From Preparation to Practice

Enhancing in-Service Teachers' Work With Emergent Bilingual Learners Through Graduate Teacher Education

**Amy J. Heineke, Elizabeth M. Vera, Martin Hill,
Maria Susman Israel, Nancy Goldberger,
Bernasha Anderson, Elina Giatsou, & Kimberly Hook**

Abstract

Across the United States, school stakeholders are grappling with how best to serve the large and often marginalized student subgroup of emergent bilingual learners (EBLs), which includes preparing the wide array of teachers who work with EBLs. This mixed-method study probes one university's efforts to prepare teachers spanning settings from early childhood to high school, considering if and how

Amy J. Heineke and Elizabeth M. Vera are professors and Nancy Goldberger is assistant dean in the School of Education at Loyola Universty Chicago. Martin Hill is president of VIP Research & Evaluation. Maria Susman Israel is director of student learning programs at Stevenson High School in Linconshire, Illinois. Bernasha Anderson is a psychologist at the Thryve Wellness House in Washington, D.C. Elina Giatsou is ESL curriculum designer and educator with American Community Schools in France. Kimberly Hook is a postdoctoral fellow at the School of Medicine at Boston University/Boston Medical Center. Email addresses: aheineke@luc.edu, evera@luc.edu, hill@vipreval.com, misrael@d125.org, ngoldberger@luc.edu, dr.bernasha.anderson@gmail.com, egiatsou@gmail.com, & kimberly.hook@bmc.org

participation in an EBL-focused graduate program influenced their understandings and practices in schools with large numbers of EBLs. Drawing from pre- and post program surveys and classroom observations, findings indicate that teachers shifted both perceptions and instruction as well as espoused roles as social justice advocates for EBLs and their families. Shifts connected to program curricula and experiences as well as the cohort model involving teachers in neighboring districts. Implications center on utilizing graduate teacher education to promote equity in schools via the preparation of in-service teachers.

Introduction

Schools today are more culturally and linguistically diverse than ever before. In the context of the United States, 20% of students speak a language other than English at home, with approximately half of those students still developing proficiency in English (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2015). Whether in urban, suburban, or rural locales from New Mexico to New Hampshire, these emergent bilingual learners (EBLs) are developing language in classrooms spanning pre-kindergarten through Grade 12 (P–12) while learning literacy, math, science, and social studies (García, 2011). As the population diversifies and EBLs increase in number, schools grapple with how best to meet EBLs' unique and diverse needs. This includes educational settings that have not traditionally served EBLs and that may not be equipped with expert teachers, relevant materials, rigorous programs, and related infrastructure (Lowenhaupt, 2016).

The well-prepared teacher is integral to bolstering educational practice for EBLs (Gándara & Maxwell-Jolly, 2006). Scholars have asserted that general education teachers play central roles in larger efforts to prioritize EBLs, given that students require equitable access to rigorous learning alongside peers while developing language (de Jong et al., 2013; Lucas et al., 2008). Previous research has indicated the importance of teachers' affirming beliefs about EBLs, which springboard them to get to know students' backgrounds, abilities, families, and experiences (e.g., Moll & González, 1997). Teachers then use those funds of knowledge to foster welcoming, collaborative contexts for learning that value and reflect students' identities and languages (Linan-Thompson et al., 2018). Perhaps the topic most widely studied in classroom practice with EBLs, instructional approaches and strategies should serve to scaffold language while maintaining disciplinary rigor and meaningful experiences (e.g., Bunch, 2013; Lee & Buxton, 2013; Schall-Leckrone, 2018).

Although all of these facets of classroom practice *should* occur in general education settings, previous scholarship has uncovered that in-service teachers often feel insecure, anxious, and underprepared to teach EBLs (Bernhard et al., 2005; Polat, 2010; Reeves, 2006). Accompanying the scant preparation on research-based teaching and learning for EBLs, teachers may espouse deficit-based perspectives toward EBLs (Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Reeves, 2006; Torff & Murphy, 2020). Deeply rooted in the institution of American education, monolingual and assimilative

ideologies pervade educational settings when educators lack preparation for EBLs and have not deconstructed these dominant ways of thinking (Bacon, 2020; de Jong, 2011). Deficit perspectives can have a detrimental impact on teachers' expectations and practice (Reyes & Villarreal, 2016; Shim, 2019) as well as students' learning and self-efficacy in P–12 and beyond (Shapiro & MacDonald, 2017; Shi, 2018).

Deficit-based perspectives have the potential to be disrupted via teacher education with sufficient field experience and consistent exposure to concomitant knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support EBLs (Hopkins, 2012; Master et al., 2016; Meskill, 2005; Polat, 2010; Valdés et al., 2005). Whereas a growing number of undergraduate programs now seek to prepare all preservice teachers for EBLs (e.g., Heineke & Giatsou, 2020; Lavery et al., 2019), university stakeholders must also consider how to use graduate programs to enrich the expertise of in-service teachers. Though scant in quantity, extant literature on university-based graduate teacher education has highlighted the benefits of English as a second language (ESL) endorsement courses for in-service teachers (Byrnes & Kiger, 1997; Hansen-Thomas et al., 2016). In a recent study, researchers found that teachers who had two or more ESL endorsement courses perceived themselves as more competent in facilitating EBLs' learning than those with less training (Hansen-Thomas et al., 2016).

Despite initial evidence that EBL-focused coursework is valuable for in-service teachers, we know little about what expertise develops, and how, in these programs. Research on teacher education for EBLs prioritizes preservice preparation, where scholars probe the efficacy of courses or field experiences in facilitating knowledge and beliefs (Villegas et al., 2018). A noted dearth in the literature involves program-wide studies that consider participants' longitudinal growth over time (Feiman-Nemser, 2018). When considering in-service teachers' learning for EBLs, research has typically focused on school-based professional development, investigating initiatives aiming to develop strategies for classroom practice (Lucas et al., 2018). Though prevalent in studies of preservice teachers, teachers' beliefs have less often been the focus of research on in-service teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 2018). Overall, there has been limited research on in-service teacher education in university coursework, including program-wide lenses that pinpoint features that promote learning (Feiman-Nemser, 2018).

In this article, we investigate one graduate program targeting general education teachers of EBLs. Distinct from other studies on in-service teacher education for EBLs that use teachers' perspectives and measures of effectiveness at a single point in time, such as following a professional development session, our research probes changes over time by presenting longitudinal data from one university program. Whereas many programs focus on individual grade bands (e.g., early childhood, elementary), this project involved cohorts of participants teaching P–12 in various contexts (i.e., urban Catholic schools, suburban public schools) with great diversity among student populations (e.g., schools with primarily Latinx EBLs, highly diverse schools with 60+ languages spoken). We seek to answer the following research

questions (RQs): (a) In what ways do teachers shift their roles in EBL education during a graduate teacher education program? (b) How do teachers develop expertise for EBLs in a graduate teacher education program? and (c) What facets of the program mediate these changes in perspectives and practices? By investigating teachers' evolving roles and expertise, as well as factors mediating those shifts, we aim to contribute to the literature on graduate teacher education for EBLs.

The Focal Program

The focal graduate program consists of a six-course sequence leading to the state's ESL endorsement with options to continue working toward a master's degree

Table 1
Graduate Program of Study, by Course Order

Course	Course content	Core experiences
Foundations	✔ History of EBL education ✔ Language education policies ✔ Second language acquisition ✔ Program models for EBLs	✔ Case study of school and district: students, policies, programs, and assessments
Culturally Relevant Literature	✔ Diversity among EBLs ✔ Students' unique stories ✔ Culturally responsive practice ✔ Social-emotional needs ✔ Safe and collaborative environment	✔ Literature circles with texts portraying EBLs' unique experiences in U.S. schools ✔ Inquiry into culturally responsive classroom practice
Assessment	✔ Language proficiency assessments ✔ Authentic classroom assessments of listening, speaking, reading, writing ✔ Issues of bias and validity ✔ Data-driven interventions	✔ Case study of EBL student, including portfolio of language assessments, data-driven interventions, and analysis of impact on student learning
Methods and Materials	✔ Language functions and demands ✔ Strategies and scaffolds for EBLs ✔ Lesson-level instructional design ✔ Formative assessments	✔ Strategy applications and presentations ✔ Instructional plans with lessons and assessments
Practicum	✔ Multifaceted student data analysis ✔ Design of classroom environment ✔ Unit-level instructional design ✔ Instructional technology	✔ Classroom observations with one-on-one coaching ✔ Data-driven environment and instruction portfolio
Applied Linguistics	✔ Teacher advocacy and decision-making in multilayered language policy ✔ Comparative analysis of home, community, and school language use ✔ Action plan to promote change	✔ Research on community and school language use ✔ Applied linguistics research to solve problems of practice

Note. EBL = emergent bilingual learner.

in EBL instruction and leadership (see Table 1). The courses are strategically sequenced to (a) develop understandings about language, culture, and EBLs; (b) apply understandings to enhance practices related to classroom environment, assessment, and instruction; and (c) extend beyond the classroom to promote advocacy within schools and communities. Across courses, teachers consistently engage in experiences that tap into their daily work with EBLs in schools, prompting them to learn from their EBLs and immediately implement learning in classroom practice. Situated at a Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation–accredited institution, all coursework aligns with TESOL Professional Teaching Standards, and faculty regularly analyze participating teachers' development toward these standards.

This study focuses on teachers completing the ESL endorsement courses as a part of a grant-funded project titled "Chicagoland Partners for English Language Learners" (CPELL). This project endeavors to support diversifying districts in improving educational opportunities and outcomes for EBLs through multifaceted work with teachers, administrators, and parents. Teachers from eight culturally and

Table 2
Partner District Demographics

Partner district	Demographic details
Urban Catholic vicariate: 13 elementary schools	Although no official percentage of EBLs was available, these schools had significant representation of Latinx students who spoke Spanish at home.
Suburban K–8 district: 3 elementary schools, 1 middle school	1,882 students: 51% low-income; 31% Asian, 37% White, 18% Latinx, 10% Black, 4% multiracial; 22% EBL; 67 languages
Suburban HS district: 6 high schools	12,029 students: 20% low-income; 54% White, 33% Latinx, 8% Asian, 2% Black, 3% multiracial; 8% EBL; 71 languages
Suburban K–8 district: 3 elementary schools, 1 middle school	2,338 students: 8% low-income; 45% Asian, 44% White, 6% Latinx, 4% multiracial, 1% Black; 24% EBL; 56 languages
Suburban K–8 district: 8 elementary schools, 3 middle schools	3,964 students: 28% low-income; 63% White, 29% Latinx, 3% Asian, 3% multiracial, 2% Black; 18% EBL; 36 languages
Suburban K–8 district: 13 elementary schools, 3 middle schools	7,943 students: 38% low-income; 43% White, 22% Black, 21% Latinx, 9% multiracial, 5% Asian; 14% EBL; 67 languages
Suburban K–8 district: 6 elementary schools, 2 middle schools	4, 250 students: 28% low-income; 45% White, 26% Latinx, 22% Asian, 4% multiracial, 2% Black; 23% EBL; 63 languages
Suburban HS district: 1 high school	4,185 students: 5% low-income; 57% White, 30% Asian, 8% Latinx, 3% multiracial, 2% Black; 2% EBL; 61 languages

Note. EBL = emergent bilingual learner.

linguistically diverse partner districts (see Table 2) had the opportunity to enroll in coursework with partially subsidized tuition by both the grant and the university. Resulting cohorts involved teachers spanning P–12, including those who teach literacy, math, science, social studies, world languages, special education, and special areas. Per the project's logic model, participating teachers were meant to occupy central roles in the larger grant efforts to build capacity and transform practice for EBLs in schools and districts. In work with administrators and parents, the other two prongs of the three-prong project, university team members frequently involved these teachers in the work.

Conceptual Framework

To guide our investigation, we employ a three-facet conceptual framework to understand how teachers recognize their roles and develop expertise across a graduate teacher education program. The first facet draws from sociocultural perspectives on language policy in practice, specifically the central role of the teacher (Ricento & Hornberger, 1997). Pushing back against perceptions of the educational system as linear and top-down, where policies trickle down from federal, state, district, and school administrators, scholars have instead conceptualized EBL education as complex and dynamic, with multiple layers and stakeholders (Johnson, 2013). Ricento and Hornberger (1997) used the metaphor of an onion, where teachers are situated at the center due to their active role in enacting change. Within the classroom, teachers make decisions that influence students; beyond the classroom, teachers interact with intermediary actors (e.g., administrators), with the potential to shift larger practices within schools (Ricento & Hornberger, 1997). With this study, we seek to understand how general education teachers potentially shift perceptions of their roles in EBL education (RQ1).

The second facet of our framework centers on linguistically responsive teacher education, which details the specific expertise general education teachers need to facilitate effective teaching and learning with EBLs (Lucas et al., 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). As EBLs have increased in number in schools over the past 15 years, various scholars have sought to outline the pertinent knowledge base needed for teachers of EBLs (Commins & Miramontes, 2006; Heritage et al., 2015; Lucas et al., 2008; Valdés et al., 2005). Frameworks converge around teacher expertise as stemming from two components: the development of *understandings* about EBLs, language, and language learning, which subsequently inform related *pedagogical practices*, such as discerning students' abilities, analyzing language demands, and scaffolding instruction (Heritage et al., 2015; Lucas et al., 2008). In this study, we investigate if and how participation in a graduate teacher education program develops P–12 practitioners' expertise for EBLs, conceptualized as understandings and practices (RQ2).

The third facet of our framework recognizes that teachers learn and develop

expertise over time through active and interactive participation in sociocultural activity (Rogoff, 1994, 1995). Three intersecting planes allow researchers to observe and make sense of the complexity within any given activity. When used within teacher education, we can probe (a) the *community* plane, prompting apprenticeship into the profession of teaching and context of schools; (b) the *interpersonal* plane, involving educators' guided participation in shared practices; and (c) the *individual* plane, where teachers appropriate and apply their learning in classroom practice (Rogoff, 1995). As teachers engage in coursework, the expectation is that they develop expertise, as mediated by particular facets of the graduate program or curriculum. With this research, we aim to discern how teachers learn on community, interpersonal, and personal planes (RQ3).

Methodology

This *single case study* (Yin, 2017) focused on one EBL-focused graduate teacher education program at a private university in the urban Midwest. Participants included in-service teachers seeking to improve their practice for the growing populations of EBLs in eight surrounding urban and suburban districts (see Table 2). Thirty-nine participants spanning three cohorts matriculated through the graduate program from 2012 to 2017, representing an array of classroom contexts, teaching experience, and linguistic backgrounds (see Table 3).

We employed a mixed-method, sequential explanatory design involving consecutive phases of data collection and analysis (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2017).

Table 3
Program Participants

Attribute	Participants, n (%)
School context	
Birth to pre-K	2 (5.1%)
Grades K–8	24 (61.5%)
Grades 9–12	13 (33.34%)
Teaching experience (years)	
<3	8 (20.5%)
3–5	16 (41.0%)
6–10	18.0%
>10	20.5%
Language ability	
Monolingual	17 (43.5%)
Multilingual[a]	22 (56.5%)
Primary school language use	
English	24 (61.5%)
Other languages	15 (38.5%)

Note. N = 39.

[a]Including Spanish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Romanian, Macedonian, and Polish.

Quantitative data took precedence in Phase 1, centering on pre- and post program questionnaires and observations to show shifts in perceptions, understandings, and practices across the program. Administered at the onset of enrollment of coursework and again at the conclusion ($N = 24$), *questionnaires* sought teachers' understandings and practices with EBLs (RQ1 and RQ2). Postprogram results were compared to baseline to identify any positive changes in teachers' perspectives and practices. Conducted at the beginning of teachers' enrollment in coursework and again at the conclusion ($N = 23$), team members conducted *observations* of teachers' roles (RQ1) and classroom practices (RQ2). Although only one team member observed in the classroom at a time, we maximized data reliability via extensive rater training and protocol norming prior to conducting observations. Preprogram observations were used as baseline measures to compare to postprogram observations to assess whether the program contributed to changes in teachers' practices and, if so, to what degree. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS software to look for trends in these changes.

In line with the sequential explanatory design, Phase 2 centered on qualitative data to explain and interpret findings from Phase 1 (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2017). This phase involved telephone interviews with teachers a year following their graduation from the program *(N* = 10; 8 White women, 2 Latinas) and focused on teachers' roles and responsibilities in current positions (RQ1) as well as opportunities or challenges applying what they learned in the program (RQ2). Questions also probed teachers' perceptions on how the program (a) prepared teachers for their current professional activities; (b) impacted their current work, approaches, or new initiatives; (c) contributed to leadership opportunities on projects within their schools or districts; (d) impacted how they worked and shared information with school staff; and (e) provided opportunities to informally or formally mentor other practitioners (RQ3). To better understand the connection between teachers' responses and facets of the graduate program, we amassed relevant documents from the graduate program (e.g., course syllabi, assignments) and grant project (e.g., district demographics, logic model, annual reports; RQ3).

Following quantitative and qualitative phases of data collection and preliminary analysis, we merged and analyzed all data sources. Seeking to respond to the three research questions, we utilized the three-facet conceptual framework to code: (a) teachers' roles (i.e., student learning, teacher advocacy, stakeholder interaction; Ricento & Hornberger, 1997), (b) teachers' expertise (i.e., understandings, pedagogical practices; Lucas et al., 2008), and (c) factors mediating learning (i.e., personal, interpersonal, community; Rogoff, 1995). Using this general coding scheme, we deductively coded open-ended survey responses and observational notes from Phase 1 and interviews from Phase 2. Inductive analysis followed, seeking out emergent trends within these larger codes (e.g., understandings about learners, practices with assessment). Three team members (e.g., external evaluator, faculty member, graduate assistant) independently coded qualitative data and then collaboratively merged findings to member-check them. We crafted assertions

regarding these findings, which were then triangulated with quantitative data sources to bolster the validity and reliability of the case study (Yin, 2017).

Findings

In this section, we share the findings from our mixed-method case study. Each subsection corresponds to a research question: (a) teachers' shifting roles in schools, (b) teachers' developing expertise for EBLs, and (c) mediating factors in the graduate program. In line with our study design, we draw from quantitative (i.e., surveys) and qualitative findings (i.e., interviews) in each subsection to respond to the focal research question.

Teachers' Shifting Roles in Schools

In response to RQ1, findings across data sources indicate that teachers embraced their role as integral stakeholders in EBL education (Ricento & Hornberger, 1997). Through participation in the program, teachers demonstrated shifts in understandings regarding what influenced EBLs' success in schools. Table 4 shows the results from paired sample *t*-tests comparing changes in ranking of factors considered most responsible for student success or failure from baseline (pretest) to program completion (posttest). Ten items were ranked from 1 to 10, where 1 equaled the factor they considered most responsible, 2 equaled the factor they considered to be second most responsible, and so on. Participants considered three factors to be most responsible for student success: (a) the use of effective teaching techniques, (b) the teacher's training and experience, and (c) the teacher's enthusiasm and perseverance. Participants rated administrative support for teacher training more

Table 4
Change in Rank Order of Factors Considered Most Responsible
for Student Success or Failure Between Pretest and Posttest,
Ascending by Posttest Mean

Measure	*n*	*Pretest*		*Posttest*		*T*	*Cohen's d*	*p-Value*
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*			
The use of effective teaching techniques	23	2.91	1.81	3.09	2.04	−0.36	0.08	0.721
The teachers' training and experience	23	4.26	1.76	3.74	2.56	0.940	0.20	0.357
The teachers' enthusiasm and perseverance	23	4.39	2.61	3.87	2.30	0.940	0.20	0.357
The students' enthusiasm and perseverance	23	3.52	2.04	4.22	2.54	−1.34	0.28	0.195
The students' home background	23	4.48	3.37	5.61	3.37	−1.17	0.24	0.256
The school curriculum	23	6.96	2.46	5.87	2.10	1.48	0.31	0.152
Administrative support for teacher training	23	7.87	1.77	5.91	2.41	3.45**	0.72	0.002
Support services available at the school	23	5.74	2.20	6.65	2.01	−1.68	0.35	0.108
Parental involvement in the school	23	7.09	2.35	7.13	2.36	−0.07	0.01	0.948
The students' inborn ability	23	7.78	2.59	8.39	2.46	−0.82	0.17	0.423

**Statistically significant at .01 level.

of a factor in student success or failure following the program compared to their baseline; this difference was statistically significant.

In addition to broadly recognizing the central role of teachers' preparation and practice in EBL education, participants came to feel more confident in their specific abilities to serve the large and diverse EBLs in their classrooms and schools. Teachers rated their level of comfort in teaching at diverse schools prior to the graduate program and again upon completion. Almost all participants indicated comfort teaching in schools with large numbers of low-income or minority students ($n = 23$, 91.3% comfortable or very comfortable) prior to the program, so there was little room for improvement upon completion (95.7% comfortable/very comfortable). On the other hand, their comfort level with teaching large numbers of EBLs increased significantly from pre- to posttest, $t = -3.15$, $p < .005$, Cohen's $d = .66$. Whereas 78.2% of teachers were comfortable or very comfortable with teaching large numbers of EBLs prior to the program ($M = 3.17, SD = 0.78$), 100.0% were comfortable or very comfortable upon program completion ($M = 3.61, SD = 0.50$). Through rigorous and extensive programs of study involving classroom-level facets of EBL expertise, all participants recognized their own preparedness to work effectively with EBLs.

Qualitative findings converged with quantitative results. Interviewed 1 year following completion of the program, all 10 teachers asserted high levels of confidence in working with EBLs in classrooms due to participation in the graduate program. Whether teaching in bilingual classrooms with all EBLs or in classrooms with only a handful of EBLs, participants described their central roles mediating students' learning and language development in classrooms. As a part of these efforts to best serve EBLs, teachers often engaged in advocacy efforts extending beyond the classroom. On the postprogram survey, 19 of 24 teachers noted advocacy efforts on behalf of EBLs, with 68% relating to EBL identification or testing for special education. In interviews, 6 of 10 teachers recounted events where they tapped into their EBL-focused preparation to advocate for EBLs, including (a) insisting upon home language testing to get a better sense of students' abilities, (b) seeking out translated materials and communications in all home languages, (c) using flexible approaches to parent and family engagement, and (d) seeking out legal support for families facing deportation.

But advocacy extended beyond students, with 8 of 10 interviewed teachers recounting stories that indicated their espoused roles in pushing the thinking of their colleagues with regard to EBLs. Four teachers noted using their voices with colleagues and administrators to ensure an EBL lens at all times, prioritizing the needs of EBLs from the outset rather than as an afterthought. Brittany, a White first-grade teacher, shared her frequent words in many meetings: "But what about our ELL kids? What about dual language?" Mary, a White fourth-grade teacher, probed grade-level colleagues to make sound decisions in the best interests of EBLs; situated in a linguistically diverse school, she advocated for students speaking less-common

languages to be grouped in classrooms, simultaneously explaining to colleagues why that was important to students' learning and well-being. Allison, a White preschool teacher, visited her principal's office on occasion to bring gentle attention to EBLs, saying, "Here's some really easy ways that we can help them in the classroom, and here are some really easy ways we can start this rolling, and then, as we grow, we can implement some more things." Taking place in daily interactions with colleagues, these teachers embraced their roles as advocates for EBLs.

Teachers also took on formal leadership roles, situating them alongside school and district leaders. All 10 interviewed teachers used the earned ESL endorsement and related expertise to lead efforts at their school sites as mentors, EBL coordinators, and grade-level team leaders, as well as participating on schoolwide teams for curriculum design, biliteracy, and instructional leadership. Participants described district and school leaders inviting them to serve on and lead committees, think tanks, and working groups focused on EBL education, such as a suburban district's task force on EBLs and special education, where one teacher contributed her expertise on discerning between language development and learning exceptionality. Other teachers took on roles mentoring other educators in the district who lacked training for teaching EBLs, supporting curriculum design work that took a lens on language and culture and leading efforts to enhance EBL parent involvement. Allison, who taught at an urban Catholic school lacking formal mechanisms to label and support EBLs, led schoolwide efforts to collect and disperse home-language data to guide her colleagues' asset-based instructional scaffolding.

Teachers' Developing Expertise for Emergent Bilinguals

In response to RQ2, probing the development of teacher expertise for EBLs across the program, findings across data sources indicate that participants (a) developed asset-based understandings about emergent bilinguals and (b) enhanced pedagogical practices to reflect research-based approaches to teaching and learning (Heritage et al., 2015; Lucas et al., 2008).

Developing Asset-Based Understandings

Participation in the program shifted teachers' understandings of EBLs' backgrounds and abilities, specifically prompting the deconstruction of dominant discourses, assumptions, and biases to recognize the rich resources that students bring to classrooms. Consider the data presented in Table 4, which show changes in the ranked order of factors considered most responsible for student success or failure between pre- and postprogram surveys. Whereas the student's inborn ability and parental involvement were ranked as the least important factors both before and after the program, teachers' changes in rankings of students' enthusiasm, perseverance, and home background indicate enhanced understandings that students' backgrounds are not a detriment to learning. Instead, student success

and failure correlated with teachers' experience, expectations, preparation, and perseverance.

Teachers' shifting understandings about students were also evident in survey responses (see Table 5). In one survey subsection, respondents rated their level of agreement on 24 items using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Table 3 shows the results from paired-sample *t*-tests comparing changes in beliefs regarding teaching and learning from baseline (pretest) to program completion (posttest). Note that this table only includes areas where participants demonstrated statistically significant improvement from pretest to posttest after receiving training in the program. Furthermore, the Cohen's *d* scores show effect sizes that indicate moderate to strong relationships between the pre and post measures. In this way, following the graduate program, teachers were less likely to believe that EBLs (a) should be taken out of class to learn English, (b) should not speak home languages in the hallways or classroom, or (c) require a focus of minimum competency. Also, participants were less likely to believe that language differences provide obstacles to academic achievement.

Participants' statements in postprogram interviews support this finding that teachers recognized students' backgrounds as resources for learning. Across all interviews, teachers contended the importance of getting to know students, including families, cultural backgrounds, home languages, and unique experiences. When asked about what stood out to her from her graduate program, Mary, a White female fourth-grade teacher, shared,

Table 5
***Change in Measures Regarding Beliefs About Teaching and Learning
Between Pretest and Posttest, Ascending by p-Value***

Measure	n	Pretest		Posttest		T	Cohen's d	p-Value
		M	SD	M	SD			
ELs should be taken out of class to learn English.	23	2.78	1.28	1.87	0.87	4.21**	0.88	0.000
ELs should not speak their native languages in the classroom.	24	2.42	1.74	1.04	0.20	3.77**	0.77	0.001
Language difference provides obstacles to academic achievement.	24	4.67	1.49	3.50	1.53	2.60*	0.53	0.016
Focus should be on "minimum competency" for ELs.	24	2.46	1.28	1.83	1.05	2.53*	0.52	0.019
ELs should not speak their native languages in the hallways.	24	1.96	1.46	1.21	0.66	2.34*	0.48	0.028
My experience as a student is a source of ideas for teaching and learning.	24	6.00	0.72	5.46	1.32	2.33*	0.47	0.029
To be good at mathematics, you need a kind of "mathematical mind."	24	2.67	1.20	2.13	1.19	2.25*	0.46	0.034

Note. EL = English learner.

*Statistically significant at .05 level. **Statistically significant at .01 level.

> The biggest thing I learned was really making the students feel as welcome as they can and learning about what they can bring to the table, what they already know and build on that. I'm accepting their language, encouraging them to use their language.

White teachers consistently described shifts in understandings about culture and language. Anna, a White female teacher who taught middle-school mathematics, asserted shifts in both mind-sets and related practices, reflecting,

> I look at how students learn, about the cultural aspect. . . . I get to know each individual student in the class. At first, I was uncomfortable with speaking different languages in the classroom, but now I appreciate and value them.

Whereas White teachers recognized stark shifts in understandings about EBLs' assets, Latina teachers aligned program learning with their own experiences. Both articulated the benefit of developing understandings that helped them make sense of their own experiences and those of students and families. Dara, a Latina bilingual kindergarten teacher, reflected,

> I grew up with my grandparents speaking a second language, but it was nice to, you know when I was in CPELL, to learn all of the concepts and know where the kids are as far as their strengths and all those things really stuck out to me. And I definitely used it [that expertise] in my classroom and when I'm working with the families in choosing our curriculum and literature to use.

Across participants and data sources, understandings about EBLs, language, and learning emerged—all with the common thread focused on students' assets. These directly informed teachers' pedagogical practices in the classroom, described in the next subsection.

Enhancing Pedagogical Practices

Developing understandings supported changes in teachers' pedagogical practices over time. Table 6 shows the results from paired-sample *t*-tests comparing changes in observed teaching from baseline (pretest) to program completion (posttest). The research team rated participants on 23 teaching attributes on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all observed*) to 4 (*strongly in evidence*). The table shows only areas where participants demonstrated statistically significant improvement from pre- to postprogram observation. Furthermore, the Cohen's *d* scores show effect sizes that indicate moderate to strong relationships between pre and post measures. In addition to the quantitative ratings, researchers captured qualitative data in the form of observational notes following each of the 23 prompts. These more nuanced descriptions of classroom practice supported the team's understanding of the shifts that occurred across the program.

Participants demonstrated improvement in classroom setup to foster welcoming environments and enhance social interaction among learners, per data from classroom observations. As demonstrated in Table 6, teachers shifted practice by (a) arranging the

classroom for multiple forms of learning, (b) providing opportunities for students to work individually or in groups, (c) showcasing student work, (d) showing evidence of respect for all cultures and languages, and (e) valuing both in- and out-of-class work. In one middle school mathematics classroom with predominantly Latinx students, the White male teacher began the program with desks in rows and bare walls. By the end

Table 6
Change in Measures Regarding Teaching Between Preobservation and Postobservation, Ascending by p-Value

Measure		Pretest		Posttest				
	n	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*T*	*Cohen's d*	*p-Value*
Teacher is easy to hear and see.	23	3.13	0.69	3.83	0.39	−4.36**	0.91	0.000
Teacher scaffolds, recycles, and revisits previously introduced information.	23	2.78	0.67	3.52	0.51	−5.15**	1.07	0.000
There is evidence that all students are considered to be able to learn and are held to high standards.	23	2.78	0.52	3.43	0.95	−4.03**	0.84	0.001
Teacher allows for appropriate response time.	23	2.87	0.71	3.35	1.03	−3.73**	0.78	0.001
Classroom management allows for student participation in the context of behavioral boundaries.	23	2.87	0.76	3.57	0.79	−3.60**	0.75	0.002
The classroom is arranged for multiple forms of learning.	23	2.91	0.67	3.57	0.66	4.21**	0.88	0.003
Teacher uses a variety of techniques.	23	2.74	0.86	3.43	0.73	−3.27**	0.68	0.003
Directions are clear and consistent, and tasks are explained well.	23	2.78	0.74	3.43	0.73	−3.35**	0.70	0.003
Teacher uses Can Do descriptors as a guide to facilitate student learning.	23	1.96	0.71	2.74	0.92	−3.33**	0.69	0.003
Teacher asks open-ended questions and allows for open-ended discussion, relative to the language level of students.	23	1.91	0.90	2.78	1.20	−3.23**	0.67	0.004
Teacher activates background knowledge and funds of knowledge through warm-ups, interest inventories, teaching vocabulary, etc.	23	2.13	0.97	3.00	1.17	−2.87**	0.60	0.009
In-class work and out-of-class work are both valued.	23	1.91	0.95	2.78	1.20	−2.87**	0.60	0.009
There is evidence that multiple forms of assessment are used.	23	2.61	0.72	3.13	0.69	−2.79*	0.58	0.011
Teacher gives opportunities for students to work individually, in small groups, and in whole-class formats.	23	2.43	0.73	3.17	1.03	−2.75*	0.57	0.012
The classroom showcases student work.	21	2.38	0.92	2.81	1.03	−2.42*	0.77	0.025
Decorations and other aspects of the classroom environment show evidence of respect for all cultures and languages.	23	2.35	0.78	2.83	0.78	−2.12*	0.53	0.045

*Statistically significant at .05 level.
**Statistically significant at .01 level.

of the program, he had moved the desks into small groups and had culturally relevant classroom displays and student work showcased on the walls. In an early childhood special education classroom, the White female teacher began the program with an interactive and print-rich environment, though monolingual and culturally neutral in nature. The postprogram observation indicated the use of multilingual displays and labels around the room in all six home languages spoken by students, as well as culturally relevant texts in the library and showcased around the room.

Teachers demonstrated greatest improvement in instructional practice. As reflected in Table 6, classroom observation data indicate that teachers across the sample shifted their instructional approaches to makes themselves comprehensible to students by (a) being easy to hear and see, (b) allowing appropriate response time, (c) providing clear and consistent directions when explaining tasks, (d) using a variety of techniques, and (e) utilizing both open-ended questions and answers in discussions relative to the language level of the students. For example, in one linguistically diverse first-grade classroom, the preprogram observation noted that the White female teacher often asked questions but did not allow students time to respond, allowed only one student to answer each question by calling out, and did not provide or explain the lesson objectives or structure. The postprogram observation found that the teacher asked questions and then waited for most kids to raise their hands before prompting answers; when kids did not raise their hands, she asked questions in new ways. She introduced the lesson plan and objectives, prompting kids to share their goals and the directions in their own words. She used verbal and nonverbal cues throughout the lesson, such as "hands on top means stop," to provide students with multiple ways to understand her expectations.

In addition to changing their own actions to enhance comprehensibility, teachers also shifted how they mediated students' learning by attending to language and scaffolding by background knowledge and abilities. As reflected in Table 6, observation data indicate that teachers across the sample had greater propensity after program completion to (a) activate background knowledge, (b) scaffold instruction, (c) use Can-Do descriptors (i.e., language proficiency levels) to facilitate student learning, (d) use multiple forms of assessment, and (e) hold high expectations for all students. For example, in one middle school history classroom, which welcomed students from across the globe with multiple home languages, the White female teacher's preprogram practice was lecture style, with the teacher talking and students taking notes. The postprogram observation documented shifts in her practice, as she explicitly connected the lesson topic to students' background knowledge from the local community; used language proficiency levels to shape questions and target supports; provided a scaffolded graphic organizer; and incorporated various checks for understanding, including for key vocabulary. Although her classroom remained in rows facing the front of the room, she moved around with greater consistency to individually support students and encouraged sharing with one another.

Interviews confirmed findings from surveys and observations regarding shifts

in teachers' practice. All 10 teachers noted shifts in pedagogical repertoires during the program. Aligning to the environment and instruction themes mentioned earlier, teachers noted incorporating culturally relevant texts, using EBL instructional strategies, scaffolding instruction based on language proficiency, prioritizing academic language demands, and utilizing students' home languages. Not easily discernible in classroom observations, one novel finding from interviews regarded teachers' shifts in curricular design, with 8 of 10 teachers noting how they planned instruction with an explicit lens on language. Nell, a White first-grade bilingual teacher, explained,

> When I'm planning my units, I'm looking at all of my students as language learners and am really planning from that perspective, where before I was looking mostly at the content. Now I'm looking mostly at the academic and language goals.

With a sound understanding of how language develops while learning across disciplines, teachers enhanced pedagogical practice to support students' language development across the school day.

Mediating Factors in the Graduate Program

Seeking to understand the shifts in perspectives and expertise, RQ3 focused on mediating factors in the graduate program. Findings from open-ended survey responses and interviews indicated (a) personal appropriation of course learning, (b) interpersonal collaboration within cohorts, and (c) community priorities across the project (Rogoff, 1995).

Personal Appropriation of Course Learning

Based on evidence of teachers' enhanced roles and expertise through participation in the program, particularly related to focal topics in program coursework (e.g., teacher advocacy, instructional strategies), findings inferred the efficacy of these courses. But we wanted to understand what particular topics and facets of coursework mediated various teachers' roles and expertise, subsequently utilizing interviews to explain previous findings from surveys and observations (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2017). Six of 10 teachers described using culturally relevant texts that reflected students' backgrounds, which was the primary focus of a semester-long course early in the program of study (see Table 1). Six of 10 teachers noted learning and applying instructional strategies for EBLs, which emerged across courses but specifically in EBL Methods and Practicum. Termed "strategy shares" in course syllabi, Dara highlighted an integral feature that stood out from these courses:

> I keep thinking that two of the classes I had with [professor] where we would teach and model and learn from one another and so that was the same kind of format that . . . my mentee and I took where she would come into my classroom to observe and take strategies from me, and then I would do the same with her and a lot of my classroom.

Teachers regarded the overall applied nature of the program, describing the usefulness of job-embedded learning in courses. Participants recalled meaningful projects that tapped into practice rather than "busy work" or "silly little assignments." Document analysis confirmed that courses centered on projects that were broken down into components across the semester, such as (a) investigation into local programming for EBLs, (b) case study of focal EBLs using classroom language assessments, and (c) unit plan designed with language lens. Allison, who taught at a Catholic school without assessments or other structures for EBLs, reflected,

> We were able to take back [learning] immediately to our classrooms, which is why I loved this program so much because almost everything we were able to take back like the next day and try new stuff out and try different things. I really did actually like the research aspect of CPELL and that we were able to do within our community a couple different research projects. Because I found that actually the most helpful and useful part of it [the program] is that I had already all of this stuff made like a home language survey which we're going to actually send home this year.

Along with three other teachers, Allison specifically lauded the school- and community-embedded research projects in the Applied Linguistics course. Nell shared, "After taking a community-based research class, I got involved in a community organization that does outreach work for Latino families, and I'm on their program advisory committee now." Whether teachers made keen realizations about their schools or got involved in their communities, these field-based research projects enhanced teachers' work with students, families, and communities.

Interpersonal Collaboration Within Cohorts

Findings indicate the function of collaboration and guided participation on the interpersonal plane (Rogoff, 1995). In particular, participants' esteem for their cohorts emerged across data sources. One hundred percent of survey respondents valued the cohort model, using open-ended prompts to notate the benefits of (a) building relationships and providing a sense of community; (b) fostering a safe space for openly sharing ideas and problem solving; (c) providing diverse viewpoints and experiences; (d) offering weekly opportunities to mutually support, motivate, and learn from one another; and (e) developing a network of contacts and resources. Interviews confirmed these findings, with all teachers noting benefits of the cohort model. But interview data more deeply developed this finding, demonstrating that the cohort facilitated not only teachers' learning but their practice in classrooms and schools. Nine of 10 teachers connected the cohort collaboration with their enhanced roles as EBL experts and leaders among colleagues. Celia, a Latina middle school special education teacher, recounted, "It feels like we problem solved together as a team, and I feel like by the ELL certification, education, I received, just helped me thrive in those suggestions and ideas that helped our teachers to reach those kids." Nell, a White first-grade bilingual teacher, shared, "I would have never realized

the value of co-planning with them [my colleagues] if I had not been involved in CPELL." The collaborative model prompted individual and collaborative learning, influencing practice.

Participants also credited interaction with instructors. Without direct prompting, 6 of 10 teachers brought up the positive impact of their professors using words like great, outstanding, respected, and realistic. Celia stated,

> I had such high respect for every one of my instructors. . . . It was definitely a vigorous program. Some people [cohort members] I went with are really, really proud of that they put so much time, effort, and energy into it [the program]. But for someone I really respect, I was only gonna do quality work.

Celia described respect as mutual, as professors respected teachers' time and roles by prioritizing classroom applications and not requiring busy-work assignments. Beyond expressing overall appreciation and admiration, teachers perceived instructors as mentors. Dara reflected on her relationship with professors, specifically noting three full-time faculty experts: "I really look up to them as mentors and try to stay in touch with them because they were really open-minded people. And I think they modeled what we should be like in our class, in our building." Overall, participants pinpointed instructors' expertise and roles as integral to their development, including maintaining high expectations but exercising flexibility and building relationships to mentor teachers around best practice for EBLs.

Community Priorities Across the Project

In addition to individual courses and experiences and interaction among peers and instructors, we found that larger community priorities mediated teachers' apprenticeship into the field of EBL education (Rogoff, 1995). Building from the findings presented in the previous subsections, particularly those drawing from pre- and postmeasures of perspectives and practices, we found that the graduate program as a whole influenced teachers' roles and expertise. All teachers interviewed concurred, aligning with the perspective of Emma, a White female third-grade teacher, who asserted, "My ESL endorsement helped me be the teacher I am today." In addition to the content of coursework, we found that consistent messages across coursework mediated teachers' shifting roles and expertise. Reflecting emergent themes presented in the preceding subsections, document analysis of course syllabi indicated consistent lenses on (a) students' cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge, (b) teachers' central role in enacting classroom and school change, and (c) responsive and scaffolded instructional design and implementation. With instructors and courses consistently messaging these priorities, paired with opportunities for teachers to explore, apply, and debrief, the graduate program apprenticed teachers into their new roles as experts and advocates for EBLs.

Findings also indicate how the connection between the graduate program and the larger grant project mediated teachers' practice, particularly with regard to

taking on leadership roles. Dara shared, "Everything we learned in the program fit with the philosophy of the school." She went on to share how leaders in her district participated in CPELL. "They supported me through it [the program], and we had those conversations. So I think that definitely helped with my leadership within the district. We were able to connect and bring that into the classrooms." Situated in a longtime partner district where previous graduates had moved into leadership positions, she saw participation in the program as integral in taking on leadership roles in the district's EBL programming. But even teachers in newer partner districts recognized how the program fit with the project's larger efforts. Cristina, a White special education teacher, shared,

> I feel that CPELL has helped me gain confidence with building my knowledge of skills to take a more leadership role. During CPELL and even afterwards, I have shared a variety of information, whether this was gained through coursework or even professional development in the district. Making sure all teachers have new information that is helpful to them is important.

With the graduate program serving as one facet of the larger project, participants used their enhanced expertise and roles to contribute to capacity-building efforts for EBLs in districts.

Discussion

EBLs have been a large and growing presence in U.S. schools in the past decade (NCES, 2015), but classroom teachers are often underprepared to support their learning and language development in general education settings (Gándara & Maxwell-Jolly, 2006; Polat, 2010). Teacher educators have been working to solve this problem by integrating EBL-related expertise during preservice (e.g., Lucas & Villegas, 2013) and in-service teacher education programs (Bernhard et al., 2005). Previous research has focused primarily on the preservice teacher education for EBLs, leaving a gap in the recent literature on how graduate teacher education programs for in-service teachers build practitioners' capacity for EBLs (Feiman-Nemser, 2018). This study probed one university's efforts to prepare P–12 classroom teachers, considering how participation in an EBL-focused graduate program influenced teachers' roles, understandings, and practices in schools with large numbers of EBLs. Overall, we found that participants shifted their daily instructional and advocacy work as connected to course and program experiences.

For the past decade, linguistically responsive teacher education has supported the conceptualization of what general education teachers should understand and do to work effectively with EBLs (Lucas et al., 2008). This study demonstrated the efficacy of one graduate program focused on language- and culture-focused understandings and pedagogical practices (Heritage et al., 2015; Lucas et al., 2008). By participating in a strategically designed series of EBL-focused courses, teachers developed understandings about their pertinent roles in supporting students' learning

and language development and embraced asset-based perspectives of students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds (de Jong et al., 2013). Teachers also enacted related pedagogical practices, including creating welcoming learning environments, getting to know students, attending to language demands, and scaffolding instruction (Lucas et al., 2008). Previous research has indicated the impact of particular courses in preparing teachers for EBLs, such as those focused on cultural competence (e.g., He, 2013), linguistics (Ann & Peng, 2005), and assessment (Heineke & Davin, 2014), with studies focusing primarily on preservice teachers. The significance of our findings centers on the value of EBL-focused coursework in the professional development of in-service, general education teachers of EBLs spanning P–12, particularly employing field-based, collaborative experiences grounded in teachers' practice.

In addition to evidence of changing understandings and practices, our study uncovered an array of advocacy and leadership roles indicating teachers' application of learning spanning classroom, school, and district contexts (Ricento & Hornberger, 1997). Teacher advocacy for EBLs has gained traction in the field in recent years, with Lucas and Villegas (2013) adding this lens to linguistically responsive teacher education with preservice teachers. Empirical studies have started to look at the development of advocacy-based mindsets among preservice teachers (Harrison, 2019; Linville, 2016; Moore, 2013), aligning with the new emphasis on advocacy in the TESOL Professional Teaching Standards. In our study, findings indicate that overall approaches spanning courses supported teachers' advocacy roles, including the applied nature of class projects that prompted them to apply learning and act upon issues in schools. Furthermore, the extensive expertise developed across the program, paired with the collaborative nature of learning in the cohort, developed teachers' confidence to informally push colleagues' thinking and formally take on leadership roles. Our findings align with the contention of Whiting (2019) that EBL advocacy should be integrated across programs, providing a unified philosophy that promotes continuity despite the different pedagogical foci in individual courses (Murray-Orr & Munroe, 2018; Ovington et al., 2002).

Another significant finding from this research was the value of the collaborative and embedded nature of the program and project, where teachers from partner districts came together for weekly coursework to learn about and discuss issues related to EBLs (Rogoff, 1994, 1995). Though not specific to EBLs or in-service teachers, previous research on graduate teacher education programs has indicated the value of cohorts in promoting learning, as ongoing exposure and collaboration prompt rapport and confidence in participants sharing challenges, celebrating success, and cooperatively solving problems (Han & Doyle, 2013; Murray-Orr & Munroe, 2018). In our study, the value of the cohort went beyond consistent exposure to the same peers, centering on learning and problem solving alongside colleagues in similar districts and communities, namely, demographically changing suburbs with large numbers of EBLs from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. By organizing the cohort and situating teachers' learning in communities, participants

developed expertise and grappled with their roles as advocates for EBLs among others working within similar educational, social, economic, political, and familial contexts (McIntyre, 2003). Despite spanning P–12 settings, participants found value in collaborating and problem solving with educators teaching in similar contexts.

Recommendations center on forging and utilizing university–school partnerships to promote in-service teachers' in-depth learning, collaboration, and leadership via EBL-focused graduate teacher education. Despite the tendency to use on-site professional development to build capacity in schools, stakeholders should pair those short-term efforts with opportunities for practitioners to develop in-depth expertise over time in graduate teacher education programs. University-based teacher educators should take the time to develop, enact, and differentiate programs of study to strategically tap into the daily classroom work of in-service teachers. Furthermore, stakeholders should offer these graduate programs as part of larger partnerships, thus situating professional learning within communities alongside colleagues working in similar contexts. These opportunities can be facilitated through cohorts to prompt consistent and meaningful collaboration connected to larger capacity-building efforts. In this way, expert teachers can be simultaneously developed and tapped as integral parts of macro-level changes to improve the education of EBLs (Ricento & Hornberger, 1997; Rogoff, 1994).

In summary, this study yielded important and significant findings on using graduate teacher education to prepare in-service P–12 teachers for EBLs. With a mixed-methods study design that involved pre- and postprogram data from multiple sources, we discovered shifting perspectives and practices across the duration of the graduate program. Limitations of the study include the lack of a control or comparison group, such as cohorts of teachers who went through graduate programs without EBL-focused coursework. Furthermore, the homogeneity in our sample of predominantly White, suburban women meant not being able to analyze for differences of program effect based on teacher characteristics, like other studies (e.g., Master et al., 2016). Despite these limitations, the case study design allowed us to probe how and why these changes in perspectives and practices occurred in this one graduate teacher education program; though not necessarily generalizable to other settings, these findings can ring true and connect with other programs and stakeholders (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2001). As institutions increasingly prioritize teacher expertise as an integral component of meaningful change, future research should involve multiple programs and partnerships to determine those overarching principles and practices that promote equity for EBLs through graduate teacher education.

Acknowledgments

References

Ann, J., & Peng, L. (2005). The relevance of linguistic analysis to the role of teachers as decision makers. In K. E. Denham & A. C. Lobeck (Eds.), *Language in the schools: Integrating linguistic knowledge into K–12 teaching* (pp. 71–86). Routledge.

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

Bernard, J. K., Diaz, C. F., & Allgood, I. (2005). Research-based teacher education for multicultural contexts. *Intercultural Education, 16,* 263-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980500211873

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*, 298–334. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12461772

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1997). Teachers' attitudes about language diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*, 637–644. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)80006-6

Commins, N. L., & Miramontes, O. B. (2006). Addressing linguistic diversity from the outset. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*, 240–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285591

Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Caslon.

de Jong, E. J., Harper, C. A., & Coady, M. R. (2013). Enhanced knowledge and skills for elementary mainstream teachers of English language learners. *Theory Into Practice, 52*, 89–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770326

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2018). What does research tell us about educating mainstream teachers to work with ELLs? *Educational Forum, 82*, 227–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013 1725.2018.1420872

Gándara, P., & Maxwell-Jolly, J. (2006). Critical issues in developing the teacher corps for English learners. In K. Téllez & H. C. Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners* (pp. 99–121). Routledge.

García, O. (2011). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 322–326. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00172.x

Han, G., & Doyle, D. (2013). *Teachers-in-residence: New pathways to the profession*. American Institutes for Research.

Hansen-Thomas, H., Grosso Richins, L., Kakkar, K., & Okeyo, C. (2016). I do not feel I am properly trained to help them! Rural teachers' perceptions of challenges and needs with English-language learners. *Professional Development in Education*, *42*, 308–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.973528

Harrison, J. (2019). Building advocacy capacity in a teacher training program. In H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 44–56). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351036665-4

He, Y. (2013). Developing teachers' cultural competence: Application of appreciative inquiry in ESL teacher education. *Teacher Development*, *17*, 55–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/1 3664530.2012.753944

Heineke, A. J., & Davin, K. J. (2014). Situating practice in schools and communities: Case studies of teacher candidates in diverse field experiences with English language learners. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 5*(1), 40–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/2639 0043.2014.12067774

Heineke, A. J., & Giatsou, E. (2020). Learning from students, teachers, and schools: Examining the efficacy of field-based teacher education for emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71*(1), 148–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119877373

Heritage, M., Walqui, A., & Linquanti, R. (2015). *English language learners and the new standards: Developing language, content knowledge, and analytical practices in the classroom.* Harvard Education Press.

Hodkinson, P., & Hodkinson, H. (2001). The strengths and limitations of case study research. *Learning and Skills Development Agency, 1*, 5–7.

Hopkins, M. (2012). Arizona's teacher policies and their relationship with English learner instructional practice. *Language Policy, 11*, 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9223-6

Johnson, D. (2013). *Language policy*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316202

Karabenick, S. A., & Noda, A. C. (2004). Professional development implications of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*, 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2004.10162612

Lavery, M. R., Nutta, J., & Youngblood, A. (2019). Analyzing student learning gains to evaluate differentiated preparation for fostering English learners' achievement in linguistically diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*, 372–387. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117751400

Lee, O., & Buxton, C. A. (2013). Integrating science learning and English language development for English language learners. *Theory Into Practice, 52*, 36–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2013.743772

Linan-Thompson, S., Lara-Martinez, J. A., & Cavazos, L. O. (2018). Exploring the intersection of evidence-based practices and culturally and linguistically responsive practices. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 54*, 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451218762574

Linville, H. A. (2016). ESOL teacher advocacy: A response to teacher education standards. In P. C. L. Ng & E. F. Boucher-Yip (Eds.), *Teacher agency and policy response in English language teaching* (pp. 101–116). Routledge.

Lowenhaupt, R. (2016). Immigrant acculturation in suburban schools serving the new Latino diaspora. *Peabody Journal of Education, 91*, 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1184944

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

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice, 52*, 261–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770327

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-González, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*, 361–373. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322110

Master, B., Loeb, S., Whitney, C., & Wyckoff, J. (2016). Identifying differentially effective teachers of English language learners. *Elementary School Journal, 117*, 261–284. https://doi.org/10.1086/688871

McIntyre, A. (2003). Participatory action research and urban education: Reshaping the teacher preparation process. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 36*, 28–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680303497

Meskill, C. (2005). Infusing English language learner issues throughout professional educator

curricula: The training all teachers project. *Teachers College Record, 107*, 739–756. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810510700407

Moll, L. C., & González, N. (1997). Teachers as social scientists: Learning about culture from household research. In P. Hall (Ed.), *Race, ethnicity, and multiculturalism* (Vol. 1, pp. 89–114). Garland.

Moore, J. I. (2013). Preparing advocates: Service-learning in TESOL for future mainstream educators. *TESOL Journal, 4*, 555–570. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.97

Murray-Orr, A., & Munroe, E. (2018). "I needed to rediscover who I really was": An inquiry into the impacts of one graduate teacher education program for early elementary teachers. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 64*, 287–303.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *English language learners*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_204.27.asp

Ovington, J. A., Diamantes, T., & Roby, D. A. (2002). An early distance learning success story: The teacher leader program. *College Student Journal, 36*, 387–398.

Polat, N. (2010). A comparative analysis of pre- and inservice teacher beliefs about readiness and self-competency: Revisiting teacher education for ELLs. *System, 38*, 228–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.004

Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*, 131–143. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.3.131-143

Reyes, R., & Villarreal, E. (2016). Wanting the unwanted again: Safeguarding against normalizing dehumanization and discardability of marginalized, "unruly" English-learning Latinos in our schools. *Urban Review, 48*, 543–559. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-016-0367-8

Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1997). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 401–427. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587691

Rogoff, B. (1994). Developing understanding of the idea of communities of learners. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 1*, 209–229.

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. del Río, & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139–164). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139174299.008

Schall-Leckrone, L. (2018). Coursework to classroom: Learning to scaffold instruction for bilingual learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 45*, 31–56.

Shapiro, S., & MacDonald, M. T. (2017). From deficit to asset: Locating discursive resistance in a refugee-background student's writing and oral narrative. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*, 80–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2016.1277725

Shi, H. (2018). Self-efficacy beliefs and effective instructional strategies: US university English learners' perspective. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 30*, 477–496.

Shim, J. M. (2019). Toward a more nuanced understanding of White teachers of English learners: Increasing capacity and capabilities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1001.01

Torff, B., & Murphy, A. F. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about English learners: Adding linguistic support to enhance academic rigor. *Phi Delta Kappan, 101*, 14–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721720903822

Valdés, G., Bunch, G., Snow, C., & Lee, C. (2005). Enhancing the development of students'

language. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 126–168). Jossey-Bass.

Villegas, A. M., SaizdeLaMora, K., Martin, A. D., & Mills, T. (2018). Preparing future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. *Educational Forum, 82*, 138–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.201 8.1420850

Whiting, J. (2019). Beyond the philosophy statement: Bringing advocacy center stage in TESOL teacher education. H. A. Linville & J. Whiting (Eds.), *Advocacy in English language teaching and learning* (pp. 31–43). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351036665-3

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.