between critical consciousness, DLBE and culturally relevant pedagogy. Given that critical consciousness is a tenet of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), understanding oneself - and helping students understand - that terminology used to describe people matters significantly, that it can be used inappropriately or appropriately, and must be reflected upon and revised can be seen as a culturally relevant pedagogical move. In addition, given that empowering culturally and linguistically diverse students is a tenet of culturally sustaining pedagogy, one can interpret the DLBE educator's attention to the terms used to describe especially groups of marginalized people who have been described inaccurately or negatively as a potentially culturally sustaining pedagogical move, especially if individuals

201

who identify with those groups have a say in how they are described or identified. Furthermore, as participants in this study understood themselves to be enacting critical consciousness by engaging in these actions, it can be said that careful consideration and revision of historically accepted vocabulary can also be seen as enactment of critical consciousness.

Selecting Appropriate Materials

For some participants, enacting critical consciousness in DLBE means selecting materials whose content reflects or centers the identities of the traditionally minoritized students in the DLBE program, striving to find authentic and appropriate Spanish language materials, and elevating the status of the Spanish language, connected Latinx and Latin American culture(s), and Spanish speakers themselves. For example, Amee described the painstaking search and analysis process she subjects herself to in order to search out and acquire texts that center and celebrate student identities that have historically not been; she described it as looking for both "windows and sliding glass doors" that can both reflect students' lives and allow them a glimpse into each other's. Importantly, it was far more complicated than simply finding "Spanish books". Toni talked about the importance of using books with Black and brown characters. Lara remarked energetically that careful materials selection "is about social justice…about which voices are heard, which voices are not…[finding] texts that address disabilities, LGBTQ, Asian Pacific Islander, African American…by authors that identify as those groups…[so that] kids of privilege need to take a step back and actually learn how to listen and the kids who don't have privilege will have a chance to speak up and share their voices". Carefully considering materials they select to share with their students, especially upon reflecting on their minoritized students' need and experiences, is one way these critical DLBE educators enact critical consciousness.

This study contributes to existing literature on critical consciousness, and especially how educators enact it in DLBE. Participants' comments reveal how they enact critical consciousness in their setting, thereby giving a concrete method (selecting appropriate materials) for enacting Freire's ideals about challenging unjust conditions. This study also illuminates interactions between critical consciousness, DLBE and culturally attentive pedagogies. Given participants' interpretation of the enactment of critical consciousness, the search for and acquisition of materials that accurately and appropriately represent and center identities of students who generally have not seen themselves reflected in their educational materials can be seen as a culturally relevant pedagogical move as well as a critically conscious one. Furthermore, the endeavor of careful materials selection can also be seen simultaneously as a culturally responsive move and a critically conscious one, since using a cultural lens in teaching aligns with culturally responsiveness. Finally, careful materials selection can also be seen simultaneously as a culturally sustaining and critically conscious pedagogical move, since accurately and appropriately reflecting and centering student identities in educational materials can help maintain the represented cultures and languages and empower them. Thus, DLBE educators who take the time consider their students, then peruse, critically review, and carefully select appropriate materials might be seen as enacting critical consciousness and culturally attentive pedagogies at the same time.

In short, DLBE educators in this study enact critical consciousness in ways that examine systems and traditions of power. They strive to empower "hyphenated" (Salazar, 2013, p. 121) community members whose perspectives and experiences have historically not been centered or valued. They also strive to integrate the stories and perspectives of these community members into the curriculum, not just on the periphery but in the center. They examine and rethink

historically accepted materials and ways of doing school and select better materials to center and accurately reflect marginalized students' identities. They examine and rethink historically accepted vocabulary and instructional materials. They engage in critical examination of the ways school has worked and then strive to disrupt the injustices they note, thus exercising not just the critical reflection portion, but also the action portion, of the definition critical consciousness and engage simultaneously in culturally attentive pedagogies. The findings of this study contribute to the literature on critical consciousness by giving concrete examples of how DLBE educators act to combat societal injustice that they observe (Freire, 1968/1974). This study also lends insight into how DLBE educators might enact critical consciousness as a "pillar" of DLBE (Palmer et al., 2019) in their work.

How DLBE Educators Acquire Understandings of Critical Consciousness

The third research question was: How do DLBE educators acquire their understandings of critical consciousness in their professional context in a DLBE setting? To answer this question, data from the themes *Preservice Programs Attend Insufficiently to Critical Consciousness, Collaboration, Communication, and Collegiality Are Key*, and *Critical DLBE Educators Pay a Price* were especially generative. Findings in the data related to this research question show that for most DLBE educators in this study acquired at least some of their understanding and practices around critical consciousness in DLBE from some form of collaboration with colleagues and members of the school community. Interaction and observation were key to both developing a more nuanced understanding of critically conscious work and also finding ways to effectively enact it. Just as significantly, participants in this study did not identify their preservice education as being a source of learning about critical consciousness or its application in DLBE.

Not From a Program

Participants in this study did not identify their preservice education as being a source of learning about critical consciousness or its application in DLBE. While some granted that they learned content area knowledge and pedagogy from their preservice education, not a single participant expressed the belief that they had gained the social-political knowledge necessary to be critically consciousness DLBE educators...until they were on the job and interacting with key colleagues or mentor figures. Clearly impassioned by this topic, Ana went even further and said:

In my opinion there is a minority of preservice programs that do it right and so because they're very, very focused on pedagogy and they don't focus on the sociopolitical and history and all the contexts that impact children and students which at this point in time we know that the majority of students in public school are black and brown students and so what are we doing here, you know? It's great, you know they're teaching them to be great teachers and to have command of their classroom but what are we doing when we're not teaching them to be able to analyze and to be able to understand the lives of these kids that's where things are falling behind and so that would be my biggest advice: to redesign these programs and create courses that will fill that gap so that when these teachers, these future teachers graduate they can go in a room and they can look at kids, whether they're black, brown, white whatever, and they know the context that they're growing up in and they know the context that they're developing in.

None of the seven participants identified their university preparation as a primary source of learning about critical consciousness in DLBE settings, when teaching emergent bilingual students, or indeed in education overall. While some participants noted that a university program provided adequate preparation in the subject matter content and pedagogy, none stated that such

205

programs taught them how to enact critical consciousness within their professional contexts. For example, some participants noted that they learned language acquisition teaching strategies or pedagogical content knowledge related to their specialty. Still, none stated that they learned important concepts about critical consciousness in DLBE education from a university program, class or piece of coursework, or specific professor.

Rather, all participants referred to one or more colleagues as the mentors or experts who helped or continue to help them learn or sharpen their critical consciousness skills. In some cases, participants identified peer observation as the methods by which they learned from colleagues. In other cases, participants mentioned productive discussions at team meetings, at staff professional development sessions, and at informal social gatherings at which a conversation of a professional nature took place. Furthermore, Amee, Ana, and Brandy identified community members outside the school who they contributed to their critical consciousness development. In several cases, participants named a particular colleague whom they felt they learned much from. Some participants noted that they became better at their craft from such colleagues, but also about issues, strategies, and concepts that can be seen as at the heart of social justice and critical consciousness. Interestingly, in some cases participants who were based in the same school named the same key colleague as being pivotal in their learning around social justice in education and in their particular setting. In fact, the same participants felt that this key individual was a leader in bringing a higher level of critical consciousness to their programs overall, not just mentoring them individually into higher levels of critical consciousness in their classroom-level work. I call this kind of pivotal collegial figure the "critical consciousness trailblazer." It is noteworthy that participants sometimes pointed out influential colleagues who were not specifically classroom teachers, even if the participants themselves were classroom

206

teachers. This highlights the importance of considering all staff that support or make up a DLBE

program as important members of the DLBE community and as potential trailblazing colleagues

who can help colleagues acquire new levels of understanding and skill in critical consciousness.

From Colleagues and Community

Significantly, all DLBE educators who participated in this study acquired at least some of

their understandings and practices regarding critical consciousness in DLBE from colleagues

instead of from their preservice teacher program. Dannie, Brandy, Amee, Toni, Esmeralda, Lara,

and Ana all commented on the importance and role of interactions with colleagues on the job or

role-alike peers outside the school in developing their thinking around critical consciousness in

DLBE. Lara and Amee, for example, mentioned the same colleague with whom they had

learning interactions about critical consciousness in DLBE and spoke especially enthusiastically

and at length about their discussions and learning from her. Interestingly, this common colleague

was Ana, whose original preparation was not in education and whose own critical consciousness

mentors largely came from a group of physically distant but ideologically influential individuals.

Her influence was evident as Lara recounted working with Ana to create new curriculum that

"allows us to focus on absent narratives, simultaneous narratives," encourage students to become

"experts and co-constructors of their education" and integrate "more inquiry and more focus on

the critical consciousness". With clear enthusiasm, she mused over this "culturally responsive"

curriculum they co-created on a larger team of colleagues.

Participants' emphasis on the significance of learning from a peer or a colleague connects

with Freirean notions (1968) of education, in that peers learning from each other through

dialogue is a central element of Freire's conception of education. Freire (2013) called dialogue

"a way of knowing" (p. 17). Interestingly, Lara describes a kind of peer pedagogy which lead to

207

the creation of "culturally responsive" curriculum. In addition, I inferred that some participants conducted these dialogues in English and some in Spanish, and some in a mix of both. Doing so can be seen as a potentially culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012) pedagogical move, in the sense that encouraging educators to use all their linguistic funds mirrors how they could encourage their own students to do the same. Furthermore, it is evident that participants acquired important and rich learning not only about critical consciousness, but also about culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2002) from colleagues or role-like peers. The findings from participants' data that relate to how DLBE educators acquire their understandings of critical consciousness lends insight into the ways in which such educators gather nuggets of understanding in social contexts as much or more than in individual reflection. This is important because it suggests critical consciousness can likely not be developed or advanced in isolation, but also because it begs the question of how important individual reflection may or may not be in the growth of a DLBE educator's critical consciousness, or any educator's critical consciousness for that matter.

From Ongoing Interactions

As discussed earlier, for most participants in this study, critical consciousness in DLBE included some form of ongoing collaboration or interaction with colleagues and members of the community outside the school. Doing so, in an ongoing fashion, was key to both developing a more nuanced understanding of critically conscious work and also finding ways to effectively enact it. In regards specifically to the process of acquiring or developing critical consciousness, many participants spoke of the importance of looking for periodic ways to learn, grow, improve, collaborate, seek feedback from respected colleagues and/or mentor-figures, and exchange ideas with other professionals and DLBE community stakeholders in order to be a better educator especially for the students in DLBE whose identity is minoritized. Lara talked about how social

208

workers, teachers, principals, and coaches worked together on curriculum to imbue it with social justice and critical consciousness. Brandy talked about interactions with colleagues and parents as the basis for her growth as a DLBE educator. Amee noted that she wished she had more colleagues to connect with about issues she faced in her work. Dannie, Toni, Esmeralda all noted the frequent conversations with colleagues that characterized their work and led to improvements to their practice. Ana observed that she had a network of peers from outside her school t

Salazar (2013) argued that one's own humanity is as important as others' humanity and vice versa. If we consider that all critical DLBE educators can grow their own humanity and benefit from exchanging ideas and encouragement with other, then we can consider consistent and frequent collaboration among DLBE educators as a humanizing element of the program. After all, Rodriguez-Mojica and Briseño (2019) argue that "no one teacher can shift a school culture on their own, thus intentional, focused collaboration to support teachers' linguistically and culturally sustaining pedagogy will be critical for significant changes to occur." (p. 16). Rodriguez-Mojica and Briseño (2019) argue that collaboration and culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogy go hand in hand with DLBE educator preparation. Given what participants told me, translanguaging and moving back and forth between languages and registers is not uncommon in their professional settings. Finally, given that critical consciousness is an element of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), taking action to encourage and support DLBE educators to work and learn in ways that work best for them could be cast as a culturally relevant move.

Another interesting finding regarding the way DLBE educators acquire critical consciousness was that participants did not report acquiring their ideas about critical consciousness from preparation programs. Instead, they discussed acquiring their understandings

of critical consciousness from ongoing interactions with colleagues and other DLBE

stakeholders within and without of the school. In addition, participants reported that the

interactions that seemed to lift their levels of critical consciousness were ongoing, taking place

over time and in a manner quite unlike a time-limited, checklist-based professional development

or degree plan. These findings contribute to the literature on critical consciousness by giving

concrete examples of how DLBE come into their knowledge about critical consciousness (Freire,

1968). This study also lends insight into how DLBE educators might learn and grow into their

own critical consciousness as they center it as a "pillar" of DLBE (Palmer et al., 2019) of their

work.

Findings from participants' data in this study lend important insight into the ways in

which DLBE educators understand, enact, and acquire their understanding of critical

consciousness as it pertains to their work. One major contribution of this study is that the data on

ways DLBE educators understand critical consciousness helps us consider and examine the parts

of the definition of critical consciousness, and contemplate the importance of reflection versus

action, and how they interact, especially in a DLBE context. A further contribution of the data in

relation to participants' understanding of critical consciousness prompts us to contemplate

critical consciousness as an ongoing, lifelong journey instead of checklist or destination. Another

major contribution of this study is that the data on ways DLBE educators enact critical

consciousness helps us think about critical consciousness in relation to culturally relevant

(Ladson-Billings, 1995), culturally responsive (Gay, 2002), culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012),

and humanizing (Bartolome, 1994; Salazar, 2013) approaches and their intersections with DLBE

programming. While this is generally useful, it is specifically and especially important in DLBE

given that the nature of DLBE programming involves drawing on and integrating a majority

language, culture, and its speakers with a minoritized language, culture and its speakers. Another major contribution of this study is that the data on ways DLBE educators acquire their understandings of critical consciousness helps us think about critical consciousness as a socially developed concept and skill; and consider to what extent it can grow through individual, inner work versus through interaction and exchange in social contexts. This data also prompts us to reexamine the preparation that DLBE educators receive during formal training, and the nature and extent of ongoing education or learning that they have access to once on the job. In the next section, I explore the implications this set of findings have for practice.

Implications for Practice

A number of key implications for practice emerge from this study. First, I address those that speak to the question of how DLBE educators understand critical consciousness. Then I address implications that relate to how DLBE educators enact critical consciousness. Third, I address implications that relate to how they acquire or develop their understandings of critical consciousness.

When they think about critical consciousness, DLBE educators should understand that critical consciousness is a journey, not an end. In fact, they should understand there is no endpoint to the journey of critical consciousness development, no point in time at which they can consider that they have "an A+" in critical consciousness, and no limit to the inner growth possible. The spectrum of critical consciousness is infinite in both directions. Therefore, staff members of a DLBE program should be prepared that, whether new or experienced, they have much development left to do in critical consciousness. In addition, those who went through a typical university preparation program should be aware that they are likely still likely missing important tools that could help them work for critical consciousness in their particular DLBE

contexts. To understand and acknowledge this is the first step to seeking out and acquiring the tools and information that will provide such individuals with the ability to work effectively for social justice in DLBE. Given that almost all participants indicated that their university preparation was wholly inadequate in terms of preparing them to work for social justice in DLBE, it behooves recent graduates and new hires to understand that they have much learning to do. If they are armed with such information, they can better mentally prepare to invest not only the extra time but the extra energy required to gain the tools and knowledge they need to be fully loaded social justice advocates in their positions.

In addition, to enact critical consciousness, DLBE educators should incorporate culturally relevant, responsive and sustaining (Ladson-Billings; Gay, 2002; Paris, 2012) approaches and materials into their daily work. First, this is key because critical consciousness is an element of culturally relevant pedagogy by definition. Moreover, drawing on culture as a lens for teaching minoritized students, as is an element of the definition of culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2002), can be seen as acting to correct a historical wrong. This means, I argue, that critical consciousness informs this pedagogy. Furthermore, making a more democratic society is by definition an element of culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012), and I argue that therefore we can consider that critical consciousness informs this pedagogy. Therefore, using culturally attentive approaches consistently and across areas of school life can help lift the level of critical consciousness in a program to higher and higher levels. This might mean that DLBE educators engage in a relevant, mutually decided upon community action project with their students, as Ana wished advocated for.

To further enact critical consciousness, DLBE educators should foster their own critical consciousness through the pursuit of continuous and ongoing learning, collaboration, and

212

interaction. Reading articles and sitting with one's own thoughts can be useful. However, connection and exchange with other people, especially those who bring new perspectives into the conversation, is an integral part of developing one's critical consciousness. Talking with others, whether colleagues, community members, or individuals outside the direct sphere of a school or education, should be part of every critical DLBE's educators regular To Do list. Stakeholders should keep in mind that classroom teachers but also teacher's assistants, technology specialists, social workers, secretaries, custodians, translators, librarians, special education teachers, ESL specialists, instructional or social-emotional coaches, speech language pathologists, school psychologists, nurses, and other staff members might have the potential to serve as a trailblazing colleague in the area of critical consciousness. Given that the participants in this study indicated that colleagues with a variety of job titles contributed in important ways to their learning, to overlook non-classroom teacher DLBE staffers may mean to lose an important critical consciousness influencer. This also means that collaborative time in a DLBE program is of utmost importance: peer observation days or opportunities, common planning or team meeting times, whole school meetings or professional development opportunities, days-way, or opportunities to attend conferences or other events through which DLBE staff can meet others, spend time talking with them, and learn. Given what the participants in this study indicated about the extent to which they learn and grow from collaborating and communicating with peers, such time together is pivotal for a quality, critical consciousness oriented DLBE program. Furthermore, DLBE educators should consider community wealth as central - not peripheral sources of critical consciousness development. Educators should reach out to community organizations or individuals, neighborhood-level social service organizations, public libraries, private bookstores or other businesses, and in the homes of the students' own family and friends

to establish connections and initiate collaboration. Even physically distant individuals may have meaningful experiences and critical wisdom to share with DLBE educators. Given that multiple participants commented on the curricular importance of people and groups outside the strict definition of "DLBE staff member" or "DLBE educator", taking such steps may prove pivotal for a quality, critical consciousness oriented DLBE program.

Another way DLBE educators can enact critical consciousness relates to their considerations around materials, especially in relation to the language of those materials. Educators should examine their assumptions about Spanish language materials, and challenge notions that materials might be more critical, relevant, responsive, or sustaining simply because they are in Spanish. Critical DLBE educators should apply the same critical lens to materials in Spanish as they do materials in English, examining authenticity, representation, and so on with equal care. Furthermore, based on Amee's revelations about the critical failures of some translated materials, curriculum creators may not be able to depend upon translations of English language materials for adequate, appropriate, and critical curricular material for a DLBE setting. As the participants of this study have indicated, such translations are far from sufficient either because the content or language contains academic or linguistic mismatches, lack of logic or contextual connection, or because the materials center a dominant identity or narrative.

In order to acquire new and higher levels of critical consciousness, DLBE educators should engage with each other, their communities, and external partners. They should do so regularly, over time, in order to foster their own critical consciousness. Keeping in mind that there is no end to the journey of critical consciousness development, such engagement should be a regular part of a critical DLBE's educator's professional development or continuing learning plan. Recalling that Ana commented on the persistent lack of critical preparation of new staff to

her program, experienced staff may consider that they may represent an important source of new colleagues' growth in the area of critical consciousness. Thus, an experienced colleague might be prepared to take a mentoring role for a time, whether in an official or de facto manner, and thus contribute to the overall level of critical consciousness of their DLBE program as a whole. Furthermore, all DLBE educators should keep in mind that the language and ethnic background of a new colleague has no correlation with their level of critical pedagogical knowledge and no assumptions should be made that a monolingual English-speaking or non-Latinx-identifying colleague has little or no understanding of critical pedagogical knowledge nor that a Spanish speaking, Latinx-identifying colleagues brings high levels of critical consciousness to bear. Finally, in order to help DLBE educators in this endeavor, preservice DLBE teacher educators and professional developers should integrate curriculum into their workshops and coursework that attends to critical consciousness, not just language, content, and classroom management. Most importantly, those with control and influence in programs that prepare professionals for a career in DLBE settings should note that almost all participants in this study stated that they were well prepared in the techniques and strategies of their particular area but woefully underprepared to challenge the sociopolitical and sociocultural status quo that weighs heavily on the minoritized portion of students and families of a DLBE program. Based on participants' comments, it is not content area knowledge or best practices that require urgent attention. Rather, individuals with professional duties associated with educator preparation should urgently strive to integrate into coursework curriculum that attends to social justice. In keeping with Ana's entreaties regarding DLBE educator preparation, program designers should add to the education curriculum historical and current sociopolitical context of racial, linguistic and ethnic groups in the United States, valuing emergent bilinguals and their families' various forms of capital or wealth, and the

215

prioritization of teaching humanity over non critically teaching content. Given that participants in this study could not say that their university education taught them meaningful and useful material that can be seen as related to teaching for social justice, stakeholders in programs that prepare DLBE educators should re-examine their programs' orientation mission, values, and engage in programmatic redesign.

Implications for Future Research

Future research might include similar research questions, interview protocol, and data analysis procedures, but recruit from a larger, more diverse sample population so as to end up with a larger group of participants. It might also use phenomenological design to study those same participants, and might incorporate participant observations in the methodology. On the other hand, future research might also attempt to explore the same questions about critical consciousness posed in this study, but with non-classroom DLBE educators, community members, or other stakeholders outside the confines of a school building. This could be extended to k-12 DLBE administrators or university level DLBE preservice coordinators. A further suggestion for future research is to explore how the findings of this and related studies could inform building or district level policies and practices. There is much left to probe about how DLBE educators and other DLBE stakeholders understand critical consciousness, they enact it, or acquire their understandings.

Future research might also focus on a more specific population of DLBE educators, namely, the "critical consciousness trailblazers" colleagues seem to look to in their DLBE setting. One example might be a case study of a single trailblazer's journey to their present state of critical consciousness, using ethnographic interviews. Another example might be a study in which several such individuals are recruited, and similar methods used. In each case, identifying

216

a trailblazer might be better done through the suggestion of a colleagues, as potential participants themselves may not consider themselves "trailblazers". Conducting an in-depth study of the experiences and education that lead a critical consciousness trailblazer to act and be seen as such could lend insight into what DLBE staff need in order to advance along their critical consciousness journey.

Finally, future research might also focus on DLBE community members outside the confines of the school, and investigate how they understand critical consciousness, they enact it, or acquire their understandings. The study might be conducted using case study design. Participants could be identified by school personnel who view them as sources of critical consciousness learning, and methods could include ethnographic interviews. As we have seen in the findings of this study, community members may have a wealth of knowledge and wisdom to offer, should we ask and listen.

Call To Action

Above, I looked at the data with a sharp eye for my research questions and what participant data reveals. However, I have been working in DLBE for some time and I bring my own wisdom and knowledge of practice to this dissertation. While my implications are necessarily a tight fit and framed strongly by the research questions, I believe there are some broader implications for practice that should be considered. Furthermore, I want to engage practitioners in a straightforward way. These broader implications are slightly out of the bounds of the research questions and the examination of critical consciousness, strictly speaking. But critical consciousness covers a lot of ground, particularly given that, by definition, it involves action. In this sense, the following implications can be seen as potential extensions and applications of critical consciousness in DLBE practice.

First, administrators of DLBE programs should strive to find, hire, and retain individuals who might fill the role of "critical consciousness trailblazer". The data in this study suggest that even just one key passionate, knowledgeable, energetic, and charismatic individual can help fill in the educational gaps in new and existing DLBE staffers' understandings of critical consciousness in DLBE. Secure or retain such a trailblazing colleague, and the critical consciousness that infuses a DLBE program is likely to grow.

Second, DLBE educators and administrators should note the potential of each DLBE stakeholder to be a source of learning and growth for their colleagues. Classroom teachers but also teacher's assistants, technology specialists, social workers, secretaries, custodians, translators, librarians, special education teachers, ESL specialists, instructional or social-emotional coaches, speech language pathologists, school psychologists, nurses, and other staff members might have the potential to serve as a trailblazing colleague or mentor to each other in the area of critical consciousness.

Third, administrators should preserve, reinstate, or initiate any type of collaborative time for staff in a DLBE program. This may mean peer observation days or opportunities, common planning or team meeting times, whole school meetings, professional development opportunities, days-way, or opportunities to attend conferences or other events through which DLBE staff can meet each other, other stakeholder, spend time talking with them at length, and learn. Given what the participants in this study indicated about the extent to which they learn and grow from collaborating and communicating with peers, such time together is pivotal for a quality, social-justice oriented DLBE program.

Fourth, DLBE educators and administrators should consider community wealth as central - not peripheral sources of curriculum and support for a DLBE program. This may mean

218

educators or administrators reach out to community organizations or individuals to establish connections and initiate collaboration, or that they empower and encourage other staff members to do so. These groups or people may be found in state, county, city, or neighborhood-level social service organizations, public libraries, private bookstores or other businesses, and in the homes of the students' own family and friends. Furthermore, physically distant individuals with meaningful experiences and wisdom to share with DLBE students may also contribute in important ways to a program's social justice mission.

Fifth, administrators can save themselves precious time and stop scrutinizing the education section of applicants' resumes for credentials or coursework that may demonstrate training or expertise in social justice or critical consciousness in DLBE. Furthermore, administrators should avoid the pitfall of making assumptions about potential hires' level of critical consciousness based on the language proficiencies and ethnicity reflected in the personal information included on applications. They are unlikely to find the evidence they seek by doing so. In fact, by making assumptions from facts listed on a resume, they may assume an applicant has little expertise in teaching for social or critical consciousness when the opposite may be true. Rather, administrators are more likely to obtain the information they seek through a conversation with potential applicants in which they ask about applicants' experience, learning, and application of social justice and critical consciousness as it relates to DLBE.

Sixth, DLBE stakeholders should acknowledge that the traditional capstone of modern U.S.- based curriculum - the English language standardized achievement test - interferes with efforts to revise traditional curriculum to reflect a more critical bent. Testing traditions interfere with potential community-based action projects, interrupt classwork that centers Spanish, and reify the dominance of traditional conservative values - a student is only good enough for this

society if they can obtain high scores in an English language bubble test taken in a high-pressure environment and which reflects no real-life activity outside itself. Traditional standardized testing must be actively devalued in DLBE settings and replaced by authentic and meaningful assessment that draws on content and language of the DLBE classroom and invites students' full linguistic repertoire in order to coax out their best effort and true ability.

Lastly, professional development creators should assume that university preparation programs have adequately prepared DLBE educators in the area of critical pedagogy, critical consciousness, or teaching for social justice. Professional development creators and leaders should center and prioritize educational material and activities that promote and develop DLBE educators' understanding of critical pedagogy, critical consciousness, and social justice. Furthermore, instead of seeking out and hiring outside entities and individuals to manage professional development at a DLBE site, DLBE stakeholders and site-level administrators should first look within a given DLBE program to identify embedded "critical consciousness trailblazers" and give them the agency to conduct professional development activities with their colleagues, before they look to hire outside sources of professional development from companies or entities disconnected from the community in question. Moreover, community members - including but not limited to students and parents - can serve as sources of critical development for both students and staff in a DLBE program, and thus may represent a source of authentic critical professional development. Those who fund, facilitate, and support professional development should prioritize and exhaust these often invisible sources of wealth.

REFERENCES

Acuff, J.B., Hirak, B., & Nangah, M. (2012). Dismantling a master narrative: Using culturally responsive pedagogy to teach the history of art education. *Art Education. 65*(5), 6-10.

Alanis, I., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of success. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(4), 305-319.

Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing Critically Conscious Dual-Language Teachers: Recognizing and Interrupting Dominant Ideologies. *Theory Into Practice*, *58*(2), 194-203.

Alfaro, C., Durán, R., Hunt, A., & Aragón, M. J. (2014). Steps toward unifying dual language programs, common core state standards, and critical pedagogy: Oportunidades, Estrategias y Retos. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal*, *8*(2).

Amanti, C. (2019a). Is native-speakerism impacting the Dual Language Immersion teacher shortage?. Multilingua, 38(6), 675-686.

Amanti, C. (2019b). The (invisible) work of dual language bilingual education teachers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *42*(4), 455-470.

Apple, M. W. (2014). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. Routledge.

Bartolome, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard educational review*, *64*(2), 173-195.

Bishop, R. (2008). A culturally responsive pedagogy of relations. In Fraser, D. & McGee, C. (Eds.), *The professional practice of teaching* (pp. 154-171).

Brewer, J. (2000). *Ethnography*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Brown-Jeffy, S., & Cooper, J. E. (2011). Toward a conceptual framework of culturally relevant pedagogy: An overview of the conceptual and theoretical literature. *Teacher education quarterly*, *38*(1), 65-84.

Cain, J. M. (2015). *Clarifying multicultural: The development and initial validation of the Multicultural Teacher Capacity Scale* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina Chapel Hill).

Cartledge, G., Kea, C. D., Watson, M., & Oif, A. (2016). Special education disproportionality: A review of response to intervention and culturally relevant pedagogy. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically diverse exceptional learners*, *16*(1), 29-49.

Castro-Olivo, S. M. (2014). Promoting social-emotional learning in adolescent Latino ELLs: A study of the culturally adapted Strong Teens program. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(4), 567.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(1), 64-82.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*(1), 403-427.

Chávez-Moreno, L. C. (2021). Racist and Raciolinguistic Teacher Ideologies: When Bilingual Education is "Inherently Culturally Relevant" for Latinxs. *The Urban Review*, 1-22.

Choi, Y. (2013). Teaching social studies for newcomer English language learners: Toward culturally relevant pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *15*(1), 12-18.

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Heinle & Heinle.

Cobb, B., Vega, D., & Kronauge, C. (2006). Effects of an elementary dual language immersion school program on junior high school achievement. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, *1*(1).

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and practice*, *2*(1), 1-20.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Pearson.

Cukor-Avila, P. (2000). Revisiting the observer's paradox. *American Speech*, *75*(3), 253-254.

Cukor-Avila, P., & Bailey, G. (2001). The Effects of the Race of the Interviewer on Sociolinguistic Fieldwork. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *5*(2), 254-70.

Darder, A. (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. Psychology Press.

Darder, A. (2017). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Routledge.

de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. I. (2014). Dual language programs as a strand within a secondary school: Dilemmas of school organization and the TWI mission. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *17*(1), 15-31

Diaz, Z., Whitacre, M., Esquierdo, J. J., & Ruiz-Escalante, J. A. (2013). Why Did I Ask That Question? Bilingual/ESL Pre-Service Teachers' Insights. *International Journal of instruction*, *6*(2), 163-176.

De La Trinidad, M. (2015). Mexican Americans and the push for culturally relevant education: the bilingual education movement in Tucson, 1958–1969. *History of Education*, *44*(3), 316-338.

DeMatthews, D. E., & Izquierdo, E. (2020a). Leadership for Social Justice and Sustainability: A Historical Case Study of a High-Performing Dual Language School along the US-Mexico Border. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, *25*(2), 164-182.

DeMatthews, D. E., & Izquierdo, E. (2020b). Supporting Mexican American immigrant students on the border: A case study of culturally responsive leadership in a dual language elementary school. *Urban Education*, *55*(3), 362-393.

Di Stefano, M. (2017). Understanding how emergent bilinguals bridge belonging and languages in dual language immersion settings. Utah State University.

Duncan-Andrade, J. (2010). To study is a revolutionary duty. In Goodman. G. (Ed.), *Educational psychology reader: The art and science of how people learn* (pp. 165-178). Peter Lang.

Durden, T. R., & Truscott, D. M. (2010). Reflective journeys toward culturally relevant Pedagogy. American Education Research Association.

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2014). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action* (pp. 25-26). Caslon Publishing.

Erickson, F., & Mohatt, G. (1982). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. *Doing the ethnography of schooling*, *131*.

Esposito, J., & Swain, A. N. (2009). Pathways to Social Justice: Urban Teachers' Uses of

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as a Conduit for Teaching for Social Justice. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *6*(1), 38-48.

Esposito, J., Davis, C. L., & Swain, A. N. (2012). Urban educators' perceptions of culturally relevant pedagogy and school reform mandates. *Journal of Educational Change*, *13*(2), 235-258.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman, Inc.

Fantilli, R. D., & McDougall, D. E. (2009). A study of novice teachers: Challenges and supports in the first years. *Teaching and teacher education*, *25*(6), 814-825.

Farruggio, P. (2009). Bilingual Education: Using a Virtual Guest Speaker and Online Discussion to Expand Latino Preservice Teachers' Consciousness. *Multicultural Education*, *17*(1), 33-37.

Fitts, S. (2009). Exploring third space in a dual-language setting: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *8*(2), 87-104.

Flores, G. M. (2011). Racialized tokens: Latina teachers negotiating, surviving and thriving in a white woman's profession. *Qualitative Sociology*, *34*(2), 313-335.

Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, *30*(1), 13-38.

Flores, B. B., & Clark, E. R. (2017). *Despertando el ser: Transforming Latino teachers' identities, consciousness, and beliefs.* Peter Lang.

Franquiz, M. E., & del Carmen Salazar, M. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *The High School Journal*, *87*(4), 36-53.

Freeman, R. D. (1996). Dual-language planning at Oyster Bilingual School: "It's much More than language". *Tesol Quarterly*, *30*(3), 557-582.

Freire, J. A. (2020). Promoting Sociopolitical Consciousness and Bicultural Goals of Dual Language Education: The Transformational Dual Language Educational Framework. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *19*(1), 56-71.

Freire, J. A., & Valdez, V. E. (2017). Dual language teachers' stated barriers to implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *40*(1), 55-69.

Freire, J. A. (2016). Nepantleras/os and their teachers in dual language education: Developing

sociopolitical consciousness to contest language education policies. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal*, *10*(1).

Freire, J. A. (2014). *Spanish-English dual language teacher beliefs and practices on culturally relevant pedagogy in a collaborative action research process* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Culture and Society, University of Utah).

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Freire, P. (2013). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Routledge.

Freire, J. A., & Feinauer, E. (2020). Vernacular Spanish as a promoter of critical consciousness in dual language bilingual education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-14.

Fry, R. (2003). Hispanic youth dropping out of U.S; Measuring the challenge. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED477379.pdf.

Gandara, P. C., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Harvard University Press.

García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(4), 245-255.

Garza, V. (2010). Decolonization of the mind and spirit: healing strategies through Latin@ critical consciousness.

Gay, G. 2002. Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*: 106–16.

Gere, A. R., Buehler, J., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). A visibility project: Learning to see how preservice teachers take up culturally responsive pedagogy.

Gilmore, P., & Glatthorn, A. A. (1982). *Children in and out of School: Ethnography and Education. Language and Ethnography Series, Volume 2. Colloquium on Ethnography and Education (Philadelphia, PA, 1978)*. Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ginsberg, M. B., & Wlodkowski, R. J. (2009). *Diversity and motivation: Culturally responsive teaching in college*. John Wiley & Sons.

Giroux, H. A. (2015). Democracy in crisis, the specter of authoritarianism, and the future of higher education. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*, *1*(1), 7.

Giroux, H. (2009). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In K. Ryan & J. Cooper (Eds.), *Kaleidoscope: Contemporary and classic readings in education (Twelfth Edition)*, (pp. 35-40). Cengage.

Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2006). Challenging neoliberalism's new world order: The promise of critical pedagogy. *Cultural studies? Critical methodologies*, *6*(1), 21-32.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.) Pearson.

Gomez, M. L., & Rodriguez, T. L. (2011). Imagining the knowledge, strengths, and skills of a Latina prospective teacher. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *38*(1), 127-146.

Grant, R. A., & Asimeng-Boahene, L. (2006). Culturally responsive pedagogy in citizenship education: Using African proverbs as tools for teaching in urban schools. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *8*(4), 17-24.

Greer, E. J. (2019). *# Instawoke: a case study of pre-service teachers' experiences with critical consciousness raising via social media* (Doctoral dissertation University of Texas Austin).

Guerrero, M. D., Guerrero, M. C., Soltero-González, L., & Escamilla, K. (2017). *Abriendo brecha: antología crítica sobre la educación bilingüe de doble inmersión*. Dual Language Education of New Mexico/Fuente Press.

Hamayan, E. V., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from A to Z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators*. Heinemann.

Hamman, L. (2018a). *Reframing the Language Separation Debate: Language, Identity, and Ideology in Two-way Immersion*. The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Hamman, L. (2018b). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education*, *32*(1), 21-42.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research. Language & Literacy (NCRLL)*. Teachers College Press.

Heiman, D. B. (2017). *Two-way immersion, gentrification, and critical pedagogy: Teaching*

against the neoliberal logic (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas Austin).

Heiman, D., & Urrieta Jr., L. (2019). La cuarta meta de la educación bilingüe y la pedagogía crítica en los mundos figurados de la preparación de futurxs maestrxs bilingües. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, *34*(1).

Heiman, D., & Yanes, M. (2018). Centering the Fourth Pillar in Times of TWBE Gentrification:"Spanish, Love, Content, Not in That Order". *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *12*(3), 173-187.

Herrera, S. G., Holmes, M. A., & Kavimandan, S. K. (2012). Bringing theory to life: Strategies that make culturally responsive pedagogy a reality in diverse secondary classrooms. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *14*(3).

Hodges, J., Tay, J., Maeda, Y., & Gentry, M. (2018). A meta-analysis of gifted and talented identification practices. *Gifted child quarterly*, *62*(2), 147-174.

Hood, S. J. (2020). Two-way immersion teacher preparation. *Foreign Language Annals*, *53*(1), 128-148.

Howard, T., & Terry Sr, C. L. (2011). Culturally responsive pedagogy for African American students: Promising programs and practices for enhanced academic performance. *Teaching Education*, *22*(4), 345-362.

Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into practice*, *42*(3), 195-202.

Hyland, N. E. (2009). One white teacher's struggle for culturally relevant pedagogy: The problem of the community. *The New Educator*, *5*(2), 95-112.

Irizarry, J. G., & Antrop-González, R. (2007). RicanStructing the discourse and promoting school success: Extending a theory of culturally responsive pedagogy for DiaspoRicans. *Centro Journal*, *19*(2), 37-59.

Irizarry, J. G. (2007). Ethnic and urban intersections in the classroom: Latino students, hybrid identities, and culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *9*(3), 21-28.

Irizarry, J. G. (2007). " Home-growing" teachers of color: lessons learned from a town-gown partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *34*(4), 87-102.

Irizarry, J., & Donaldson, M. L. (2012). Teach for America: The Latinization of US schools and the critical shortage of Latina/o teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *49*(1), 155-194.

Kabuto, B. (2017). A socio-psycholinguistic perspective on biliteracy: The use of miscue analysis as a culturally relevant assessment tool. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, *56*(1), 2.

Kerper Mora, J. (2002). Caught in a policy web: The impact of education reform on Latino education. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *1*(1), 29-44.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2011). Critical pedagogy and the knowledge wars of the twenty-first century. In *Key works in critical pedagogy* (pp. 385-405). Brill Sense.

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research: introducing focus groups. *Bmj*, *311*(7000), 299-302.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. *Educational researcher*, *35*(7), 3-12.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American educational research journal*, *32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into practice*, *34*(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Liberatory consequences of literacy: A case of culturally relevant instruction for African American students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *61*(3), 378-391.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 74-84.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. "Yes, but how do we do it?": Practicing culturally relevant pedagogy." *City kids, city schools: More reports from the front row* (2008): 162-177.

Lakin, J. M., & Lai, E. R. (2012). Multigroup generalizability analysis of verbal, quantitative, and nonverbal ability tests for culturally and linguistically diverse students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *72*(1), 139-158.

La Serna, J. (2017). *The secret language of success: Accessing African American achievement in two-way immersion programs*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill).

Layder, D. (1998). *Sociological practice: Linking theory and social research*. Sage.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). Practical research planning and design. Prentice-Hall.

Leonard, J., Napp, C., & Adeleke, S. (2009). The complexities of culturally relevant pedagogy: A case study of two secondary mathematics teachers and their ESOL students. *The High School Journal*, *93*(1), 3-22.

Li, J., Steele, J., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Teaching practices and language use in two-way dual language immersion programs in a large public school district. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 31-43.

Lincoln, N. K., & Denzin, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, *51*(4), 256-262.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(1), 43-60.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: Native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *32*(6), 531-545.

Martın Rojo, L. & H. Grad (2008). Identities in discourse: An integrative view. In R. Dolon & J. Todolı (eds.), Analysing identities in discourse. John Benjamins, 3–28.

Maye, D., & Day, B. (2012). Teacher identities: The fingerprint of culturally relevant pedagogy for students at risk. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *78*(2), 19-26.

Mazak, C., & Herbas-Donoso, C. (2014). Translanguaging Practices and Language Ideologies in Puerto Rican University Science Education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *11*(1), 27–49.

McLaren, P. (2016). Revolutionary critical pedagogy: Staking a claim against the macrostructural unconscious. *Critical Education*, *7*(8).

Moje, E. B., & Hinchman, K. (2004). Culturally responsive practices for youth literacy learning. *Adolescent literacy research and practice*, 321-350.

Montalvo, J. G. (2012). *Self-esteem and Identity: A Case Study of Two Bilingual Education Students* (Masters thesis, University of Texas--Pan American).

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant

pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *41*(4), 433-452.

Nascimento, F. C. (2017). Benefits of dual language immersion on the academic achievement of English language learners. *International Journal of Literacies*, *24*(1), 1-15.

Olivos, E. M., & Quintana de Valladolid, C. E. (2005). Entre la espada y la pared: Critical educators, bilingual education, and education reform. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *4*(4), 283-293.

O'Neal, C. R. (2018). The impact of stress on later literacy achievement via grit and engagement among dual language elementary school students. *School Psychology International*, *39*(2), 138-155.

O'Neal, C. R., Goldthrite, A., Weston Riley, L., & Atapattu, R. K. (2018). A reciprocal, moderated mediation model of grit, engagement, and literacy achievement among dual language learners. *Social Development*, *27*(3), 665-680.

O'Neal, D. D., Ringler, M., & Rodriguez, D. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of their preparation for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse learners in rural eastern North Carolina. *The rural educator*, *30*(1).

Orfield, G. & Lee, C. (2005). Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality. Cambridge, MS: Harvard Civil Rights Project.

Ortiz, A. M. (2003). The ethnographic interview. In F. Stage & K. Manning (Eds.), Research in the college context: Approaches and methods (pp. 35–48). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ortiz, P. R. (2009). Indigenous Knowledge and Language: Decolonizing Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in a Mapuche Intercultural Bilingual Education Program in Chile. *Online Submission*, *32*(1), 93-114.

Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language "strand" program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *41*(1), 94-114.

Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, *58*(2), 121-133.

Palmer, D. K., & Henderson, K. I. (2016). Dual language bilingual education placement practices: Educator discourses about emergent bilingual students in two program types. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 17-30.

Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 98(3), 757-772.

Palmer, D. K., & Menard-Warwick, J. (2012). Short-term study abroad for Texas preservice teachers: On the road from empathy to critical awareness. *Multicultural Education*, *19*(3), 17-26.

Palmer, D. & Wicktor-Lynch, A. (2008). A bilingual education for a monolingual test? The pressure to prepare for TAKS and its influence on choices for language of instruction in Texas elementary bilingual classrooms. Language Policy.7, 217-235.

Parker-Jenkins, M. (2018). Problematising ethnography and case study: reflections on using ethnographic techniques and researcher positioning. *Ethnography and Education*, *13*(1), 18-33.

Parkes, J., Ruth, T., Anberg-Espinoza, M., & De Jong, E. (2009). Urgent research questions and issues in dual language education. *Dual Language Education of New Mexico*, 5-58.

Parthasarathy, B. (2008). The ethnographic case study approach. The global impact study. Retrieved from http://www.globalimpactstudy.org/2008/07/the-ethnographic-case-study-approach/.

Patel, S. (2019). *Supervising Preservice Teacher Critical Consciousness*. California State University, East Bay.

Picower, B. (2012). Teacher activism: Enacting a vision for social justice. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *45*(4), 561-574.

Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(1), 75-101.

Potowski, K. (2005). Latino children's Spanish use in a Chicago dual-immersion classroom. *Latino language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago*, 157-185.

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school* (Vol. 63). Multilingual Matters.

Ramírez, P. C., & Faltis, C. J. (2020). 11 Diverse Perspectives in Dual Language Education. *Dual Language Education in the US: Rethinking Pedagogy, Curricula, and Teacher Education to Support Dual Language Learning for All*. Routledge.

Ramirez, P., & Faltis, C. (2020). Dual Language Education in the US: Rethinking Pedagogy, Curricula, and Teacher Education to Support Dual Language Learning for All. Routledge.

Ravitch, D. (2014). Hoaxes in educational policy. *The Teacher Educator*, *49*(3), 153-165.

Richards, H. V., Brown, A. F., & Forde, T. B. (2007). Addressing diversity in schools: Culturally responsive pedagogy. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *39*(3), 64-68.

Rodríguez, A. D. (2014). Culturally relevant books: Culturally responsive teaching in bilingual classrooms. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *5*(1), 173-196.

Rodriguez-Mojica, C., & Briseño, A. (2019). Critical Consciousness in Bilingual Teacher Preparation for Emancipatory Biliteracy. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, *34*(1).

Rosa, J. (2019). *Looking like a Language, Sounding like a Race*. Oxford University Press.

Saint-Hilaire, L. A. (2014). So, how do I teach them? Understanding multicultural education and culturally relevant pedagogy. *Reflective practice*, *15*(5), 592-602.

Salazar, M. (2013). A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 121-148.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Samson, J. F., & Collins, B. A. (2012). Preparing All Teachers to Meet the Needs of English Language Learners: Applying Research to Policy and Practice for Teacher Effectiveness. *Center for American Progress*.

Sánchez, M. T., García, O., & Solorza, C. (2018). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *41*(1), 37-51.

Santamaria, L. J. (2009). Culturally responsive differentiated instruction: Narrowing gaps between best pedagogical practices benefiting all learners. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(1), 214-247.

Savage, C., Hindle, R., Meyer, L. H., Hynds, A., Penetito, W., & Sleeter, C. E. (2011). Culturally responsive pedagogies in the classroom: Indigenous student experiences across the curriculum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(3), 183-198.

Schmeichel, M. (2012). Good teaching? An examination of culturally relevant pedagogy as an equity practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *44*(2), 211-231.

Simmons, C. L. (2019). *Critical Consciousness: A Measurement Tool for English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Teachers in US K-12 Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Mercer University).

Sleeter, C. E. (2011). An agenda to strengthen culturally responsive pedagogy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *10*(2), 7-23.

Sleeter, C. E. (2011). *Professional Development for Culturally Responsive and Relationship-Based Pedagogy. Black Studies and Critical Thinking. Volume 24*. Peter Lang.

Souto-Manning, M. (2009). Negotiating culturally responsive pedagogy through multicultural children's literature: Towards critical democratic literacy practices in a first grade classroom. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *9*(1), 50-74.

Souto-Manning, M., & Martell, J. (2017). Committing to culturally relevant literacy teaching as an everyday practice: It's critical!. *Language Arts*, *94*(4), 252.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 443–466). Sage.

Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of dual-language immersion programs on student achievement: Evidence from lottery data. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(1_suppl), 282S-306S.

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (2014). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (Vol. 20). Sage.

Taylor, S. V., & Sobel, D. M. (2011). *Culturally responsive pedagogy: Teaching like our students' lives matter* (Vol. 4). Brill.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.

Thomas, W. P., Collier, V. P., & Collier, K. (2011). English learners in North Carolina, 2010. *Fairfax, VA: George Mason University. A research report provided to North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.*

Tyrrell, J. L. F. (2019). *Critical Consciousness Development in Privileged Teacher Populations* (Doctoral dissertation, Marian University).

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the

education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(3), 391-430.

Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *The Urban Review*, *48*(4), 601-627.

Valenzuela, A. (2005). Subtractive schooling, caring relations, and social capital in the schooling of US-Mexican youth. *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools*, 83-94.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring. SUNY Press.

Valenzuela, A. (Ed.). (2016). *Growing critically conscious teachers: A social justice curriculum for educators of Latino/a youth*. Teachers College Press.

Valenzuela, A., & Rubio, B. (2018). Subtractive schooling. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.

Varghese, M. M., & Snyder, R. (2018). Critically examining the agency and professional identity development of novice dual language teachers through figured worlds. *International multilingual research journal*, *12*(3), 145-159.

Ware, F. (2006). Warm demander pedagogy: Culturally responsive teaching that supports a culture of achievement for African American students. *Urban education*, *41*(4), 427-456.

Warren, C. A. (2018). Empathy, teacher dispositions, and preparation for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *69*(2), 169-183.

Watzinger-Tharp, J., Swenson, K., & Mayne, Z. (2018). Academic achievement of students in dual language immersion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(8), 913-928.

Wortham, S., & Contreras, M. (2002). Struggling toward culturally relevant pedagogy in the Latino diaspora. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *1*(2), 133-144.

Yin, R. K. (2013). Case study research: Design and methods. Sage publications.

Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice?. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(3), 248-260.

Young, J. W., Lakin, J., Courtney, R., Martiniello, M., Adler, R., Blood, I., ... & Miller, S.

(2012). Advancing the quality and equity of education for Latino students: A white paper. *ETS Research Report Series*, *2012*(1), i-92.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

- Welcome and thanks

- Remind the participant interviewee(s) of the goals of the study

- Remind the interviewee(s) that they can refuse to answer a question

- Remind the interviewee(s) that I will be recording the interview as stated in the release form

- Remind the interviewee(s) that I will maintain their data password protected, that I will submit the transcripts to them later to check accuracy

- Confirm pseudonym

- Request the electronic copy of the artifact or document they brought to the interview (or check that it has been sent or shared electronically)

Focus Group Interview Questions

How many years have you been teaching, in general and in Dual Language?

What grade level(s) do you currently teach?

What subject(s) do you teach?

What languages do you speak?

Tell me how and why you got started in dual language education.

Tell me about the artifacts you submitted. Why did you choose these to submit?

Tell me about some striking or memorable experiences from your time teaching in dual language.

Talk to me a bit about your experiences teaching ELL or native Spanish speaking students.

What do you consider your mission or priorities as a dual language teacher?

What motivates you most in your job?

Tell me about your school context, the students, and some of your biggest challenges and joys.

Describe a lesson or strategy or set of materials you have used in teaching that you are proud of or that you find meaningful - maybe you want to talk about the item you brought to this interview and shared with me electronically.

Describe good dual language instruction, curriculum, or materials, in your view.

Describe bad dual language instruction, curriculum, or materials, in your view.

When teaching your students, especially your ELL or native Spanish speakers, what are you trying to accomplish?

Where do your ideas about teaching this way come from?

How and why has your thinking about dual language teaching changed, especially when you think about your ELLs and native Spanish speakers?

What is most important to you when you teach ELL or natgive Spanish speakers?

Looking back on the time you have spent as a dual language educator, what moments or events jump out at you? Can you give an example of a time?

In what ways do you feel you provide good instruction, especially to you ELLs or native Spanish speakers?

When you think about your teaching, what makes for a good day or a bad day? Can you give an example?

What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of your school and the dual language context? Can you give an example?

How do you think language, culture, ethnicity, and other factors play a role in your teaching?

What are the challenges you grapple with in your job? Can you give an example?

Tell me about how you came to these understandings.

How do you (continue to) learn, grow, and develop as a professional educator, in relation to critical consciousness, dual language, and/or in relation to students sometimes labeled "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs"?

Tell me about your preparation to teach in DLBE/dual language/two way immersion.

Tell me about what you have learned on the job since you started working as a DLBE/dual language/two way immersion educator.

What, if any, progress, improvements, or successes do you notice in this area?

What, if any, barriers, challenges, or problems do you notice in this area?

Imagine you could go back to your teaching preparation program coordinator, and give them feedback about your preparation to teach in dual language and to teach "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs". What might you say?

Imagine you receive a student teacher or practicum student in this very setting, tomorrow. What initial advice might you give him or her?

What other insight strikes you that you might share?

Individual Interview Questions

Note: The following questions will be adjusted after a preliminary analysis of responses to the first interview. I will hand the interviewee a transcript of the first interview.

Do you see any inaccuracies in the transcript, or anything that came out wrong and you would like to correct or explain?

Since we last met, have you thought of anything you might want to add to your prior responses? Specifically in regards to students labeled "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs"?

What does, or could, pedagogy that promotes critical consciousness look like?

What is your understanding of critical consciousness specifically and uniquely for your students sometimes labeled "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs"?

How do you enact critical consciousness in your work as a DLBE/*dual language/two way immersion educator, specifically and uniquely for your students sometimes labeled "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs"?*

What, if any, progress, improvements, or successes do you see in this area?

What, if any, barriers, challenges, or problems do you see in this area?

Let's focus on the scope and sequence, and the teaching material - what students study/learn/read in class. Recall the documents you sent me to illustrate. So what does, or could, critically conscious curriculum look like?

What is your understanding of critical consciousness specifically and uniquely for your students sometimes labeled "native Spanish speakers" and/or "ELLs"?

What other insight strikes you that you might share?

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Caroline A. Hesse is a (dual language) bilingual teacher who has taught for 18 years in a variety of bilingual and monolingual k-21 settings, from high school and middle school to college and elementary levels. She holds a B.S. from Beloit College, an M.A. from Viterbo University and an M. A. from the Universidad de Salamanca, and a doctorate in curriculum and instruction with a focus on bilingual education through The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. Her research interests lie at the intersections of curriculum, language, identity, dual language bilingual education, and humanizing pedagogy. She currently works in a Spanish-English DLBE charter elementary school in the Midwest. She can be contacted at carolineahesse@gmail.com.