"That's a Line That We Have to Draw": A Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) Perspective on World Language Teacher Ideologies

Xinyue Lu, *The Ohio State University*
Francis John Troyan, *The Ohio State University*

Abstract

A deeper interpretation of world language (WL) teachers' ideologies toward language learning and students' languaging practices can provide us with a different lens through which to understand teachers' teaching practices in language classrooms. This study adopts the attitude system of systemic functional linguistics (e.g., Martin & White, 2005), specifically the features of affect, judgment, and appreciation, to explore one elementary Mandarin WL teacher's ideologies regarding language teaching and language use. The data were collected through semistructured interviews with the teacher-participant from an ongoing ethnographic study. Findings indicate the Mandarin teacher's alignment with "the younger, the better" language acquisition stance and her multifaceted perspective on bilingualism. While she acknowledged the cultural capital of Chinese, she exhibited fluctuating views on students' home languages and home language use. Based on the findings, we suggest the need for future WL teacher training and professional development programs to guide teachers in identifying and reflecting upon their implicit ideologies about language teaching and learning, as well as students' linguistic resources.

Keywords: attitude analysis, teacher ideology, Chinese as a foreign language, systemic functional linguistics

Introduction

World language (WL) teachers play a pivotal role in shaping students' bilingual identities and broadening their perspectives. They introduce learners to diverse ways of knowing and living through the study of target languages and cultures, helping learners move away from dominant worldviews (ACTFL, 2016; Muirhead, 2009). However, the extent to which WL teachers actively facilitate this shift away from dominant linguistic and cultural perspectives is not determined solely by the content they teach. An often overlooked aspect is the influence of their underlying language ideologies. These ideologies shape teachers' everyday teaching practices, their language policies, and the development of students' bilingual identities (e.g., De Costa, 2011; Henderson, 2017; Razfar, 2005; Young, 2014). However, the challenge lies in the fact that teachers often are not consciously aware of the linguistic and social ideologies to which they subscribe (Alfaro & Bartolome, 2017; Gonsalves, 2008). This lack of awareness can inadvertently limit their efforts in diversifying students' perspectives. Therefore, unearthing and understanding these ideologies can illuminate the challenges WL teachers face in striving to achieve this goal.

To date, limited empirical research has addressed the intricate relationship between teacher ideologies and WL education, especially in K-12 settings. Most studies have focused on teachers' overt attitudes toward language learning and pedagogies, without unpacking the ideologies embedded in their discourse. Positioning language ideologies as powerful driving forces in WL teachers' professional practices, this study explores a Mandarin WL educator's language ideologies using the attitude framework of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) (Martin & White, 2005). Through an in-depth analysis of the Mandarin WL teacher's attitudinal discourse, we sought to examine the nuanced ways in which language ideologies permeated her teaching practices. This study was guided by the following research question:

> What does the attitude analysis of SFL reveal about a K-5 Mandarin teacher's language ideologies toward her culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Literature Review

Language and Language Acquisition Ideologies

Language ideologies can be broadly defined as a set of beliefs, values, and assumptions about language, language use, and language users (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). These ideologies are deeply ingrained in individuals and societies and often reflect broader social, cultural, and political factors (Blackledge, 2008; Kroskrity, 2000). Language ideologies also exist on an individual level as socially shared knowledge that is formed and sustained through dialogue and communication (Marková et al., 2007). Unlike individual attitudes and beliefs, which are specific to an individual's opinions and convictions, language ideologies encapsulate a broader and often more deeply ingrained framework that shapes those individual attitudes and beliefs. While language ideologies operate as a foundational framework, individual attitudes and beliefs act as lenses or indices through which

these overarching ideologies can be discerned (e.g., Murchadha & Flynn, 2018; van Dijk, 2006).

Understanding language ideologies is important in educational settings, especially in formal language learning environments such as schools. Language ideologies can be manifested in language policies, curricula, and teaching practices (Jaffe, 2009; Kroskrity, 2000; Palmer et al., 2014; Ricento, 2000), influencing opportunities for language learning based on alignment with learners' backgrounds, needs, and goals (Baker & Wright, 2021). For example, monolingual ideologies may obstruct bilingualism, particularly for learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds (Cummins, 2000; 2007). Conversely, additive bilingualism and plurilingualism ideologies support the development of multiple languages (García, 2011). Language ideologies also shape learners' identities. Learners may internalize ideologies that affect their relationship with language and its speakers (Norton, 2013), ultimately impacting their success or struggles in language learning (Dong, 2009; Duff, 2012; Hamman, 2018; Martínez et al., 2017).

Language acquisition ideology (LAI) also plays a pivotal role in shaping language learning processes and outcomes. LAI refers to the beliefs and assumptions that people hold about how second languages are learned and taught (Riley, 2011). Influenced by various learning theories, these ideologies shape attitudes and policies. LAIs are often explained through different theoretical perspectives, such as cognitive language learning theories (Chomsky, 1965; Pinker, 1994) and sociocultural theories (Vygotsky, 1987). Recently, translanguaging has emerged as a prominent LAI and pedagogical approach that emphasizes the fluid and dynamic use of multiple languages in instruction and learning (García & Li, 2014). Instead of viewing bilingualism as the parallel mastery of two separate language systems, translanguaging recognizes the interconnected nature of bilingual learners' linguistic repertoires and celebrates the natural blending and mixing of languages in authentic communicative situations (Otheguy et al., 2019).

Research on World Language Teacher Ideologies

Research on WL teachers' ideologies has delved into various dimensions. Scholars have explored effective teaching practices (Bell, 2005; Kissau et al., 2012), aligning with standards (Byrd et al., 2011), attitudes toward students (Baggett, 2018; Sparks & Ganschow 1996), and attitudes about standard/non-standard varieties (Blake & Cutler, 2003; Jenkins, 2007). While earlier studies often employed large-scale surveys to glean insights into teachers' perspectives, there has been a discernible shift toward qualitative frameworks in recent research.

Takeuchi's (2021) examination of ideologies surrounding Keigo, a form of polite speech in Japanese culture, exemplifies this trend. The study emphasized the need for WL teachers to reflect upon language ideologies impacting classroom dynamics and champion the legitimacy of second language (L2) speakers. This introspective wave continues with studies exploring bilingualism and translanguaging pedagogy in various contexts such as L2 Arabic teaching (Azaz & Abourehab, 2021) and Chinese bilingual pre-service teachers (Chang, 2022).

The intricate nature of teacher's language ideologies demands an intricate approach (Kim, 2022; Reeves, 2006). Survey methodologies can offer valuable insights but may fall prey to oversimplification or social desirability biases (Karathanos, 2009). Furthermore, some ideologies may be unconscious or not readily apparent to those who hold them. This makes the examination of "embodied" ideologies—an exploration of deeply ingrained and often subconscious beliefs—a key to a more nuanced understanding of the subject. In alignment with this thinking, our study employs a qualitative methodology, deciphering ideologies from a Mandarin teacher's interviews and examining their influence on her pedagogical choices.

An extension of this exploration into ideologies is the concept of fostering "critical consciousness" among language educators. Following the multilingual turn in applied linguistics (May, 2013), there has been growing interest in nurturing the critical consciousness of language educators to challenge dominant notions and narratives surrounding language, culture, and identity (Baggett, 2020; Kubota & Austin, 2007; Wesley et al., 2016). Critical consciousness involves an active awareness and interrogation of power dynamics, historical contexts, and cultural complexities in the classroom (Palmer et al., 2019). Examining WL teachers' ideologies is crucial for cultivating their critical consciousness. Such scrutiny encourages educators to reflect upon their own assumptions and biases, enabling them to tailor their teaching practices and language policies to be more responsive to the needs of their culturally and linguistically diverse students.

An Attitude Framework for Analyzing Teacher Ideologies

Building on the complexity of teachers' language ideologies and the challenge in understanding them, the current study seeks to adopt a methodological approach that allows for a more nuanced examination of these ideologies. An effective way to approach this multifaceted issue is through the study of attitudes within teacher discourse, an area where linguistic analysis can provide valuable insights.

This qualitative study draws on the attitude framework, a component of the appraisal system that extends Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013). The framework serves as a tool to explore, describe, and explain how language is used to express attitudes, make evaluations, and pass judgments (Martin, 2000; Martin & White, 2005). The appraisal system consists of several components, including (1) the manifestation of values through attitude categories; (2) the introduction and management of voices to whom these values are attributed, through categories of engagement; and (3) the manipulation of degrees of values through categories of graduation. With a particular analytical focus on value attribution, the attitude system is especially apt for the current study, offering a lens through which the subtleties of language ideologies in teacher discourse can be revealed and understood.

According to Martin and White (2005), attitude is realized through three categories: affect, judgment, and appreciation. Affect refers to feelings or emotional reactions, which include un/happiness, in/security, dis/satisfaction, and dis/inclination. Judgment is understood as the institutionalization of feeling, relative to

norms or expectations regarding acceptable and unacceptable behavior. These norms can be constructed negatively or positively. While judgment is focused on the evaluation of people's behavior, appreciation is used for the evaluation of things, natural phenomena, and human artifacts. It expresses an evaluation of the worth of something, its complexity, its importance, and its quality (Martin & White, 2005).

Table 1.
System of Attitude

Category	Dimension	Subcategories
Attitude	Affect (present emotional responses)	± happiness
		± security
		± satisfaction
	Judgment (assess human behavior)	± normality
		± capacity
		± veracity
		± tenacity
		± propriety
	Appreciation (evaluate products or performances)	± reaction
		± composition
		± valuation

Note. Adapted from Martin, J.R. & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause*. Continuum, London and New York.

Fernandez (2018) demonstrated the potential of the appraisal framework as a qualitative tool for analysis. Using multiple approaches (i.e., thematic analysis, mood system, appraisal analysis, transitive and ergative analysis) to analyze the same qualitative interview data, Fernandez discovered that the appraisal analysis allowed her to gain a fine-grained view of how interviewees construe their experiences, adding a functional account to the analysis. The appraisal framework has been widely applied to inform literacy pedagogy (e.g., Humphrey et al., 2011) and to examine public discourse (e.g., Meadows & Sayer, 2013; Tilakaratna & Mahboob, 2013). More recently, it has been used in educational research to examine the beliefs of teachers of English as an additional language in the United Kingdom (Hall & Cunningham, 2020) and to explore the language ideologies and practices of K-12 teachers of minoritized students in the United States (Kim, 2022). Other research has used the framework to examine the ideologies that informed the practiced language policies of a general education teacher in a primary school in southern France (Troyan & Auger, 2022; 2023).

Together, the prior research has demonstrated that the appraisal framework is a powerful analytical tool for gathering rich insights in qualitative research. The current study used the features of attitude in the appraisal framework to examine a Mandarin teacher's ideologies mediated by linguistic choices. As Table 1 depicts, attitude analysis allows for the identification of both conscious or unconscious disclosures of ideological positions through expressions of feelings, judgments of behaviors, and evaluations of things. Moreover, the framework makes visible the textual cues in discourse by providing a systematic account of how ideological positionings are achieved through language (Martin & White, 2005).

Methodology

This study is part of a larger ethnographic study of a K-5 Mandarin classroom of a white female teacher in a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom in an urban Midwest U.S. school district. Data were collected from September 2019 to August 2020. Lu was a participant observer in Ariel's (all names are pseudonyms) classroom, investigating the views and practices of the Chinese teacher concerning children's language learning and teaching. Taking an ethnographic perspective (Blommaert & Jie, 2011), a variety of data sources were collected, including participant observation, field notes, audio recordings, classroom documents, and semi-structured interviews.

Research Setting

Hope School is a public magnet school located in a large Midwestern suburb. It serves students from pre-kindergarten through grade 5 and has a student-teacher ratio of 17 to 1. The school has a diverse student body. As of 2020, minority enrollment constituted 81% of the student population. The largest enrollment was Black students at 41%, followed by Hispanics at 30%, and white at 17%. Asian enrollment was less than 2% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020). The most spoken languages at the school, in descending order by number of speakers, are English, Spanish, Somali, and Arabic. In addition to following the district-prescribed curriculum, Hope School also offers Mandarin Chinese instruction with a full-time instructor who works with each grade level.

The Chinese program had been established for five years at the time the research was conducted. Being the only Mandarin program at the elementary level in the district, Hope School described its Mandarin Chinese instruction as a unique feature that makes the school outstanding. Unlike immersion or dual-language programs, in which the second language typically serves as a medium for content instruction, Hope School's Mandarin program was integrated into the standard curriculum. Classes met twice a week for 40-minute sessions during regular school hours, rather than functioning as a separate or supplementary offering. The Mandarin teacher, Ariel, had her own classroom, which was more than just a logistical advantage. This dedicated space allowed her to craft an immersive environment with visual cues, cultural artifacts, and resources that facilitated the learning experience.

Participant

At the time of the study, Ariel was a white female in her early thirties who learned Chinese during her undergraduate studies and obtained a WL teaching license in the U.S. after two years of teaching experience in China. This was her fourth year teaching in the program, and prior to her current position, she also had one year of student teaching experience within the same program. According to an informal conversation with Ariel, she enjoyed considerable autonomy in deciding the content and sequence of her teaching. While student teaching in the program, she noticed that the previous teacher's class lacked structure and sufficient exposure to the target language. Consequently, when she began teaching, she reformed the curriculum based on state standards and the HSK (Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi) test, a Chinese language proficiency test administered by the Ministry of Education of China.

Positionality

Lu is a bilingual speaker of Mandarin and English, originally from China. She worked as a Chinese instructor in the U.S. and developed an interest in the representation of cultural and linguistic diversity in Chinese WL education as she embarked on her doctoral studies. During this data collection period, she was conducting a pilot study for her dissertation research at Hope School and volunteered to assist Ariel in her teaching. Francis is a white, gay, cisgender male language teacher educator and former classroom teacher. He has been Lu's co-advisor throughout her doctoral program and taught her doctoral seminar on functional linguistics, language teacher identity, and language ideologies, where this particular project originated. Further, in his work as a language teacher educator, he was Ariel's professor when she completed her Master of Education at the university. An ongoing partnership with the university connected Lu and Ariel.

Data Collection and Analysis

This study examines Ariel's language ideologies and how they manifest in her classroom language practices and policies. The data were derived from a segment of a larger ethnographic study focused on language learning and language use in the Mandarin program at Hope School. The data set included three semi-structured interviews with Ariel conducted between January 2020 and August 2020, classroom observation fieldnotes, 10 audio-recorded classroom interactions between January 2020 to March 2020, and classroom artifacts including student works, teaching materials, and teacher evaluation. Specifically, these interviews prompted Ariel to reflect on her language teaching practices, student performance, and curriculum design. The semi-structured interviews were transcribed and then coded for lexical and grammatical choices that express the three subcategories of attitude.

Utilizing the attitude framework, we centered our analysis on Ariel's use of the categories of affect, appreciation, and judgment in evaluating her students and their language practices. As illustrated in Table 1, the attitude analysis allows for the identification of both overt and covert ideological stances via expressions of feelings, assessments of behaviors, and evaluations of entities. This analytical ap-

proach served as a foundation for identifying underlying language ideologies, particularly those Ariel did not explicitly mention in the interviews.

The coding process involved two steps. Initially, the data were coded using the attitude framework. When coding the transcripts, we noted these evaluations alongside the highlighted lexicogrammatical items constructing them, using symbols such as "+" and "-" to indicate the positive and negative values of the attitudes. An example of this coding practice is seen in Table 2.

Table 2.
Attitude Analysis Example

Features of Attitude	Examples
Affect	I **like** my job here. [Affect: +happiness]
Judgment	That **has to be shut down** [Judgment: -propriety].
Appreciation	They are **cute**. [Appreciation: +reaction]

Subsequently, iterative coding rounds were conducted to identify emergent themes. By analyzing the way Ariel expressed her attitudes through the linguistic choices she made, we could identify specific patterns and themes that pointed toward her ideologies. These included tendencies to associate younger students with positive capacity, or more subtle implications that revealed preferences for certain language policies. For example, the use of positive or negative affect might reveal a bias toward certain linguistic practices, reflecting broader societal attitudes toward monolingualism or specific language supremacy. The attitude framework thus not only provided insights into Ariel's attitudes but also served as a robust tool to translate these attitudes into tangible language ideologies. To ensure the validity and reliability of our findings, regular team meetings were held to discuss the coding consistency and resolve any discrepancies.

After coding the interviews and identifying Ariel's language ideologies and LAI, we revisited field notes and conceptual memos. Our goal was to search for evidence that either confirmed or contradicted these expressed ideologies in the classroom observation data. Ultimately, we selected representative excerpts from the data, which served to illustrate prominent themes in Ariel's language ideologies, supported by evidence found from classroom observations that illustrate those practiced language learning ideologies.

Findings

"The younger, the better"

One of the most recurrent themes emerged from the analysis is the LAI that younger learners are better learning at Chinese, as compared to older children. Throughout the interviews, Ariel demonstrated contrasting views toward "little kids" and "older kids." She used positive judgments to describe the younger learn-

ers' language learning capacities as "good" and "better," while she negatively judged the older students as not having "the whole language." For example, in the following excerpt, when asked to explain her expectations for her students, Ariel constructed age-based hierarchies among the learners, and such a stance was made explicit through the attitude analysis:

> I think the expectations change. […] [For] the older students, I expect [affect: +desire] [judgment: +capacity] them to know more about the culture and things just because they don't have like the whole language [judgment: -capacity]. But like the third-grade class, I've had them since kindergarten, so I have higher language expectations [affect: +desire] for them. (Interview 1, 2020)

When discussing her expectations for students, Ariel's response revealed a nuanced understanding of their learning abilities, which differed according to age groups. For the older students, she expressed an expectation that they should focus more on learning about Chinese culture. This expectation was underlined by a judgment that these students lacked the capacity for the "whole language," leading her to emphasize cultural learning over language proficiency in her teaching approach. In contrast, Ariel's expectations for younger students were characterized by higher aspirations for their language learning. Having been with them since kindergarten, she felt a strong connection and belief in their ability to meet her heightened linguistic expectations. Her affective investment in these students, coupled with her judgment of their capacity, highlighted a belief in their potential to achieve more. This dual coding of affect (desire) and judgment (capacity) provided a more complex insight into Ariel's pedagogical philosophy.

This analysis of Ariel's expectations also laid the groundwork for the subsequent exploration of what constituted a "good" student in her view. Building on the language expectation question, Lu further asked about who she considered to be good students. In her response to this question, Ariel again made several positive judgments about the younger learners' language learning capacities:

> I think the younger kids are generally the **good** students [judgment: +capacity] just because they **try more**, they **speak more**. [judgment: +capacity] Like you saw, for example. I just asked them a question. Like the one, we weren't just practicing [verb to indicate the location in Chinese], and one was like, oh 在哪 [where]. Like, he remembered that from the song 一二三四五六七 [one, two, three, four, five, six, seven]. So, they **can** [judgment: +capacity] start figuring it out and making the connections. Things I think the younger, the **better** [judgment: +capacity] because it's in there. (Interview 1, 2020)

In her response to the question about who she considered to be good students, Ariel's language was laced with comparative judgments that serve to evaluate her students' language learning abilities. For Ariel, the younger students were "good" [judgment: +capacity], and she grounded this assessment in specific behaviors that she observed: they "try more," they "speak more," and they are able to "start figuring it out and making the connections." Each of these behaviors is evi-

dence of a learner who is engaged, active, and resourceful, thereby reinforcing her positive judgment of their capacity. Her discourse around older students, though not explicitly present in the excerpt above, appeared to be shaded by negative judgments, such as their lack of "the whole language."

Ariel's comment that "the younger, the better" encapsulates her belief in a critical period for language learning. It suggests an underlying theory that language acquisition is more natural, effective, and promising at an earlier age — an LAI that could have wide-ranging implications for how she approaches her teaching. By positively judging younger learners as "good" and more capable, she may be internalizing a belief that might lack critical examination of its broader implications or underlying biases.

Chinese as a Cultural Capital

In addition to the age-based language learning ideology, another theme that emerged from Ariel's discourse is a value-laden hierarchy among languages present in the classroom, with Chinese perceived as conferring more cultural capital than students' home languages. This notion was evidenced by Ariel's consistently positive evaluations of Chinese language learning throughout the interviews. In the data, Chinese, as a school subject, was positioned as desirable and useful. Positive appreciation and capacity judgments about students' aptitude for learning Chinese are indicative of a broader language ideology that Chinese is a form of cultural capital. In this interview, Ariel was asked to comment on her experience teaching Chinese at Hope School:

> I do like it. [affect: +happiness] I think it's good for the kids [appreciation: +valuation] too. Even if they never use a language to think about other things, (they can) realize [judgment: +capacity] there's a whole world that is different. [judgment: -normality] (Interview 1)

Ariel first expressed a positive affect for Chinese teaching, as evidenced by the term "like." Her appreciation of the language also extended to its benefits for her students, indicating a belief in the inherent value of young individuals learning Chinese. This belief was reinforced by the hypothetical scenario she presented, suggesting that even if the language is not used for practical purposes, it offers a broader perspective by making learners realize the vastness and diversity of the global cultural landscape. By emphasizing that Chinese learning can help children grasp the idea of a "whole world that is different," Ariel revealed a language ideology: learning Chinese is not merely about communication but also cultural enlightenment and global awareness. The value of Chinese, in this context, extends beyond utilitarian purposes to the realm of broadened horizons and deepened cultural understanding.

Ideologies about Students' Home Languages in School

Ariel's positive attitude toward Chinese as a school subject contrasted with her multifaceted ideologies concerning students' home languages, such as Spanish. This nuanced perspective reveals a complex interplay of ideologies that shape Ariel's practices and language policies. During a classroom interaction (Excerpt

1), Ariel interacted with Bennett, a 10-year-old bilingual Latina who spoke Spanish at home:

Excerpt 1
Interaction between Ariel and Bennett (March 10, 2020)

Ariel	Give me a sentence – My big brother is in the bathroom, Bennett
Bennett	*Mi hermano mayor está en el baño.* [My big brother is in the bathroom.]
Ariel	Well, you can't just go cheat. I'll call you back when it's time to review. {T points to the door and asks Bennett to go upstairs to see the guidance counselor}
Ariel	Bye. Bye. No. Bye.

In this excerpt, when Bennett provided the response in Spanish instead of Chinese, Ariel's response indicated a classroom language policy that Spanish was not permitted. Her subsequent action of asking Bennett to leave the classroom further suggested that the use of Spanish was not in alignment with her expectations at that moment. In Interview 2, Ariel expanded upon this interaction when she was asked to describe her bilingual students' performance in her fourth-grade Chinese class.

> I think there are maybe 10 or 11 (students who) speak Spanish at home. Today, did you hear me **yell at** [affect: -satisfaction] Bennett? Because she likes to **only** [judgment: -normality] answer me in Spanish because she just wants to be—**sassy** [judgment: -normality]. (Interview 2)

Ariel's reflections on this interaction exposed a complex web of judgments surrounding Bennett's language practices. Her expressions of dissatisfaction, alongside negative judgments of normality and propriety, revealed discomfort with Bennett's choice to use Spanish in her Chinese class. Ariel further made the distinction between students' home culture and the mainstream culture (i.e., the white, middle-class way of schooling) in her practiced language policies regarding what students were expected to do in school. This distinction was expressed in the following interview, in which Ariel shared her concerns about the students' extensive use of Spanish:

> Those kids were doing it because **they were doing it to exclude** the English-speaking kids from their conversation [judgment: -propriety]. So that's a **NO** [affect: -satisfaction]. That **has to be shut down** [judgment: -propriety]. Because **that's not using Spanish to help you learn** something else **that's using Spanish to exclude** other students [judgment: -propriety]. It's not a **secret** language [judgment: -normality]. (Interview 3)

Rather than viewing the students' home language practices in school as natural and normal, Ariel considered these practices to be out of place and in need of regulation. She viewed the extensive use of Spanish, in particular, as a mechanism

that some bilingual students employed to exclude others. This perception suggests a framing of Spanish not as a legitimate form of communication, but as a potentially divisive element within the school setting. This view is consistent with a monolingual habitus ideology, which advocates for the limitation and regulation of home languages to uphold mainstream cultural norms (Bourdieu, 1993).

However, Ariel's language ideology was not monolithic. Her views on students' home languages were complex and sometimes contradictory. While she negatively appraised her students' use of Spanish in certain contexts, she also recognized and appreciated the capacity of bilingual students to navigate multiple cultures. For example, when asked about bilingual students' performance in the classroom, Ariel responded:

> I think they also **do a better job** [judgment: +capacity] of accepting other cultures because they already have cultures that are **different** [judgment: -normality]. So, they're just like, "Yeah, okay. That's what you do here, that's what we do at home." (Interview 3)

Independent of the recognition of the intrinsic worth of students' home languages, the sense of a need to supervise the use of home languages in the school was seen as a key focus by Ariel:

> If they needed to use Spanish to get something across to find meaning and something or for me to understand something, then I think that's **okay**. [judgment: +propriety] But if you're just going to use Spanish as a refusal to use any other language, then **that's a line that we have to draw** [judgment: - propriety]. (Interview 3)

The findings above reveal the presence of juxtaposing ideologies in Ariel's perspective on students' home languages. On one hand, Ariel embraced a multilingual ideology, perceiving students' home languages as valuable learning resources. On the other hand, these ideologies seemed to contrast with Ariel's more regulated view on the use of students' home languages in her class and her enactment of language policies that limited students' use of their home languages at school.

Discussion

Examining Ariel's embedded language ideologies through the attitude framework reveals a tension between her belief in early-age language learning and her nuanced views on bilingualism. The data highlighted an overarching pattern of Ariel's attitudinal discourse consistent with "the younger, the better" LAI, which reflects a fundamental understanding of language learning as innate, and its capacity decreases as age grows. A monolingual ideology also emerged from Ariel's discourse, privileging English at school while attributing different values to other languages. However, this does not imply a complete rejection or devaluation of other languages. For instance, Ariel viewed Chinese as bestowing cultural capital and exhibited an oscillating perspective on students' home languages, such as Spanish. This nuanced stance on students' bilingualism is emblematic of broader tensions within language education, where multi- and monolingual ideologies often coexist in intricate ways.

Ariel's alignment with the "younger, the better" LAI taps into a longstanding debate in second language acquisition. This belief, rooted in the critical-period hypothesis, suggests that language learning is most effective during a supposed optimal period in early life (e.g., Lenneberg, 1967). While this idea has been both supported and challenged in academic circles (e.g., Scovel, 2001), its influence persists among some language teachers. It is essential to recognize, however, that applying this hypothesis broadly can be problematic. In the context of Ariel's classroom, the "younger, the better" LAI might shape her expectations for learners of different age groups, potentially influencing the opportunities they are given.

Ariel's attitudes toward her students' home languages resonate with the prevalent monolingual ideologies that often ascribe a privileged status for a particular language within a country, such as English in the U.S. (e.g., Blommaert et al., 2006; García & Hesson, 2015). This ideology is manifested in Ariel's denial of students' free use of Spanish in school, portraying it as "secret" and "problematic." Such an approach draws a distinct line between bilingual students and their monolingual peers, risking the entrenchment of educational inequalities by separating home and school language practices (García et al., 2017). This may undermine students' bilingual identities and linguistic and cultural assets by implicitly valuing classroom languages over home languages (Lam, 2009).

However, Ariel's monolingual ideology is not unidimensional. Contrary to a complete devaluation of other languages, her discourse reveals a nuanced appreciation for her students' bilingualism, even while exhibiting restrictive views of their home languages. This complex duality is reflective of broader tensions in the field of language education, where the value of multilingualism is often recognized in theory but challenged in practical application (Hornberger & Vaish, 2009; May, 2013). The translanguaging perspective, which encourages the fluid use of multiple languages in the learning process (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), provides a potential framework for rethinking these dynamics. Yet, it also adds further complexity to the classroom context, requiring thoughtful integration and recognition of various languages as valuable resources rather than problems (García & Flores, 2012). Ariel's fluctuating perspective between validation and restriction raises critical and intricate questions regarding the valuation, control, and integration of multiple languages within classroom settings. It emphasizes the need for a more context-specific approach that both acknowledges the richness of students' linguistic repertoires and navigates the practical challenges of effective language teaching (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006; Tian et al., 2020).

As the current educational climate emphasizes language teaching for social justice and equity, the findings hold significant implications for WL classrooms (e.g., Baggett, 2018; Glynn et al., 2018; Wesely et al., 2016). Kubota et al. (2003) argued that WL classrooms could serve as spaces where students can interrogate social inequalities by critically examining the target language and culture, thus allowing them to question hegemonic practices within their own contexts. This endeavor is particularly complex, as many language teachers, predominantly white, may lack critical consciousness regarding their own identities, the languages they teach, or the cultures they engage with (Baggett, 2018; Glynn, 2012). Moreover, the

isolation that often characterizes the working conditions of WL teachers, coupled with a broader social context that may regard culturally and linguistically diverse students as less competent or deserving (Bartolomé, 2004), exacerbates these challenges.

Pedagogical Implications

In accordance with Alfaro and Bartolomé's (2017) call for explicitly helping language educators develop ideological clarity in their pedagogical expertise, we argue that WL teacher education programs should incorporate components that can help teacher candidates critically examine and deconstruct their underlying ideologies. This should involve specific tools that would allow the teachers to elicit or identify their ideological beliefs. Systemic functional linguistics, as both a linguistic theory and a robust analytical instrument, could offer an invaluable resource for novice teachers. It could help teachers identify and deconstruct their implicit assumptions about languages and language teaching. Troyan and colleagues (Troyan & Sembiante, 2021, Troyan et al., 2023) argued that the integration of SFL in WL education programs could help WL teacher candidates develop a functional linguistic repertoire that allows them to analyze their everyday language use and language use in WL classrooms. Through an activity called the Language Use Profile, the language teachers in Troyan et al. (2023) examine their cultural, linguistic, and racialized identities through the analysis of their language use across contexts. In a similar vein, Austin's (2022a, 2022b) award-winning research and practice provides a model for deconstructing antiBlack ideologies in language teacher education to better equip language teachers to engage in anti-racist pedagogies in their classrooms. By actively engaging WL teachers in the analysis of their own discourse and practices through SFL, WL teachers are provided opportunities to develop the critical consciousness that would allow them to interrogate their own position, privilege, and power within educational systems (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Heiman, 2021). Developing this critical consciousness can help to better prepare WL teachers implement pedagogies that center antiracist (Hines-Gaither & Acceilien, 2023), socially just (Glynn et al., 2018; Randolph & Johnson, 2017), and gender just (Knisely & Paiz, 2021).

Developing critical consciousness requires ongoing examination and challenge of power dynamics, a deep understanding of the historical and sociopolitical context of schools and education, and an earnest engagement with discomfort as a means to transform the prevailing status quo (Palmer et al., 2019). An important part of this process is the practice of critical listening. Critical listening offers teachers a way to examine their perspectives and move beyond the "abyssal thinking" regarding their bilingual students (García et al., 2021). This approach encourages open dialogues about complex subjects such as power, race, and privilege within classrooms and involves students and their families in these dialogues (Nancy, 2007). By doing so, teachers could develop an awareness of the multifaceted connections between language learning and students' lives. This reflective practice aligns with the recent push towards humanizing pedagogies (Palmer et al., 2019; Salazar, 2013), where the process of developing critical consciousness be-

comes both a catalyst for change and a result of engaging with these transformative practices.

Conclusion

This study used attitude analysis to reveal the complex interplay of Ariel's language ideologies toward her culturally and linguistically diverse students. The findings underscore the need for WL education programs to help educators critically assess their implicit ideological underpinnings. As we continue to advocate for classrooms that interrogate social inequalities and promote critical consciousness, we also need to develop more context-specific pedagogical frameworks that can foster equitable language learning spaces and transcending monolingual ideologies in world language classrooms.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Ariel, her students, and the school community for opening the classroom to us. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their feedback on earlier versions of this article.

References

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

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2016). Alignment of the world-readiness standards for learning languages with the common core state standards. Retrieved from: **https://www.actfl.org/news/reports/alignment-the-world-readiness-standards-learning-languages-the-common-core-state-standards**

Austin, T. (2022a). Linguistic imperialism: Countering anti Black racism in world language teacher preparation. Journal for Multicultural Education, 16, 246– 258. **https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-12-2021-0234**

Austin, T. (2022b). 'A Hard Time Seeing the Relevance': Race and discourse identity in language teacher preparation. International Journal of Literacy, Culture and Language Education, 2, May 2022, 28-30. **https://doi.org/10.14434/ijlcle.v2iMay.34386**

Azaz, M., & Abourehab, Y. (2021). Should Standard Arabic Have" The Lion's Share?": Teacher Ideologies in L2 Arabic through the Lens of Pedagogical Translanguaging. Intercultural Communication Education, 4(1), 90-105. **https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v4n1.442**

Baggett, H. C. (2018). "We're here to learn to speak French": An exploration of world language teachers' beliefs about students and teaching. Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association, 54(6), 641-667. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2018.1478836**

Baggett, H. C. (2020). Relevance, Representation, and Responsibility: Exploring World Language Teachers' Critical Consciousness and Pedagogies. *L2 Journal*, *12*(2). **https://doi.org/10.5070/l212246037**

Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2021). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (7th ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Bartolomé, L. I. (2004). Critical Pedagogy and Teacher Education: Radicalizing Prospective Teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *31*(1), 97-122. **http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478420**

Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and Attitudes of Effective Foreign Language Teachers: Results of a Questionnaire Study. *Foreign Language Annals*, *38*(2), 259-270. **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02490.x**

Blackledge, A. (2008). Language Ecology and Language Ideology. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 2923-2936). Springer US. **https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_219**

Blake, R., & Cutler, C. (2003). AAE and Variation in Teachers' Attitudes: A Question of School Philosophy? *Linguistics and Education*, *14*(2), 163-194. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(03)00034-2**

Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2011). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Multilingual Matters.

Blommaert, J., Creve, L., & Willaert, E. (2006). On being declared illiterate: Language-ideological disqualification in Dutch classes for immigrants in Belgium. *Language & Communication*, *26*(1), 34-54. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2005.03.004**

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Byrd, D. R., Hlas, A. C., Watzke, J., & Valencia, M. F. M. (2011). An examination of culture knowledge: A study of L2 teachers' and teacher educators' beliefs and practices. *Foreign Language Annals*, *44*(1), 4-39. **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01117.x**

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*(1), 403-427. **https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X17690120**

Chang, S. (2022). Chinese bilingual preservice teachers' reflections on translanguaging pedagogy: The need for critical language curricularization. *Foreign Language Annals*, *55*(4), 1086-1108. **https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12654**

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 103-115. **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x**

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 221–240. Retrieved from **https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19743**

De Costa, P. I. (2011). Using language ideology and positioning to broaden the SLA learner beliefs landscape: The case of an ESL learner from China. *System*, *39*(3), 347-358. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.007**

Dong, J. (2009). 'Isn't it enough to be a Chinese speaker': Language ideology and migrant identity construction in a public primary school in Beijing. *Language &Communication*,*29*,115-126.**https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2009.01.002**

Duff, P. A. (2012). Identity, agency, and second language acquisition. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 410-426). Routledge.

Fernandez, L. (2018). Qualitative Interview Analysis: The Use of Systemic Functional Linguistics to Reveal Functional Meanings. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *19*(2). **https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-19.2.2663**

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective.* John Wiley & Sons.

García, O., & Flores, N. (2012). Multilingual pedagogies. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (pp. 249-263). Routledge. **https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203154427.ch13**

García, O., & Hesson, S. (2015). Translanguaging frameworks for teachers: Macro and micro perspectives. In A. Yiacoumetti (Ed.), *Multilingualism and language in education: Current sociolinguistic and pedagogical perspectives from commonwealth countries* (pp. 221-242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46-62). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *18*(3), 203-228. **https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1935957**

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning.* Caslon.

Glynn, C. L. (2012). The role of ethnicity in the foreign language classroom: perspectives on African-American students' enrollment, experiences, and identity (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, **https://hdl.handle.net/11299/143200**

Glynn, C., Wesely, P., & Wassell, B. (2018). *Words and actions: Teaching languages through the lens of social justice.* (2nd ed.). ACTFL.

Gonsalves, R. E. (2008). Hysterical blindness and the ideology of denial: Preservice teachers' resistance to multicultural education. In L. I. Bartolomé (Ed.), *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality* (pp. 3-28). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Hall, C. J., & Cunningham, C. (2020). Educators' beliefs about English and languages beyond English: From ideology to ontology and back again. *Linguistics and Education*, *57*. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.10081**

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.

Hamman, L. (2018). *Reframing the language separation debate: Language, identity, and ideology in two-way immersion* (Publication Number 10846507) University of Wisconsin-Madison].

Heiman, D. (2021). "So, is gentrification good or bad?": One teacher's implementation of the fourth goal in her TWBE classroom. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *52*(1), 63-81. h**ttps://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12362**

Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education*, *42*, 21-33. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.08.003**

Hines-Gaither, K., & Accilien, C. (2023) The antiracist world language classroom. Routledge.

Hornberger, N., & Vaish, V. (2009). Multilingual language policy and school linguistic practice: globalization and English-language teaching in India, Singapore and South Africa. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *39*(3), 305-320. **https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920802469663**

Humphrey, S., Love, K., & Droga, L. (2011). *Working grammar: An introduction for secondary English teachers*. Pearson Australia Group Pty Ltd.

Jaffe, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oup Usa.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Karathanos, K. (2009). Exploring US mainstream teachers' perspectives on use of the native language in instruction with English language learner students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *12*(6), 615-633. **https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802372760**

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

Kissau, S. P., Algozzine, B., & Yon, M. (2012). Similar but different: The beliefs of foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(4), 580-598. **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2013.12001.x**

Knisely, K., & Paiz, J. M. (2021). Bringing trans, non-binary, and queer understandings to bear in language education. *Critical Multilingualism Studies, 9*, 23-45.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Language ideologies in the expression and representation of Arizona Tewa identity. *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*, 329-359.

Kubota, R., & Austin, T. (2007). Critical approaches to world language education in the United States: An introduction. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 4*(2-3), 73-83. **https://doi.org/10.1080/15427580701389367**

Kubota, R., Austin, T., & Saito-Abbott, Y. (2003). Diversity and Inclusion of Sociopolitical Issues in Foreign Language Classrooms: An Exploratory Survey. *Foreign Language Annals*, *35*(1), 12-24. **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2003.tb01928.x**

Lam, W. S. E. (2009). Multiliteracies on Instant Messaging in Negotiating Local, Translocal, and Transnational Affiliations: A Case of an Adolescent Immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(4), 377-397. **https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.44.4.5**

Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). *Biological foundations of language*. New York: John Wiley.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2006). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Multilingual Matters. **https://doi.org/doi:10.21832/9781853599255**

Marková, I., Linell, P., Grossen, M., & Salazar Orvig, A. (2007). *Dialogue in focus groups: Exploring socially shared knowledge*. Equinox publishing.

Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142-175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, J.R. & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause. Continuum*, London and New York.

Martínez, R. A., Durán, L., & Hikida, M. (2017). Becoming "Spanish learners": Identity and interaction among multilingual children in a Spanish-English dual language classroom. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *11*(3), 167-183. **https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2017.1330065**

May, S. (Ed.). (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (1st ed.). Routledge. **https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113493**

Meadows, B., & Sayer, P. (2013). The Mexican sports car controversy: An appraisal analysis of BBC's Top Gear and the reproduction of nationalism and racism through humor. *Discourse, Context & Media, 2*(2), 103-110. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2013.04.003**

Muirhead, P. (2009). Rethinking culture: Toward a pedagogy of possibility in world language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 6*(4), 243-268. **https://doi.org/10.1080/15427580903313512**

Murchadha, N. O., & Flynn, C. (2018). Language educators' regard for variation in late modernity: Perceptions of linguistic variation in minority contexts. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *22*(3), 288-311. **https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12286**

Nancy, J. L. (2007). *Listening*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). School District Demographics System. U.S. Department of Education. **https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sdds/**

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*, Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual matters. **https://doi.org/ 10.21832/978178309056**

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *10*(4), 625-651. **https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0020**

Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory Into Practice*, *58*(2), 121-133. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569376**

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. **https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12121**

Pinker, S. (1994). How could a child use verb syntax to learn verb semantics? *Lingua*, *92*, 377-410. **https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(94)90347-6**

Randolph, L.J., & Johnson, S.M. (2017). Social justice in the language classroom: A call to action. *Dimension*, 9-31.

Razfar, A. (2005). Language ideologies in practice: Repair and classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, *16*(4), 404-424. **https://doi.org/https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2006.04.001**

Reeves, J. (2006). Secondary Teacher Attitudes Toward Including English-Language Learners in Mainstream Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research - J EDUC RES*, *99*, 131-143. **https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.3.131-143**

Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *4*(2), 196-213. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/1467-9481.00111

Riley, K. C. (2011). Language socialization and language ideologies. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, B. Schieffelin (Eds.) *The handbook of language socialization*, 493-514. **https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444342901.ch21**

Salazar, M. d. C. (2013). A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 121-148. **https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732x12464032**

Scovel, T. (2001). "The younger, the better" myth and bilingual education. In *Language Ideologies* (pp. 114-136). Routledge.

Sparks, R. L., & Ganschow, L. (1996). Teachers' perceptions of students' foreign language academic skills and affective characteristics. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *89*, 172-185. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1996.9941323**

Takeuchi, J. (2021). Language ideologies among Japanese foreign language teachers: *Keigo* and L2 speakers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *54*(3), 589-606. **https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12575**

Tian, Z., Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Schissel, J. L. (2020). Envisioning TESOL through a Translanguaging Lens in the Era of Post-multilingualism. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a Translanguaging Lens: Global Perspectives* (pp. 1-20). Springer International Publishing. **https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47031-9_1**

Tilakaratna, N., & Mahboob, A. (2013). Appraisal in the time of conflict: Coding evaluation through textual and contextual analysis. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, *8*(1), 63–90. **https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.v8i1.63**

Troyan, F. J., & Auger, N. (2022). Unprepared for superdiversity: Teacher agency and constraint in a culturally and linguistically diverse French elementary classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1-15. **https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2022.2152033**

Troyan, F. J., & Auger, N. (2023). 'Yes, but you were born in France': Practiced language policies with culturally and linguistically diverse students in an elementary classroom in France. *Language And Education*, 37(4), 500-515. **https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2022.2145902**

Troyan, F. J., & Sembiante, S. F. (2021). Developing a critical functional linguistic knowledge based for world language teachers. In F. J. Troyan (Ed.), *Genre matters in world language education: Contextualized assessment and learning.* Routledge.

Troyan, F. J., Fernández, L., Weng, Z., Ferguson, D. S., Iswandari, Y. A., & Avdakov, S. (2023). Toward humanizing SFL praxis: Coconstructing language teachers' understandings of their intersectional identities via language use. *Foreign Language Annals.* **https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12720**

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *11*(2), 115-140. **https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908**

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech (N. Minick, Trans.). In *The Collected Works of L.S. Vygotsky. Problems of General Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 37-285). Plenum Press.

Wesely, P. M., Glynn, C., & Wassell, B. (2016). Equity, access, and social justice: From pain to possibility. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(2), 564-568. **http://www.jstor.org/stable/44135029**

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *23*(1), 55-82. **https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.000415**

Young, A. S. (2014). Unpacking teachers' language ideologies: attitudes, beliefs, and practiced language policies in schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness*, *23*(1-2), 157-171. **https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2013.863902**

Xinyue Lu (M.S., Fordham University) is a Ph.D. candidate in the Multilingual Language Education program at The Ohio State University. She currently serves as a university field supervisor for the World Language Education program. Her research focuses on issues of cultural and linguistic diversity in world language classrooms and teacher education.

Francis J. Troyan (Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh) is an Associate Professor of Multilingual Language Education in the Department of Teaching and Learning at The Ohio State University. He teaches in the Bilingual, TESOL, and World Language Education programs. His research focuses on engaging language teachers in critical reflection on their language use, identity, and ideologies in the classroom.