Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ARTICLES

Teacher and Student Language Practices and Ideologies in a Third-Grade Two-Way Dual Language Program Implementation

Kathryn I. Henderson

Department of Bicultural-Bilingual Studies
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Deborah K. Palmer

Department of Curriculum & Instruction
The University of Texas at Austin

This article provides an in-depth exploration of the language ecologies of two classrooms attempting to implement a two-way dual language (TWDL) program and its mediating conditions. Drawing on ethnographic methods and a sociocultural understanding of language, we examined both teachers' and students' language ideologies and language practices, including the use of Spanish, English, and code-switching. The English language arts teacher adhered to strict language separation as dictated by the TWDL model, while the Spanish language arts teacher instructed in both English and Spanish to accommodate standardized test preparation. Students enacted agency to engage in their hybrid language practices. Despite the multiplicity and, at times, contradictory ideologies embodied and articulated by both teachers, the overarching dominant language ideology of English superiority was present and powerful. We discuss implications for dual language implementation, including the role of standardized testing, students as language policy makers, and teacher (mis)alignment between articulated and embodied ideologies.

Keywords: bilingual education, language ideologies, language practices, policy implementation, standardized testing, two-way dual language

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Deborah K. Palmer, The University of Texas at Austin, 1912 Speedway Stop D5700, Austin, TX 78712-0379. E-mail: debpalmer@austin.utexas.edu

Two-way dual language (TWDL) programs are often identified as a strong model for bilingual development and an alternative to traditionally deficit-oriented bilingual programs (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Marian, Shook, & Schroeder, 2013). Content instruction, according to the model, is delivered in two languages, and the student population is balanced between native English speakers and native speakers of a language other than English (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Yet, as with any academic program, TWDL program success is contingent on its implementation, which can be multilayered and complex (Palmer, Henderson, Wall, Zuñiga, & Berthelsen, in press; Freeman, 2004). For one academic school year, drawing on ethnographic methods, we documented a team of teachers implementing a top-down mandated TWDL program. In this analysis, we will explore the linguistic interactions in each third-grade classroom. We will examine the conditions that appeared to mediate student and teacher language practices as they worked together to enact the two-way dual language program.

Prior research recognizes multiple factors as critical for TWDL implementation, including strong program models, effective leadership, robust curriculum, an adequate student population, and high-quality teachers (Palmer, Zuñiga, & Henderson, in press; Howard & Sugarman, 2007; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). More recently, researchers have identified teacher language ideologies as playing a key role in program implementation success (Palmer, 2011; Olson, 2009; Varghese, 2008). Teachers draw on language ideologies to interpret, negotiate, and enact language policy and, ultimately, open or close spaces for diverse language practices and development. Teachers are language policy makers through their negotiation of language policies at the local level (Palmer, 2011; García & Menken 2010). In this context, we examine the conditions, including teacher language ideologies, that appeared to mediate classroom language practices.

This article provides an in-depth understanding of the language ecologies of two classrooms attempting to implement TWDL and its mediating conditions. Specifically, we examined language practices, including the use of Spanish, English, and code-switching by both teachers and students. The guiding questions for this study were:

1. What are the language practices of the teachers and students in two third-grade classrooms in the first year of TWDL program implementation?
2. How do the language practices by the teachers and students appear to be mediated by (and mediate) local conditions, language ideologies, and larger societal processes?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This article draws on a social view of language. Maybin (2001) summarizes this perspective: "Language in the Bakhtin and Volosinov writings is characterized not as a decontextualized abstract system of signs, but as originating in social struggle, coloured by the history of its use, always evaluative and highly ideological (p. 67)." We understand language to always take place within fields of power, foregrounding its ideological nature (Kress, 2001). Speakers use the cultural and linguistic resources that are available to them in their social environment for social interaction and language production.

More specifically, we draw on social theory detailed by Erickson (2004) to explore the language practices in each classroom. Language practices are defined as the local production of oral discourse that is informed by nonlocal and prior processes (Erickson, 2004). Erickson builds on

the work of Bakhtin and Volosinov to put forth a theory connecting micro local language practices and macro societal processes. He critiques both total voluntarism and determinism when examining local language practices, concluding that:

> . . . the two truths we have been considering . . . must necessarily be held together in a tension of paradox: (1) the conduct of talk in local social interaction as it occurs in real time is unique, crafted by local actors for the specific situation of its use in the moment of its uttering, and (2) the conduct of talk in local social interaction is profoundly influenced by processes that occur beyond the temporal and spatial horizon of the immediate occasion of interaction. (Erickson, 2004, p. 197)

Erickson postulates that these macro and micro processes work together: Linguistic shifts occur both top-down and bottom-up in terms of redefining the "structure" and "wiggle room" in local language ecologies. Erickson's framework is suited for the purposes of this study, which aimed to consider local language choices and the larger mediating conditions.

The language practices explored in this study included code-switching between Spanish and English. The bilingual practice of code-switching, or shifting between/among multiple languages throughout communication, is alternatively referred to as *hybrid language practices* (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999), *translanguaging* (García, 2009), and *polylanguaging* (Jorgensen, Karrebaek, Madsen, & Moller, 2011). The concept of linguistic hybridity is used to better describe the "polytextual, multivoiced and multiscripted" nature of language within social activities that manifests in the mixing of languages or any language contact (Gutiérrez et al., 1999, p. 287). García distinguishes the term *translanguaging* from *code-switching* to underscore that bilinguals have a single linguistic repertoire for communication (García, 2009). The term *translanguaging* rejects the conception of bilingual speakers as two monolinguals in one, referred to as the "two solitudes" assumption (Cummins, 2008) or "dual monolingualism" (Fitts, 2006). While the current analysis is in line with this conception of bilingualism, we use the term *code-switching* here because the teachers in this study used code-switching to describe the mixing of language. We build from the research-based perspective that code-switching is a valid and socially meaningful way to communicate and does not indicate inexperience or ignorance. We further understand code-switching as a sociolinguistic tool for interaction, including classroom communication (García, 2009; Potowski, 2004; Zentella, 1997). Code-switching was part of the linguistic repertoires of the teachers and students in this study.

When language practices are considered, a researcher must take into consideration the role of language ideologies (Gal, 1995). The ideological impact of language is as important in everyday conversation as in formal institutional language (Maybin, 2001). In this study, language ideologies are defined as "beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds" (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 498). This conception of language ideology allows for "uses" that are potentially hegemonic, counter-hegemonic (or both), as well as multiple and contradictory (Kroskrity, 2004). Research exposes the multiple and contradictory nature of language ideologies occurring within communities (Hill, 1998) and even individual speakers (Martínez, 2013). Arguably, TWDL programs represent a pluralist, counterhegemonic language ideology. We conceive of language ideology as an active process with less emphasis on the beliefs themselves (noun) and more on the way the beliefs show up in people's linguistic practices.

Participants' awareness or consciousness of language ideologies varies (Kroskrity, 2010). It is arguably most productive to conceive of linguistic awareness of language use along a continuum (Martínez, 2014). In light of this variation, Philips (2011) recognizes a need to differentiate

between types of language ideologies and subdivides the concept into normative and phenomeno-logical sense-making practices. The normative or dominant language ideology represents a larger, often subconscious structural belief, while phenomenological sense making involves individuals making sense of a singular event happening in real time (Philips, 2011). We are most interested in phenomenological sense making by teachers and students of classroom language practices, although we consider the role of dominant language ideologies. Furthermore, language ideolo-gies can be articulated or inferred by the actions and decisions of speakers (McGroarty, 2008). To distinguish between the tacit actions and verbal elaboration of linguistic norms and practices, we consider articulated and embodied language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2010), recognizing that these sites overlap and intertwine.

Some research examines the role of language ideologies within TWDL implementation. Palmer (2011) explored transitional bilingual educators' language ideologies, identifying the tension between the teachers' ideological positioning toward additive bilingualism and their pro-gram requirement to transition students to English. Despite their beliefs, teachers were pressured to transition students and, ultimately, became invested in the transition process as the ultimate goal. On the other hand, Olson (2009) explored English language learner (ELL) language policy, teacher beliefs, and reform implementation in California and found that teachers have agency to adapt policy to fit their ideological viewpoint. This study contributes to this body of research by examining how language ideologies and additional societal conditions mediate the language practices in two TWDL classrooms mandated to implement TWDL.

CONTEXT

This study takes place in a large city in central Texas where Spanish and English often coexist in the same spaces, particularly in predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods where signs, billboards, business names, and street art display a mix of Spanish and English. The emerging bilingual stu-dents attending Woodward Elementary (pseudonym), the school selected for this study, generally belong to the largely Hispanic local communities in which bilingualism and code-switching are the norm.

Woodward Elementary is a medium-sized urban school situated within a largely Hispanic community. At the time of the study, the school was approximately 87% Hispanic, 97% eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, and 75% "limited English proficient." Woodward was one of 10 pilot schools in the district implementing a dual language bilingual education program model. The implementation began during the 2010–2011 school year in pre-K and first grade. Every year as the children advance, the school implements one additional grade level. Data were collected during the 2012–2013 school year, the first year of TWDL implementation in third grade.

Dual Language Model: Gómez and Gómez

The Gómez and Gómez dual language model was purchased by the school district for district-wide implementation. A central tenet of the model is the separation of language by content area, with the goal to attain content-area biliteracy by fifth grade: Math is taught in English, while sci-ence and social studies are instructed in Spanish. In third grade, students receive approximately

an hour each of English and Spanish language arts (Gómez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005; Gómez & Gómez, 1999). Furthermore, the model requires a number of pedagogical strategies, including the use of "bilingual pairs," "bilingual learning centers," interactive word walls in both Spanish and English, and the labeling of objects throughout the classroom in Spanish (red) and English (blue). The model establishes a language of the day, which alternates daily for all noninstructional school language (Gómez & Gómez, 1999). Taken altogether, the Gómez and Gómez dual language model is highly prescriptive in terms of language use and classroom pedagogy.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

There were four teachers on the third-grade team at Woodward: a team of two teachers in charge of the TWDL program, one teacher who taught a self-contained classroom made up entirely of ELL students using the Gómez/Gómez instructional model (known by the Gómez team as "One Way Dual Language" or OWDL), and one ESL teacher. This article focused specifically on the TWDL team: the "English side" teacher, Ms. Stevens, and the "Spanish side" TWDL teacher, Ms. Castillo. We chose to focus on the third-grade teachers because it was their first year attempting to implement the dual language program.

Ms. Stevens. Ms. Stevens identified as a White female in her late twenties. This was her first year at Woodward Elementary; however, she had two years of previous teaching experience teaching in second grade at a different school in the district. Ms. Stevens had received her certification through a popular local alternative certification program. Ms. Stevens identified as bilingual in Spanish and English, having majored in Spanish in college and having spent two years in Madrid. Given that Ms. Stevens learned Spanish as an adult and in a foreign language context, her individual bilingual language development was distinct from the students in her classroom.

Ms. Castillo. Ms. Castillo identified as a Latina female in her early thirties. This was her first year at Woodward Elementary; however, she was in her ninth year teaching. Ms. Castillo identified as bilingual in Spanish and English. Both of her parents spoke Spanish when she was growing up, and she attended school entirely in English. In this way, Ms. Castillo's bilingual upbringing more closely resembled that of a large percentage of her students.

Students. Ms. Stevens and Ms. Castillo cotaught two groups of children for the TWDL program. Despite the TWDL program label, there were very few native English speakers. In Ms. Steven's homeroom, there was one native English speaker and in Ms. Castillo's homeroom, there were four; however, the labels were insufficient to capture the complex linguistic repertoires of the students. Research suggests that language dominance is not fixed (Genesee, 2001) and can shift based on motivation, preference, or situation (Meisel, 2007). Indeed, every student in the classroom was better conceptualized as being on different points along the bilingual/biliterate continua (Hornberger, 2003). While only five students were labeled native English speakers, eight students were identified as stronger in English and designated to take their standardized tests

in English for reading. The classroom demographics mirrored the demographics of the school; almost all students were Latina/o and came from low-SES (socioeconomic status) households.

Sources of Data

This study drew on ethnographic methods for data collection. Sources for data included observing in the two teachers' classrooms and weekly planning meetings, as well as semistructured and informal interviews.

Classroom observations targeted language arts instruction because it was the only subject taught by both teachers, allowing for a cross-classroom comparison of teacher and student language practices. Classroom observations occurred between October and April on Thursdays by the teachers' request and to facilitate attendance of weekly planning meetings, which also occurred on Thursdays. Extensive field notes were taken during each class observation and then expanded upon following the class within 48 hours (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Both classrooms were audio-recorded (also video-recorded in Ms. Stevens classroom) after the fourth observation for approximately three hours of recording in each classroom.

In addition to classroom observations, researcher 1 attended 18 weekly planning meetings. Planning meetings were audio-recorded starting on the fifth meeting for a total of approximately 10 hours of recording. Two additional third-grade team members were present at the weekly planning meetings. The principal attended about half the meetings. Attending planning meetings created a space for informal interviews with Ms. Stevens and Ms. Castillo and provided insight into language arts curriculum decisions. In addition, conversations took place during the planning meetings about the dual language model and language practices; on three different occasions, the teachers engaged in a conversation on code-switching. These data served as a measure of articulated language ideologies. The fact that the conversations arose authentically without prompting from the researcher increased the validity of the measure (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Data Analysis

Data do not exist objectively. Data analysis began alongside data collection and infiltrated all points of the research process (Emerson et al., 1995). Analytic memos were written during the data collection process to make sense of emerging patterns and further inform data collection. We actively sought deviant cases to (dis)confirm developing themes during each subsequent observation (Mertens, 2009).

Following completion of data collection, the field notes and semistructured interview transcripts were read carefully and open coded line by line to both reveal and confirm developing patterns and themes (Emerson et al., 1995; Mertens, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994). In this way, data analysis unfolded both inductively and deductively; while themes identified during the data collection period were explored for (dis)confirming evidence, we remained open to the possibility of new themes to emerge from this process (Emerson et. al., 1995). Researcher 1 listened to the audio recordings of weekly planning meetings two times and coded to triangulate findings and reveal potential new themes. We targeted conversations on student language and discussions on the dual language model for additional analysis utilizing tools from discourse analysis (Schiffrin, 1994; Erickson, 2004).

A Note on Researcher Positionality

During observations, researcher 1 participated minimally in the classroom environment. Nonetheless, her presence to some degree mediated the teacher and student talk. Researcher 1 is a White, female, sequential bilingual (Spanish/English), former elementary school teacher. When asked, both Ms. Stevens and Ms. Castillo felt her presence in the classroom did not substantially change students' or their own behavior and language. Researcher 1 deliberately spoke in Spanish or code-switched during interactions with students. She spoke English with Ms. Stevens and Spanish with Ms. Castillo during class time. Conversations during planning meetings were predominantly in English.

FINDINGS

Language Practices

Ms. Stevens's classroom.   Teacher language practices were consistent throughout all classroom observations; Ms. Stevens, the official "English side" teacher in the TWDL program, was only observed speaking English to her students despite her bilingual capability.

Students were only observed speaking English to Ms. Stevens, except for one case in which a student said *sí* instead of "yes." The following is an excerpt from expanded field notes during the first classroom observation: *As of now, I have heard students speaking Spanish to each other but not to the teacher* (September, 2012). Additional observations as well as analysis of audio and video recordings revealed this pattern was consistent.

Over time, a more nuanced pattern emerged in which students appeared to speak more in English with teacher proximity. Researcher 1 identified this pattern in part by recognizing students' modifying their own language practices with her proximity to them. The following is an excerpt from field notes (October 2012):

> As I get closer to the students, I hear more English. *They appeared to be switching into English more with my closer presence.* One group in particular, when I walked close to them, I heard two students speak in English and they were glancing at me as they spoke.

As evident in the expanded field notes, students appeared to modify their language choices not only based on to whom they were talking but also the proximity of the researcher. The fact that researcher 1 is a White woman and successive bilingual, similar to Ms. Stevens, likely influenced student language choices, or perhaps it was simply that she was an adult in their English class.

The pattern of students speaking only English when the teacher was near was generally consistent, yet there were two noted instances during observations in which the pattern broke. In the following example, the teacher was sitting at a table in the corner of the room used to meet with individual students, pairs, or groups. Ms. Stevens announced to students that she would be calling a group to work with her. She called five student names. Mariela was one of the students, and Ms. Stevens asked Mariela if Leslie was in the bathroom.

> **Mariela:** (*facing and talking to teacher*) No, she is at the computer. (*turns about 45 degrees in the direction of Leslie*) Leslie, *te habla la maestra* [Leslie, the teacher is calling you].

When Mariela initiated the interaction facing and talking to the teacher, she spoke in English. Her second phrase, directed toward a classmate, was in Spanish. There was a stark contrast between her language choice when talking to the teacher and her language choice toward her classmate. The specific reason for Mariela's code-switch into Spanish is difficult to pinpoint. It is possible Mariela typically interacted with Leslie in Spanish. Perhaps she was distancing herself from the teacher and demonstrating solidarity and camaraderie with her classmate. An alternative explanation was that the phrase *te habla la maestra* was formulaic speech repeated frequently within classroom discourse. Finally, Mariela's code-switch was perhaps an illustration of the local hybrid language practices of her community; code-switching between interlocutors is a daily phenomenon in this linguistically diverse community.

In addition to Mariela's noticeable break from the overall pattern of students speaking only English with teacher proximity, during a whole-class observation, two boys at different tables in the classroom shouted out Spanish comments across the room. This broke the pattern because the shouts were loud enough for everyone to hear. Ms. Stevens was walking the students through a poetry lesson; she had the students close their eyes and imagine what they could see from the poem's descriptive language. Several boys did not close their eyes, which caused them to discretely giggle and make subtle glances toward one another. When the students were asked to open their eyes and share something they saw, one boy said, "I saw a shadow." The teacher praised and repeated his answer and told everyone to write down what they had seen. As students began to write, the teacher walked toward the table closest to the wall, distancing her from the boys who were giggling and began to monitor student work. A space opened up for the boys to communicate with each other:

1	**Boy 1**	(loud enough for boys at three different tables to hear him) *Yo estaba así* [I was like this]. *Yo estaba así* [I was like this] (glancing at the different boys at the table and modeling with his hands how he had made it look like he was covering his eyes while in reality maintaining vision)
2	**Boy 2**	(shouting) *Yo miré* shadow [I saw shadow]
3	**Several Boys**	(Rocking back and forth laughing)

Although the second boy's gesture was not observed when he made the comment, we inferred that he was covering his eyes and still looking and commenting on how he could literally see a shadow from his hand. In this event, the students still used teacher proximity to mediate when they shouted to one another; they waited until the teacher was across the room. However, the shouting was loud enough for researcher 1 to hear across the room, so presumably the teacher also heard it. Thus, as with Mariela's comment, this was a discrepant case.

This language event revealed some potentially interesting uses of Spanish or code-switching in the classroom as a form of student agency. It appeared as though the boys were shouting to each other in Spanish as a covert way to discuss their local act of resistance, in this case, not shutting their eyes. Their Spanish language use with one another positioned them socially distant from the English-speaking teacher. The student who said, "*Yo miré* shadow" was drawing on the word *shadow* from the poetry lesson but repurposing its meaning; the "shadow" image in the poem versus the "shadow" created by his hands. The code-switch was potentially a subtle and creative way to indicate this change in meaning of the word *shadow* and its potential underlying purpose of student resistance.

In one informal interview with Ms. Stevens in November, researcher 1 discussed her observations of classroom language practices. She told Ms. Stevens she observed her only speaking in English and the students only speaking to her in English. Ms. Stevens confirmed both to be true. Researcher 1 also told her the observation of the students speaking in Spanish and code-switching with each other. In reaction, Ms. Stevens gave a surprised look (eyebrows lifted) and said, "They should only be speaking in English." She appeared to be expressing both disbelief and concern, commenting that she had only noticed students speaking Spanish when they were "misbehaving or off-task."

This was surprising; we were under the assumption that Ms. Stevens supported her students' use of Spanish with each other, given the prominence of Spanish and code-switching in student interactions. The observation that students were speaking more English the closer they were to the teacher became more meaningful; it appeared that students had found the "wiggle room" and were enacting student agency to engage in their community hybrid language practices when the teacher was at a distance (Erickson, 2004). Ms. Stevens's reaction also shed a new light on our interpretation of the boys shouting to each other in Spanish across the room. Indeed, the students seemed to be designating Spanish and code-switching, in part, as a space for resistance. The overall frequent use of Spanish and code-switching within peer interactions likely reflected that the practices were natural and spontaneous (Reyes, 2001). The students were drawing on their linguistic repertoires, including their bilingual competencies. In other words, in these peer interactions, students continued to be bilingual regardless of what the "official" model and classroom policy dictated.

Ms. Castillo's classroom.   Ms. Castillo spoke in both Spanish and English during Spanish language arts class. Researcher 1 wrote the following during the first classroom observation: *When I walk in the classroom I am shocked to hear the teacher speaking in English* (November, 2012). This was surprising because the TWDL model prescribed the teacher to speak and instruct solely in Spanish for Spanish language arts. This pattern held for all the classroom observations; the teacher spoke English and Spanish in all lessons. Students were also separated for distinct language practice (leveled Spanish or English) for at least part of every lesson except two. Between three and five students (identified as struggling learners) worked with a teacher aide in the back of the classroom in Spanish.

Ms. Castillo used Spanish language arts as the period to complete her mandatory "motivation reading" program. Motivation reading was a program adopted by the school for test preparation. Students were required to complete their "motivation reading" in the language in which they were going to take their state test in April. Specifically, eight students were identified as stronger in English proficiency and were provided workbooks in English. This left Ms. Castillo in the position to conduct whole-class instruction for students working in two different languages. The teacher positioned students as belonging to the "English group" or "Spanish group," for example, she said, "Spanish group, put your homework away and you are going to do this part. English, get your motivation out" (1/30/13). In this example, the teacher provided instructions for both groups in English. In other examples, she provided instruction for both groups in Spanish. Ms. Castillo rarely translated, thus simultaneously positioning all students as competent bilinguals.

For the two final observations in April directly before standardized testing, six of the eight students who were identified to take the test in English were moved to the third-grade ESL classroom for test preparation in English. The two students who were not moved were the

highest-performing native English speakers. Ms. Castillo explained in an informal interview that these students were not at any risk of failing the state test (STAAR). She didn't want to "subject them to more STAAR preparation" (field notes 4/11/13), and so they completed an independent book study. During these two observations, these two students were observed reading books in English on beanbags in the corner of the room.

The school's mandate that Ms. Castillo complete Motivation Reading in two languages was a central reason for her constant switching of languages. In the following classroom observation, the students were reading a story from their workbooks, and Ms. Castillo attempted to negotiate students having the books in different languages:

1	**Ms. C.**	She's going to read it in English and you can read it in your mind in Spanish.
2	**Student 1**	(Student reads passage in English.)
3	**Ms. C.**	Melissa, will you read it in Spanish for us please.
4	**Student 2**	(Student reads passage in Spanish.)
5	**Ms. C.**	Antonio, follow (strict tone). Rosa, *lea por favor* [Rosa, read please]

In line 1, Ms. Castillo was speaking entirely in English, but asked students to "read it in your mind in Spanish." Ms. Castillo was negotiating how to instruct students using workbooks in two separate languages. Her negotiation continued in line 3 when she asked a student in English to read it in Spanish. By asking the student in English, Ms. Castillo positioned the student as a competent bilingual; she expected the student to understand her English and read in Spanish. However, in line 5, the teacher redirected Antonio in English and then intersententially code-switched into Spanish to ask Rosa to read. This example illustrated how students engaged in more English or Spanish based on the language they were testing in; it determined what language they read in (Palmer, 2008).

In line 5, it is possible the teacher switched into Spanish because she viewed Rosa as a more dominant Spanish speaker, although additional data analysis revealed an alternative explanation: The teacher would switch between Spanish and English often during classroom transitions and emotional responses (i.e., reprimand or praise). In the previous case, Ms. Castillo reprimanded Antonio in English and then switched to Spanish to ask Rosa to read. The following classroom examples further illustrated this pattern of teacher code-switching during an emotional response or a transition:

Example 1	**Ms. C.**	*Me enojo más que no estás haciendo nada*. [I get more angry when you aren't doing anything.] (Pause) Cassandra, you are really testing my patience. I asked you take out your book (said louder). (January, 2013)
Example 2	**Ms. C.**	We are going to do another one when you get back and I hope that you do better. *Imagínate si esto fuera la MOY* [Middle of Year Benchmark Test] *que van a tomar la semana que entra. ¡Nada más cuatro niños habrían pasado!* [Imagine if this was the MOY that you are going to take next week. Only four of you would have passed!] (February, 2013)
Example 3	**Ms. C.**	(Following a question asked in Spanish and a student response in Spanish) Oh! That is a good inference! Okay, *¿cómo se siente Beatriz?* [Okay, how does Beatriz feel?] (March, 2013)
Example 4	**Ms. C.**	Good morning, children. (Students say "Good morning, Ms. Castillo.") Get your motivation reading out. (Followed by seven turns by Ms. C. in Spanish). (January, 2013)

In each of the examples, Ms. Castillo code-switched intersententially between Spanish and English. In the first example, the teacher was speaking in Spanish to Cassandra and switched into English as she reprimanded her. In the second example, the teacher spoke initially in English and switched to Spanish as she reprimanded students in reference to their MOY (middle of the year) test scores. In the third example, the teacher guided students in a question-and-answer session in Spanish but code-switched into English to praise the student before switching back into Spanish for more questions. In the final example, the teacher transitioned to start class using formulaic speech in English. Directly following the transition, the teacher began classroom instruction in Spanish.

Ms. Castillo generally code-switched intersententially; she would complete an entire sentence in Spanish or English before changing languages. However, in the previous example, Ms. Castillo said, "Okay, *como se siente Beatriz*?" Indeed, Ms. Castillo frequently said "okay" while speaking in Spanish. The word *okay* was used as a filler word. While native Spanish speakers more commonly use a word in Spanish such as *pues*, Ms. Castillo's use of the word *okay* signified her fluid bilingualism.

There were other discrepant cases when the teacher code-switched intrasententially. This occurred when the teacher appeared to change her mind or make a mistake. For example, Ms. Castillo in the process of instructing students to open their books to a particular page said, "Okay, *página* [page], wrong book" (November, 2012). In another instance, Ms. Castillo was asking students questions and said, "*Yo uso* [I use], hold on, let me start my sentence again" (January, 2013). Although these discrepant cases occurred in low frequency, the fact that she code-switched intersententially represented the embodiment of a particular language ideology that contradicted Ms. Castillo's articulated language ideology. I observed Ms. Castillo reprimand or redirect students on multiple occasions for code-switching intersententially, as demonstrated in the following example:

1 **Student** *Mi hermana esta enferma y no tiene que ir a la escuela*. [My sister is sick and she didn't have to go to school.] *Está* lucky.
2 **Ms. C.** *Suertuda*. [Lucky.] *Tu hermana es suertuda*. [Your sister is lucky.] *Acuérdate que el inglés y el español no se pueden mezclar*. [Remember that English and Spanish can't mix.]

Ms. Castillo articulated her disapproval of "mixing" languages, despite her constant intersentential code-switching and occasional intrasentential code-switch. It seemed likely, given Ms. Castillo's constant intersentential code-switching, that she viewed switching between languages at the sentence level to be acceptable but intrasentential code-switching to be unacceptable. Indeed, her correction of student language practices targeted intrasentential code-switching.

Ms. Castillo's language ideologies, i.e., accepting some bilingual practices (intersentential code-switching) but not others (intrasentential code-switching), potentially explained the spaces in the classroom for student language practices. Ms. Castillo was unable to implement a language policy in which certain bilingual practices were okay whereas others were not; students were observed speaking English, Spanish, and code-switching to Ms. Castillo. Although Ms. Castillo redirected students on occasion to not mix languages within sentences, students were observed numerous times code-switching intrasententially in interactions with the teacher. Indeed, Ms. Castillo articulated her frustration with code-switching in a planning meeting: "Go and get their language straight. No code-switching!" (October, 2013). Ms. Castillo's inability to limit language

mixing can potentially be explained by the combination of her embodied language ideology (she occasionally code-switched intrasententially) and the complexity of the language policy.

Unlike in Ms. Stevens's classroom, where students appeared to engage in Spanish and code-switching discretely, students fluidly shifted between languages in Ms. Castillo's classroom. In other words, the language ecology of the Ms. Castillo's classroom was entirely hybrid in nature (Gutiérrez et al., 1999). Students were also observed speaking English, Spanish, and code-switching with their classmates in Ms. Castillo's classroom. Indeed, peer interactions did not appear to differ substantially from classroom to classroom.

Conditions Mediating Classroom Language Practices

Erickson (2004) posits that language events are both co-constructed locally and deeply influenced by larger societal processes. This research draws on Erickson's theoretical framework to explore the conditions mediating classroom language practices: First, we explore the local mediating conditions, specifically how language ideologies were enacted in the classroom to open or close spaces for diverse language practices. Second, we examine societal conditions that appeared to highly influence the local language ecology.

Language ideologies.   Ms. Stevens and Ms. Castillo both articulated support of bilingual-ism and bilingual education in their interviews and during planning meetings. In other words, both teachers articulated an additive language ideology and expressed that students would benefit from being bilingual. However, Ms. Stevens and Ms. Castillo embodied very distinct language ideolo-gies in their classroom. Ms. Stevens viewed her English language arts classroom as, ideally, an English-only space. Ms. Stevens's beliefs about the language that *should* be spoken in the class-room influenced both students' engagement with her and each other when she was within earshot (almost entirely in English). Ms. Stevens articulated and embodied an English-only ideology to support the implementation of the TWDL model.

On the other hand, Ms. Castillo viewed her Spanish language arts classroom as a space for Motivation Reading, thus, language development in either Spanish or English, depending on which language students were going to take their state test in. She expressed feeling pressured to continue English language development for students designated to test in English. She voiced that she had no choice, given the high-stakes nature of the exam. Despite Ms. Castillo's articu-lated desire to develop students' bilingualism, she used English during Spanish language arts. Ms. Castillo also articulated the language ideology that code-switching was "incorrect." However, Ms. Castillo embodied an ideology of language hybridity (Gutiérrez et al., 1999) and code-switched constantly herself.

As for the students' language ideologies, they appeared to view Ms. Stevens as an English-only interlocutor, while Ms. Castillo was viewed as bilingual. For the most part, when Ms. Stevens was in earshot, students spoke in English. Student language choices, however, involved more agency; they found spaces to engage in hybrid language practices even with Ms. Stevens's strict language separation. By contrast, in interactions with Ms. Castillo, students spoke in English, Spanish, and code-switched. Students' code-switching in interaction with Ms. Castillo suggested that her embodiment of linguistic hybridity was more powerful than her articulated negative language ideology toward code-switching.

Peer interaction in both classrooms involved the use of Spanish, English, and code-switching between Spanish and English. Students viewed and engaged with one another as bilinguals.

Additional mediating societal processes.   Two factors appeared central to mediating the language ecology developed within Ms. Stevens's and Ms. Castillo's classrooms: (a) the dual language model, and (b) pressure from standardized testing. Ms. Stevens and Ms. Castillo articulated highly distinct views on the language model being implemented in the school. Ms. Stevens expressed support for the model. Indeed, Ms. Stevens had changed schools specifically in order to participate in the TWDL program. Furthermore, she positioned herself as an expert on the model multiple times during planning meetings and understood her role as the English teacher to speak English only. On two separate occasions, Ms. Stevens expressed her desire to speak Spanish with the students, but she "can't" because now she is the "English" dual language teacher. Ms. Stevens's support, knowledge, and fidelity to the model all appeared to impact the local language ecology created in her classroom, specifically her effort to make it an English-only space.

On the other hand, Ms. Castillo articulated contradictory feelings toward the TWDL model. While she articulated overall support for the model, she did not feel that the school or district provided sufficient support for its implementation. Rather, she felt the requirements for test preparation were incompatible with the demands of the dual language model: "I feel *so torn*. Like how much of my time do I focus on the Spanish? How much time do I focus on the English? I have a split group." In the following interaction in a planning meeting, Ms. Castillo vented to her colleagues about the principal's (Mr. Bowers) observation and critique of her implementation of the model. Ms. E. was the third-grade OWDL teacher, and Ms. L. was the third-grade ESL teacher:

1 **Ms. C.** And let me tell you, when Mr. Bowers was doing the walk through. He walked in when I was, ahh, modeling motivation reading. And I was explaining it in Spanish and then in my English group, I was doing it in English to them, and he said that I shouldn't do that. That I'm code-switching.
2 **Ms. E.** You're supposed to wait at least five minutes. (Participants laugh except Ms. Stevens and myself.)
3 **Ms. L.** Or wait until Mr. Bowers is not in the room. That's the real answer (said while laughing). Do not do it (laughing).
4 **Ms. E.** Let me tell you. From my point of view, I don't see nothing wrong about code-switching.
5 **Ms. L.** Gómez and Gómez hate that.
6 **Ms. C.** But if you talk to them. If you speak to them. That's how they speak.
7 **Ms. L.** Somebody told me that. You're not the first person to say that.
8 **Ms. C.** They speak horrible!
9 **Ms. L.** They code-switch. (Teachers discuss code-switching for six turns.)
10 **Ms. C.** And I had both books! The Spanish and the English! So he's like in the dual . . . and he told me in the hallway when I was going to TELPAS.
11 **Ms. E.** He always does that.
12 **Ms. C.** And I was like, okay. I mean I'm not going to go against what he's telling me.
13 **Ms. L.** Just say okay.
14 **Ms. C.** Uh huh. And I was just like okay. And I just said, well, you *do* know I *do* have a lot of English now. So, he's like, yeah, but, um, you might need to pull them aside.
15 **Ms. E.** Aside, yes, and by the time you pull them aside . . .
16 **Ms. C.** Yeah.
17 **Ms. E.** You are already killing like three or four of your minutes.

In line 1, Ms. Castillo shared that the principal told her not to code-switch. Ms. Castillo began the story with "And let me tell you," implying the absurdity of the principal's actions. In lines 3 and 4, her two colleagues demonstrated support for Ms. Castillo by making jokes about feigning compliance to administrators. In lines 4–9 the participants addressed their problems with the strict separation of the model. In line 8, Ms. Castillo personally insulted the developers (Gómez and Gómez) of the model by saying "They speak horrible!" This insult also indirectly expressed an articulated language ideology that code-switching is "horrible." In line 10, Ms. Castillo demonstrated how impossible it was for the principal to expect her to stay in one language when she had books in two separate languages. This interaction demonstrated Ms. Castillo's frustration with the model and what she identified as her principal's unrealistic expectation for implementation.

The principal appeared to critique Ms. Castillos's lack of fidelity to the model, but in line 14 Ms. Castillo expressed how the principal offered no solution for her predicament to complete motivation reading for students in two languages other than to "pull them aside." In lines 15–17, Ms. E. demonstrated solidarity with Ms. Castillo that this was an inadequate solution. Following this planning meeting in March, the English-dominant students began to go to the ESL classroom during Spanish language arts, thus ultimately resolving the issue in favor of test preparation.

The planning meeting interaction demonstrated the role of standardized testing in the mediation of the classroom language ecologies. Particularly, Ms. Castillo was pressured to prepare students for a monolingual test, while simultaneously being required to implement a language model that promotes bilingualism. The teacher prioritized test preparation and dismantled the dual language model. In fact, a broader analysis of the planning meetings revealed that test preparation was the single most discussed topic (see Palmer & Henderson, 2014, for details). All teachers expressed tremendous pressure to achieve high test scores. In reality, Ms. Castillo appeared to have little agency to make any other decision; the current sociocultural schooling environment in Texas prioritizes standardized testing. Ms. Stevens was not similarly pressured to provide test preparation to students in Spanish during her English language arts class. Thus, despite the multiplicity of ideologies embodied and articulated by both teachers, the overarching dominant language ideology of English superiority was present and powerful.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings in this study indicated that the language model (TWDL), standardized testing, teacher language ideologies, and student agency all played key roles in the creation of diverse spaces for language practices in each classroom. Each finding has important implications for TWDL implementation.

TWDL Implementation and Standardized Testing

The district's mandate for TWDL implementation provided the structural model for the division and use of language in the classroom. As indicated by the TWDL model, Ms. Stevens's was the "English" classroom and Ms. Castillo's the "Spanish" classroom. The principal was committed to executing the TWDL program "with fidelity" and monitored teacher implementation. However, the spaces created for language production were mediated by the local teacher implementation

of the model highlighting the role of teachers as language policy makers (Palmer, 2011; García & Menken, 2010). Ms. Stevens supported the model and believed in the separation of languages for bilingual development. On the other hand, Ms. Castillo was frustrated with the contradictory demands placed on her: test preparation and TWDL model implementation. The responsibility for test preparation was not shared across teachers, and the time for Spanish language arts instruction was compromised, highlighting a larger structural issue of English dominance.

The pressure Ms. Castillo faced to have her students perform on monolingual tests superseded the goals of student bilingual development. This is in line with other research that highlights the problematic nature of monolingual standardized testing for bilingual education (Palmer, 2008; Menken, 2008). High-stakes standardized testing and the apparent effort required to prepare young children to perform well on such tests acted in Ms. Castillo's classroom as de facto language policy (Menken, 2008).

Articulated and Embodied Language Ideologies

The findings highlight that embodied language ideologies do not always match articulated language ideologies, with embodied ideologies appearing perhaps more important. This study supports research that suggests language ideologies can be multiple and contradictory even within an individual (Martínez, 2013). While Ms. Castillo articulated support for bilingual education and advocated for student bilingual development, she did not embody this ideology in her classroom instructional decisions. Rather, her classroom decisions prioritizing monolingual tests reflected a monoglossic ideology (García & Torres-Guevara, 2010). In this case, the teachers' articulated support for bilingual education was rendered meaningless amidst structural constraints.

Furthermore, Ms. Castillo's articulated negative language ideology toward code-switching did not align with her own language practices; Ms. Castillo consistently intersententially code-switched and occasionally intrasententially code-switched. This pattern of use indicated that Ms. Castillo understood "code-switching" as intrasentencial code-switching, which she nonetheless embodied on occasion. The teacher code-switched to help transition, to get students' attention, to reprimand, or to praise students, supporting research that dispels the myth of code-switching as crutching (Martínez, 2010; Zentella, 1997). Despite her repeated attempts at redirecting students to not "mix their language," her students continued to do so. Her embodiment of linguistic pluralism appeared to send a stronger message than her articulated discontentment. Yet her articulated negative ideology toward code-switching was important. While the students continued to code-switch, they were exposed to this deficit perspective about their language skills. Research suggests that continued exposure to this dominant ideology within institutions could lead students to internalize subordinated identities (Kroskrity, 2010; Zentella, 1997).

The findings also suggest that the alignment of articulated and embodied ideologies can be powerful. Ms. Stevens articulated and embodied an English-only ideology, and students treated her as an English-only interlocutor. This "English-only" ideology was for the purpose of bilingual development; she was upholding her half of the model. At the same time, students continued to engage in bilingual practices occasionally as a form of resistance. This brings into question the strict separation of languages in TWDL bilingual education models; the embedded message that bilingualism needs to be hidden seems to contradict the additive goals of bilingualism and biliteracy in dual language bilingual education. These findings support research questioning

the strict separation of language (Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014; Fitts, 2006). Proponents of strict separation of languages in TWDL programs argue that it is necessary to preserve a safe space in order to nurture development in the minority language (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Gómez et al., 2005). As such, this case study represented the worst-case scenario. Ms. Castillo did not adhere to strict language separation during Spanish language arts, while Ms. Stevens did. Importantly, as discussed, Ms. Castillo's motivation to engage bilingually was not to value this practice; rather, she used English during Spanish language arts to accommodate standardized test preparation.

Students as Language Policy Makers

Student agency led to the creation of spaces for local hybrid language practices; students found the "wiggle room" to create spaces to speak Spanish and code-switch during English language arts (Erickson, 2004). Students also engaged in Spanish and code-switching as a form of resistance. Within the Spanish language arts classroom, students were positioned in the "English" group or "Spanish" group, yet no observable difference was identified in peer verbal interactions between classrooms. Much emphasis has been placed in current research on the role of teachers as language policy makers; teachers represent the heart of the metaphorical language policy "onion" (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Yet, this research suggests that students are also language policy makers and potentially better represent the onion's heart.

Thus, as Erickson's (2004) paradox would suggest, the spaces generated for language production in these classrooms were impacted by both *macro* influences, including the district's implementation of TWDL and standardized testing, and *micro* processes, like the students finding "wiggle room" to engage in local community hybrid language practices and teachers' articulated and embodied language ideologies.

REFERENCES

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*, 1–20.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 65–75). New York, NY: Springer.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*, 337–365. doi:10.1080/15235882.2006.10162880

Freeman, R. (2004). *Building on community bilingualism*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Gal, S. (1995). Language and the arts of resistance. *Cultural Anthropology*, *10*(3), 407–424. doi:10.1525/can.1995.10.3.02a00060

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

García, O., & Menken, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

García, O., & Torres-Guevara, R. (2010). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of U.S. Latinas/os. In E. G. Murillo, Jr., S. A. Villenas, R. T. Galván, J. S. Muñoz, C. Martínez, & M. Machado-Casas (Eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 182–193). New York, NY: Routledge.

Genesee, F. (2001). Bilingual first language acquisition: Exploring the limits of the language faculty. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 153–168. doi:10.1017/S0267190501000095

Gómez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50-50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *29*(1), 145–164. doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162828

Gómez, L., & Gómez, R. (1999). *Dual Language Training Institute*. Retrieved from http://dlti.us/3.html

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *6*, 286–303. doi:10.1080/10749039909524733

Hill, J. (1998). "Today there is no respect": Nostalgia, "respect," and oppositional discourse in Mexicano (Nahuatl) language ideology. In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 68–86). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hornberger, N. H. (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Howard, E., & Sugarman, J. (2007). *Realizing the vision of two-way immersion: Fostering effective programs and classrooms*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Jorgensen, J. N., Karrebaek, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Moller, J. S. (2011). Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, *13*(2), 23–37.

Kress, G. (2001). From Saussure to critical sociolinguistics: The turn towards a social view of language. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 29–38). London, UK: Sage.

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

Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies: Evolving perspectives. In J.-O. Östman, J. Verschueren, & J. Jaspers (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics highlights: Society and language use* (pp. 192–211). Herndon, VA: John Benjamins.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-ay immersion programs benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *36*(2), 167–186. doi:10.1080/15235882.2013.818075

Martínez, R. A. (2010). Spanglish as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *45*(2), 124–149.

Martínez, R. A. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*(3), 276–288.

Martínez, R. A. (2014). "Do they even know that they do it?": Exploring awareness of Spanish-English code-switching in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(2), 195–210. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.934972

Maybin, J. (2001). Language, struggle and voice: The Bakhtin/Volosinov writings. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 64–71). London, UK: Sage.

McGroarty, M. (2008). The political matrix of linguistic ideologies. In B. Spolsky, & F. Hult (Eds.), *Handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 98–112). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Meisel, J. M. (2007). The weaker language in early child bilingualism: Acquiring a first language as a second language? *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *28*(3), 495–514. doi:10.1017/S0142716407070270

Menken, K. (2008). *English language learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. London, UK: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olson, K. (2009). Systemic reform and superficial compliance: Teacher loyalty to lived experience. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *3*, 72–89. doi:10.1080/19313150903073596

Palmer, D. (2008). Diversity up close: Building alternative discourses in the dual immersion classroom. In T. Fortune & D. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 97–116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2014). *Dual language bilingual education placement practices and educator discourses on emerging bilingual students*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Portland, OR.

Palmer, D., Henderson, K., Wall, D., Zuñiga C., & Berthelsen, S. (in press). Team teaching among mixed messages: Implementing two-way dual language bilingual education at third grade in Texas. *Language Policy*.

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., Zuñiga, C., & Henderson, K. (in press). A dual language revolution in the United States? On the bumpy road from compensatory to enrichment education for bilingual children in Texas. In W. E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education*.

Philips, S. U. (2011). How Tongans make sense of the (non-)use of lexical honorifics. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *21*(2), 247–260. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1395.2011.01109.x

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. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00219.x

Reyes, M. (2001). Unleashing possibilities: Biliteracy in the primary grades. In M. Reyes & J. Halcon (Eds.), *The best for our children* (pp. 96–121). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(3), 401–427. doi:10.2307/3587691

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Varghese, M. M. (2008). Using cultural models to unravel how bilingual teachers enact language policies. *Language and Education*, *22*(5), 289–306. doi:10.1080/09500780802152671

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.