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Abstract
Mirroring the heterogeneity of Spanish-speaking bilingual teachers and students in the United States, the authors reflect on their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds to interrogate what it means to be “linguistically qualified” to prepare bilingual teachers in the United States. Through critical collaborative autoethnographies, they problematize the question of who is “linguistically qualified” to do this work and ask how universities can better prepare bilingual teacher education faculty for the distinct challenges they face so that they can thrive rather than survive and, in turn, better prepare future bilingual teachers. This article proposes three guiding principles for preparing and sustaining linguistically diverse bilingual teacher educators: (a) explore and develop language ideologies and equitable pedagogies; (b) develop and maintain critical consciousness to examine intersectional
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identities that include race, gender, sexual orientation, language, ethnicity, social class, and immigration status; and (c) incorporate explicit navigation of the politics of bilingual education and provide opportunities for networking and mentoring.

Introduction

Currently the framing of bilingual education continues to reproduce hegemonic Whiteness that defines English as the White, “standard” variety of English (Flores, 2016) and Spanish as the “standard,” conqueror’s form of Spanish (García, 2014). Bilingualism in the United States has been interpreted in multiple ways, including having equal, high degrees of bilingualism and biliteracy across languages or being two monolinguals in one (Grosjean, 1989). In contrast, Valdés (2001) argued that the “idealized, perfectly balanced bilingual is for the most part a mythical figure that rarely exists in real life” (p. 40). Bilingualism (Valdés, 2001) and biliteracy (Hornberger & Link, 2012) exist on a dynamic continuum, and proficiencies shift accordingly. Bilinguals speaking nonprestige or stigmatized language varieties are often associated with lower socioeconomic status and education levels such that Valdés, Brookes, and Chávez (2003) wrote, “Bilingual is considered the polite or even politically correct term with which to refer to children who are poor, disadvantaged and newly arrived” (p. 35). More recently, Rosa (2016) showed a school principal’s understanding of the term bilingual as meaning not knowing “the language,” implying that “the language” is English and thereby devaluing non-English languages.

In the United States, Latinx K–12 students receive explicit and implicit messages that their linguistic practices are not welcome in the classroom, resulting in subtractive bilingual education (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Flores, 2016). Berry (2009) and Amos (2018) showed that this marginalization also occurs in bilingual teacher preparation with equally damaging effects. Amos’s (2018) study reported two bilingual education teachers’ experiences of being condemned by a teacher education classmate for speaking Spanish in public and the questioning of their intelligence and accomplishments. Berry (2009) noted that with limited numbers of bilingual people of color in tenure-track positions, bilingual students of color are at risk of being underestimated and misunderstood.

Flores (2016) argued that the marginalization of bilinguals in U.S. schools is a result of the history of bilingual education in the United States having two competing visions during the civil rights movement: race radicalism and liberal multiculturalism. Race radicalism positioned bilingual education as a struggle against oppression, but over time, bilingual education was co-opted by those supporting liberal multiculturalism (Flores, 2016). As a result, much of bilingual education today is subtractive when “the home language of language-minoritized students is used solely to develop Standardized American English” (Flores, 2016, p. 14). Consequently, Latinx students’ English and Spanish are viewed as deficits, while White students who acquire Spanish as a second language are lauded (Rosa, 2016).
One consequence of the current, subtractive form of bilingual education is that language is racialized to systematically exclude Others (Rosa, 2016). For instance, the English learner (EL) label and its testing requirements not only stigmatize and result in overtesting of EL students but also identify students as less American than their English-speaking peers, as English is associated with citizenship and Spanish with foreignness (S. J. Hernández, 2017). Flores (2017) called for a materialist anti-racist approach to language activism, positioning language policy within the broader social, political, and economic contexts. This approach emphasizes the intersectionality of bilingual education with race and class and calls for interdisciplinary approaches to begin to combat the marginalization of communities of color (Flores, 2017).

In this article, we explore the heterogeneity of bilingual teacher educators through our critical collaborative autoethnographies. We problematize the question of who is linguistically qualified to do this work and ask how universities can better prepare bilingual teacher educators for the distinct challenges they face so that they can better prepare future bilingual teachers. We aim to initiate dialogue about the heterogeneity of bilingual teacher educators and how their preparation can support the resistance of hegemonic discourses. To this end, we begin by discussing how critical race theory and raciolinguistics ground our understanding of what it means to be “linguistically qualified” to prepare bilingual teachers in the United States.

**Critical Race Theory and Raciolinguistics**

Critical race theory (CRT; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001) and raciolinguistics (Flores & Rosa, 2015) informed the process of our critical collaborative autoethnographies. CRT challenges dominant ideologies of education and acknowledges the intersection of race, gender, class, and other forms of demographics in discrimination (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Valuing the lived experiences of people of color, CRT seeks to amplify their voices through narratives, counternarratives, storytelling, family histories, and biographies (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Stemming from a history of legal scholarship, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) first set CRT in the realm of education, and Solórzano and Yosso (2001) located it specifically in the context of graduate education, stating,

The overall goal of a critical race theory in graduate education is to develop a theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical strategy that accounts for the role of race and racism in U.S. graduate education and works toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating other forms of subordination, such as gender, class, and sexual orientation. (p. 472)

A cursory introduction to CRT in graduate education is insufficient to foster scholars who teach and pursue research that aims to eliminate racism; deep, rich experiences are needed instead (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). This is particularly true for schol-
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ars who will prepare future teachers in institutions that traditionally serve White students and foster hegemonic beliefs and teaching practices (Sleeter, 2017). CRT recognizes that institutionalized, systemic racism results in systems—including teacher education systems—that are designed to meet the needs of White students and, at best, benignly neglect the needs of students of color (Rogers-Ard, Knaus, Epstein, & Mayfield, 2013; Sleeter, 2017).

Interest Convergence and Linguicism in Bilingual Education

Interest convergence, a tenet of CRT, explains that racial equality will be pursued by the majority only when it aligns with the majority’s interests and needs (Milner, 2008; Milner, Pearman, & McGee, 2013). Milner (2008) explored bilingual education as an example of interest convergence, relating how a school district decided to integrate Spanish-speaking students into its better schools only after White parents sought Spanish-language models for the district’s dual language program. Cervantes-Soon (2014) described a similar occurrence in North Carolina, where bilingual education was implemented to integrate a “foreign” language and enrich White students’ schooling experiences. Similarly, Palmer (2010) found that when a traditional bilingual program became a dual language program, bilingual teachers could serve only half of the Latinx students they had previously served.

Flores and Rosa (2015) examined the linguicism (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2015) inherent in schools and argued that school communities simultaneously require multilingual students to “mimic the white speaking subject while ignoring the raciolinguistic ideologies that the white listening subject uses to position them as racial Others” (p. 155). Varieties of Spanish acquired in the United States are in constant contact with English and are stigmatized as compared to peninsular Spanish (Flores & Rosa, 2015); the conqueror’s form of Spanish is valued over the varieties of the colonized (García, 2014). As such, “correcting” a stigmatized American variety of Spanish is a form of cleansing or purifying the language (Flores & Rosa, 2015) rather than celebrating the dynamic bilingualism (García, 2009) possible in a contact zone such as the United States (Pratt, 1991). We (Briceño, Rodriguez-Mojica, & Muñoz-Muñoz, 2018) recently demonstrated that some Spanish-speaking preservice teachers internalize hegemonic raciolinguistic beliefs to such an extent that they question their Spanish and consider themselves unqualified to become bilingual teachers. For those who do become bilingual teachers, these raciolinguistic beliefs influence their pedagogy and responses to students’ use of home Spanish (Briceño, 2018; Martínez, Hikida, & Durán, 2015).

Deficit Orientation and Trauma

The deficit views of languages spoken by students of color appear across schooling systems, from P–12 (Briceño et al., 2018; S. J. Hernández, 2017; Rosa, 2016) to university world language departments (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998).
and teacher preparation programs (Berry, 2009). Repeated messages that their home language and literacy practices are inferior to purported “standard” varieties can be traumatic and compound marginalization outside school walls (Briceño et al., 2018; S. J. Hernández, 2017). Children in bilingual programs, their families, bilingual teachers, and bilingual teacher educators may suffer from trauma or posttraumatic stress disorder, as diagnostic criteria include issues commonly faced by immigrants and their families in the United States, including drastic changes to relationships and support networks, prolonged financial challenges, and discrimination (Perreira & Ornelas, 2013; Phipps & Degges-White, 2014). Deportation and the resulting separation from family members can also affect mental health (Allen, Cisneros, & Téllez, 2015), as can the fear of deportation (Gándara, 2018; Martínez et al., 2015). Trauma can be transgenerational (Lev-Wiesel, 2007) and can be compounded by hegemony and systemic oppression (Goodman & West-Olatunji, 2010).

Scholarship grounded in CRT has shown that scholars of color may be presumed incompetent or tracked into service-oriented positions that reduce their research, thus negatively impacting their ability to succeed in the academy (Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, Gonzalez, & Harris, 2012; Peguero, 2018). Additionally, the inherent discrimination in higher education can cause psychological trauma (Giles, 2015) and “racialised impostership,” or the notion that one does not belong in academia due to race (Dancy, 2015, p. 135). The effect, termed racial battle fatigue, describes being “‘behind enemy lines’ and within systemically racist environments affectionately known as American higher education” (Giles, 2015, p. 169). Biases at the faculty level can lead to an unhealthy ecology of learning and feelings of “disinvite” (Patton, 2016, p. 325). We argue that the “disinvite” is felt by both faculty and students of color, who may suffer when leaders or instructors are not prepared to provide support for—or acknowledge—a negative campus racial climate. This study adds to the research by exploring the critical collaborative autoethnographies of three bilingual teacher educators of differing backgrounds to propose principles for the preparation of bilingual teacher educators that combat institutional hegemony and support affirming, inclusive, culturally sustaining learning environments. We describe herein how we engaged in critical collaborative autoethnography as method.

Critical Collaborative Autoethnography as Method

Through critical collaborative autoethnography (Boylorn & Orbe, 2016), we share our experiences with deficit views of our bilingualism and identities as bilingual teacher educators. Autoethnography is a qualitative research method that centers the self as the site of study and uses personal experiences as primary data (Chang, 2016; Marx, Pennington, & Chang, 2017). Boylorn and Orbe (2016) describe critical autoethnography as writing “as an Other, and for an Other” (p. 15), as autoethnographers reflect upon, analyze and interpret their lived experiences in relation to the larger sociocultural context (Chang, 2016). Marx et al. (2017)
further explain, critical autoethnography can address “how power and privilege play out in socio-personal lives and how these entities are reproduced and resisted” (p. 2). Critical autoethnography acknowledges that autoethnographers experience marginalization and benefit from inevitable privileges (Boylorn & Orbe, 2016).

Collaborative autoethnographers (K.-A. C. Hernández, Ngunjiri, & Chang, 2015) engage in solo and collective reflection, analysis, and interpretation (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernández, 2016). Collaborative autoethnography allows for “(1) collective exploration of researcher subjectivity; (2) power-sharing among researcher-participants; (3) efficiency and enrichment in the research process; (4) deeper learning about self and other; and (5) community building” (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernández, 2016, p. 25). Although we worked collaboratively, we opted to maintain our individual voices in writing our autoethnographies to more faithfully reflect ourselves in written form.

We engaged in four phases of data collection and analyses. In Phase 1, we drafted questions to guide our self-reflective writings on our linguistic background and experiences related to what it means to be a “linguistically qualified” bilingual teacher educator. The questions and prompts were as follows: (a) How did you arrive at bilingualism? (b) Share a story or two that illustrate your experience with bilingualism. (c) Why and how did you enter the field of bilingual teacher preparation? (d) What is challenging for you about this work, particularly in relation to your identity and bilingualism? (e) What is most meaningful to you about the work of preparing bilingual teachers? (f) How were you prepared to do the work of preparing bilingual teachers? We wrote our self-reflections independently, shared them with one another, and wrote comments and follow-up questions as we read the self-reflections independently. In addition to writing comments and follow-up questions, we began to independently identify themes relevant to the preparation of bilingual teacher educators.

In Phase 2, we met in person to discuss the comments, follow-up questions, and emerging themes stemming from Phase 1. We audio-recorded our group discussion and began to collaboratively draft the guiding principles for the preparation of bilingual teacher educators resulting from our collective self-reflections, emerging themes, and discussion. In Phase 3, we independently examined our self-reflections and audio-recorded group discussion to verify and challenge the guiding principles emerging from the data. Finally, in Phase 4, we met virtually to discuss and arrive at shared guiding principles.

Our Stories

In this section, we offer our critical collaborative autoethnographies, each of which illustrates our experiences with bilingualism and marginalization of our intersectional identities as bilingual teacher educators.
I am a U.S.-born Chicana who was classified as an “English learner” in school and placed in an early-exit bilingual program. As with other bilingual programs based on liberal multiculturalism (Flores, 2016), the program did not aim to develop my bilingualism and biliteracy, so my parents taught me how to read and write in Spanish. My parents immigrated to the United States as adults and worked in agricultural fields and farms in northern California. Many of my family members have at some point been undocumented in the United States. I remember the anxiety I felt hiding behind the couch and peeking at the window to see if the patrolling immigration vehicles were gone. I did not understand how immigration officials decided whom to take; much later, I began to recognize the privileges I had been given simply for being born in the United States and the challenges family members had to overcome as undocumented youths and adults. The literature explains how anxiety and fear of deportation affect mental health (Gándara, 2018; Martínez et al., 2015) and how trauma can be transgenerational (Lev-Wiesel, 2007). Even with a greater awareness of the privileges associated with U.S. citizenship, I still hold my breath at the sight of patrolling immigration vehicles.

U.S. citizenship privileges have not shielded me from having my American-ness questioned when I pronounce my own name in Spanish. In graduate school, research articles told me that I was an “at-risk” student because my family lived below the poverty line, my parents did not have high school diplomas, and I was an “English learner.” I remember sitting in class listening to my classmates and professors discuss my schooling experience. I quickly learned that they were not interested in hearing my personal experience or perspective because it was not objective “research.”

I had few challenges communicating in English as an adolescent. Spanish class, however, was a different story. I enrolled in 2 years of Spanish for Spanish speakers in high school, and I struggled because my Spanish did not reflect the conqueror’s Spanish (García, 2014) expected in class. I used Spanish at home every day and grew up translating for teachers, doctors, and family members; I spoke Spanish. However, I had not learned the Spanish accent rules. My family said garach; my teacher said cochera. We said lonche; my teacher said almuerzo. Almuerzo in my family meant “breakfast.” My Spanish contains a combination of Spanish with American English borrowings and Spanish constructed as low class because it is found in rural, less formally educated areas. Of course, I did not know this in high school. All I knew was that my lowest grade was in Spanish class. I struggled to understand why my Spanish was never questioned when I was asked to translate but was repeatedly corrected in Spanish class. I never enrolled in another Spanish class again.

As a bilingual teacher, I was proud to teach in Spanish. I realize now, however, that I had internalized understandings of the conqueror’s Spanish (García, 2014) as the “right” kind of Spanish. I painfully remember my reaction to a student’s writing.
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Fernando had written a story that was fully comprehensible, but I “corrected” all of the regionalisms in his writing. I crossed off naidén and wrote nadie. I crossed off trujo and wrote trajo. I remember reading Fernando’s story and shaking my head, thinking how much work he needed on his Spanish. My reaction failed to honor that naidén and trujo carried the same denotations as nadie and trajo; worse, I knew the denotations because my family used them. Just like my Spanish teacher had, I viewed his Spanish as not good enough because it was not the “right” Spanish. As an elementary bilingual teacher, I was communicating that the Spanish that Fernando’s family and my own family used did not belong in the classroom. I was perpetuating deficit beliefs about my own community. I entered bilingual teacher preparation because I want, in some way, to break the cycle that I was a part of as a high school student and bilingual teacher by problematizing ideological understandings of “correctness.”

As a bilingual teacher educator, I find myself in a space that, in many ways, is intended for me. My bilingual teacher candidates and their families look like mine and sound like mine. Encouraged by a sense of belonging, I have attempted to publish bilingually and have been discouraged by peer reviewers who question the authenticity of my Spanish and criticize my language use as “forced.” While I hope one day to have the courage and strength to write an academic article in Spanish, my experiences with the manner in which my Spanish has been read and judged as “inauthentic” in scholarly publication venues makes me hesitate.

As an assistant professor, I have been assumed not to be tenure track, and when I clarify, I have been asked questions to show that I know the difference. In my role as director of our bilingual teacher preparation program, I have challenged decisions that schedule bilingual courses in the least desirable slots and discourses that marginalize our bilingual students and program. When I challenged a White woman’s deficit research, I was scolded by administration for the manner in which I delivered my challenges and was accused of causing a division between our two departments. When I tried to understand what about my delivery was wrong, I was told that I did not raise my voice, that my words were professional, and that my argument was clear and was made stronger when I provided recommendations. I have come to see that there was nothing wrong with my delivery. I was villainized because the White woman cried and leadership and faculty felt the need to protect her. There was no regard for how I felt as I listened to her describing how Latinx low-income students’ poor sleep habits (children sharing a bed, multiple families in a home, lack of temperature control, etc.) are associated with high incarceration and crime rates. I had to remind my administration that I, too, am human.

I find myself welcomed in bilingual teacher education while living the anxiety of racial battle fatigue (Fasching-Varner, Albert, Mitchell, & Allen, 2015) in academia. As a Chicana bilingual teacher educator from a rural farmworking Mexican family, I embody my ancestors’ strength and perseverance as I take space in institutions that were never intended for us.
Allison: Does My “Sí, Se Puede” Count When It Is Said With a Gringo Accent?

I should start by expressing that I am uncomfortable with this—as a person of relative privilege, I am unsure of whether my voice deserves to be part of this story, particularly through a lens of CRT. But that is part of my story—how do I, an ethnic White person of (lower) middle-class upbringing, lend my voice in a way that supports those I want to support without undermining or invalidating or diminishing the conversation? What is my role? How do I lend my voice to the struggle if my “Sí, se puede” has a bit of a gringo accent? How do I convince others that I am committed to this fight when I am a cultural and linguistic outsider? And do I have a right to?

I identify as a New York Italian American. To my family, this was different than being “White” or “American,” but I have been granted privileges associated with both. Growing up, we spent a lot of time at my grandmother’s house, listening to my relatives use a handful of Italian words for food, curses, or other words they did not want my sister and I to learn in English, but my extended family was essentially monolingual English speaking. I am a result of acculturation and the decimation of Italian as a heritage language, and I see the fight for Spanish–English bilingualism and the right to sustain cultures among the Latinx community as one worth fighting.

I opted to take Spanish in school because of its similarity to Italian. I did well because I could memorize vocabulary. There was nothing even vaguely related to communicative competence involved in Spanish class. I liked Spanish, maybe because I was led to believe (by my grades, false indicators) that I did well at it, and I minored in it in college; I was one of the White students praised for their bilingualism in a context that devalued the bilingualism of my peers of color (Rosa, 2016).

Working as a bilingual teacher in a high-poverty school with 98% Latinx students was a critical experience for me in learning about educational (in)equity. I listened to parents’ stories of border crossings and learned about the Mexican and Central American education systems and the complexity of immigration issues, including deportation, families’ fear of “the system” (including schools) and the police, the way parents had to leave their children in Mexico with grandparents and send for them later, food insecurity, and a lack of health care. My teaching partner grew up in Mexico City, so we complemented each other well, each helping the other with her nondominant language. While I was always concerned about my Spanish being “good enough,” no one else questioned my right to be a bilingual teacher, at least not out loud. I now wonder if the trade-off for my “native” English was considered a good one by a community that, as in Arce’s (2004) study, had come to internalize many negative beliefs about itself after repeated oppressive messages.

That changed when I became tenure-track faculty. After being hired specifically for a Spanish–English biliteracy position, my right to work in the field of bilingual education was publicly and aggressively questioned. The concern was that I was
not a native Spanish speaker. Part of me had been worrying about this already: If I really wanted bilingual teachers to be well prepared, should not a native speaker be the one to prepare them? Am I, a White woman of privilege, taking the place of a Latinx scholar? I am still not comfortable with my position in this field.

At a recent meeting for bilingual teacher education faculty, I realized that at least half of the participants were White, non-Latinx scholars, which only exacerbated the issue for me. My Latinx colleagues reminded me that giving up will not help and that “research policing” (Brooks, 2017, p. 554) based on identity is an example of the discriminatory practices that need to come to an end. Yet, I self-police based on my perceived expectations of the academy. For example, how would it be regarded if I, a non-Latinx, published in Spanish? And what would it mean for my upcoming tenure review if the committees could not read my Spanish publications?

Despite wonderful mentors, I have felt unprepared for my position as a bilingual teacher educator and scholar in a variety of ways. Preparing future bilingual teachers is complex work, especially in the current political climate. We, educators, cannot just throw teachers into classrooms and tell them to teach for social justice; they must align their social justice stance with pedagogy to avoid maintenance of the status quo. My coauthors have been a significant support in helping me to find my place in this work. Currently I see one of my roles as that of an advocate that might be listened to in certain hegemonic circles that may devalue other voices. I hope to use this privilege to advocate for bilingual education and combat the interest convergence that results in pseudo-equity at the behest of, and for the benefit of, the dominant class (Milner, 2008).

**Eduardo: Language Assets and Burdens**

If I stay silent, I can be constructed as a White, male, cisgender, able-bodied individual. Many of these privileges remain with me, but something changes when I speak. My “accent” brings onto the table that my first language was Spanish and that I was born “elsewhere.” Furthermore, my Spanish “accent” is often described as different from “the people around here.” Recently, a Chicana student teacher described that I “qualified as spicy White” in her understanding of the American racial hierarchy. Often, I feel in no-man’s land, caught between a perennial feeling of foreignness and my debt to a social system that has privileged my Europeanness.

I arrived in the United States in 2005 to teach bilingual first graders in Oakland, California. Born, raised, and turned teacher in Spain, I was “imported” as many other colleagues in the context of the Visiting Teachers Program between Spain, Mexico, and California to address the everlasting shortage of bilingual teachers. As part of my baggage, I was relatively blind to matters of race and class. I was resocialized into the U.S. educational system and quickly learned about the “achievement gap,” “fidelity of implementation,” and other eduspeak narratives and discourses in the context of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). My first school was a “reconstituted”
elementary in East Oakland. As a newcomer, I followed the rules; I soaked in and mastered many of the creeds and learning flavors of the year during NCLB to such a degree that I was able to become a bilingual coach in 3 years and a bilingual principal in 5 years. In retrospect, this happened at a faster pace than my ability to come to terms with the layers of privilege that I trailed and often inadvertently enacted. Much of my advocacy social justice work was “facing outward”: fighting for the survival of the remaining early-exit bilingual programs, engagement with families to promote family-school partnerships and other enrichment activities. However, with the benefit of hindsight, the outward work was missing the deep introspection of my positionality and identity—what I would call inward work.

At Stanford University, privilege acquired new meanings. As a graduate student, I was often complimented on the “purity” of the Spanish I spoke, while at the same time I engaged with critical scholars who ignited and fueled the inward work. This self-introspection was paired with postmodern notions of identity, language fluidity, and performativity that ran so counter to the culture of labeling into which I had been professionally resocialized. Ultimately, the extreme resource inequities between the Oakland I experienced, and the otherworldly abundance of the university led to both an awakening and a galvanizing of class awareness and racial hierarchical positionality. As a teacher, as an administrator, and even as an academic, I have benefited from a racist sociolinguistic judgment that deprecates the Spanish of “Others” based on the intersection of societal perceptions like race, class, or gender (Flores & Rosa, 2015). This linguistic capital has undoubtedly turned into advancement opportunities for me.

In another turn of the screw, the “Europeanness” was turned into a problem from a linguistic lens. A dear mentor once said that my writing was too European and that, to develop and thrive in American academia, I had to adapt my writing to “American writing.” I have always had a very troubled relationship with these blank ideological statements about writing effectively according to this “imagined language” (Anderson, 1991). However, I can see how these ideological “American expectations” on my language cast a long shadow in the pursuit of an academic career. These pressures are compounded with my determination to publish in Spanish as a form of academic activism to realize a vision of linguistic equity but that, nonetheless, may not be as impactful if it is not preceded by publications in that “American academic writing.”

Cultural relevance, authenticity, and my identity have also been called into question. The Spaniard, the colonizer, the imperialist, and the so-called habla pura are ideological narratives that underpin my trajectory in the United States. I struggle with identity politics and essentializing constructions that result in an ethnic limbo for Spaniards: a European Latino? For instance, I recently participated in a phone conversation as part of a job selection process. The conversation was held mostly in Spanish between an early 60s Mexican American female professor preparing bilingual teachers and me. She asked, “How do you think you can surmount the
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fact that your origin and language are from Spain when working with the local population and, in particular, local bilingual teachers?”. Clearly the tension does not lie on my individual experience and ethnopolitical affiliation but on the external ratification of my identity by discourses based on bounded, essentializing notions of culture and belonging.

The transformation of education has been an active desire and vision for myself for quite some time, evolving and growing as I became acquainted with more and more issues and problems regarding bilingual education in the United States. Much of the learning dates to my time as a bilingual principal. The convoluted relations, chains of command, and conflicting interests that school principals are subjected to leave little time to operate the changes needed for schools. In all these struggles, language and identity were pivotal, and by virtue of numbers and role, teachers are in a position to exert a radical transformative force in society. Accordingly, I decided that the preparation of critical and linguistically aware teachers was the area where I wanted to focus for the years to come.

Collectively, we endured linguistic violence and marginalization on our journeys to prepare bilingual teachers. Our stories illustrate how race, ethnicity, and social class play a central role in judgments about whose bilingualism is valued. Developing our understanding of language ideologies and maintaining a critical awareness of the ways in which our intersectional identities influence how our bilingualism and presence in bilingual education and academia is received are crucial to our work as bilingual teacher educators. We have encountered and challenged discriminatory policies that directly affect us and the bilingual communities with which we work. Explicit navigation of the politics of bilingual education while maintaining their platform for advocacy could help sustain future bilingual teacher educators as they work to prepare future bilingual teachers.

Guiding Principles to Prepare and Sustain Bilingual Teacher Educators

We propose the following guiding principles to prepare and sustain bilingual teacher educators as they support the development of future bilingual teachers.

1. Explore and Develop Language Ideologies and Equitable Pedagogies

What does it mean to be “linguistically qualified” to prepare bilingual teachers in the United States? Is a Chicana who acquired Spanish at home “linguistically qualified” to prepare bilingual teachers when her Spanish is stigmatized and she did not formally study Spanish beyond high school? Is an ethnic White “Spanish learner” who acquired Spanish via formal study “linguistically qualified” to prepare bilingual teachers? Is a Spaniard who speaks the Spanish of Spain “linguistically qualified” to prepare bilingual teachers in the United States? These
questions raise important concerns about the ideological nature of standardized linguistic qualifications.

Claudia encountered deficit views of the stigmatized varieties of Spanish associated with the poor. The experience led to her internalizing the negative ideologies associated with her Spanish use and perpetuating the same deficit views as a bilingual teacher. It was not until she explored theories of bilingualism and language ideologies in graduate school that she came to see how dominant ideologies undergirded her schooling experiences, views of language, and teaching practices.

Allison and Eduardo faced a variation of what Brooks (2017) terms research policing, where academics challenge the appropriateness of areas of study for different individuals based on how they are perceived. In a flip of the script, preconceived notions about what someone who belongs in bilingual teacher preparation in the United States should look like and sound like serve to police bilingual teacher educators. In different ways, we have each encountered racialized language ideologies that delineate boundaries of who is qualified to prepare bilingual teachers. These language ideologies impact our sense of belonging within the field and may impact whether future bilingual teacher educators enter the field. In their work on preparing bilingual teachers, and drawing on Bartolomé and Balderrama (2001), Alfaro and Bartolomé (2017) have reminded us that developing bilingual teachers' ideological clarity is crucial if they are to recognize and resist discriminatory language ideologies. Similarly, we argue, it is imperative that the preparation of future bilingual teacher educators include the interrogation of language ideologies. Future bilingual teacher educators will navigate linguistic complexities in academia, such as the push–pull tensions around publishing in Spanish we have shared. Like bilingual teachers, bilingual teacher educators must be prepared to recognize and resist discriminatory language ideologies if they are to model and support bilingual teachers' own development toward equitable pedagogies, while navigating their path to tenure within English-medium institutions.

Eduardo’s style of writing has been criticized for being too European and has been cautioned to acquire a purported “American style of writing” if he wishes to succeed in academia. Teachers communicate language ideologies when they correct students’ writing styles. As such, it is important that we prepare teachers to recognize and accept different styles of writing when writing in multiple languages. For example, as bilingual teacher educators, we have engaged future bilingual teachers in explicit work to develop ideological clarity by having them read and reflect on Alfaro and Bartolomé’s (2017) work on discriminatory and culturally enriching ideologies. In addition, we have engaged future teachers in activities aimed at uncovering ideologies embedded within classroom practices, the explicit exploration of their own systems of beliefs, and how they enact their beliefs through classroom practice. To gauge alignment of classroom practice with linguistic ideology, we have unearthed the linguistic ideologies embedded in lesson plans, classroom scenarios, and classroom videos and compared them with the
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ideologies future teachers claim and hope to enact. The aim is that, increasingly, classroom practice reflects the teacher’s ideological stance. In this way, we have worked with future bilingual teachers to counter the “taken-for-grantedness” of “standard” and “academic” discourses by problematizing constructions of “styles” and “appropriateness.” To engage future bilingual teachers in this work, bilingual teacher educators would benefit from exploring translanguaging, raciolinguistics, and CRT as they develop a deeper understanding of the political and historical contexts of bilingual education in the United States and their roles as bilingual teacher educators.

2. Develop and Maintain Critical Consciousness to Examine Intersectional Identities That Include Race, Gender, Sexual Orientation, Language, Ethnicity, Social Class and Immigration Status

Our collaborative critical autoethnographies illuminate some of the heterogeneity of bilingual teacher educators in the United States. We each entered bilingual teacher education with diverse language, ethnic, immigration, and socioeconomic lived experiences. As a result, we have each faced marginalization at various points in our lives. As a Chicana with undocumented family members, Claudia lives the traumatic effects of dehumanizing immigration policies and elements of racial battle fatigue (Giles, 2015) as a woman of color in academia. As a White Spanish learner, Allison struggles with questions about her right to prepare bilingual teachers while beginning to realize the power her passion and advocacy for bilingual teachers and children can have. As a Spaniard, Eduardo has become increasingly uncomfortable by assumptions that his Spanish is the “right” Spanish and concerned by questions of his ability to connect with Latinx communities. To different degrees, we have each been implicitly and explicitly told that we do not belong. This atmosphere of disinvite and resulting sense of impostership take time and energy away from the work that “counts” toward solidifying our place in academia—scholarly publications aligned with specific language and stylistic rules.

While we were guided by passion for bilingual education and a commitment to social justice, we did not critically examine our identities and roles in bilingual education until graduate school. Claudia and Eduardo illustrate how failure to examine one’s intersectional identities, even as people marked as Others in the United States, can result in a lack of awareness of one’s privileges, systemic inequality, and internalized deficit views. In a politically contested space, bilingual teacher educators must be prepared to advocate for themselves, their colleagues, students, and families. As bilingual teacher educators, we need to consider how to support bilingual teachers to advocate for their bilingual programs and students when confronted by staff and community members opposed to bilingual education. Our call for the development of critical consciousness in the preparation of bilingual teacher educators is aligned with Cervantes-Soon
et al.'s (2017) proposed addition of critical consciousness as the fourth pillar of two-way immersion programs.

Developing a critical consciousness about our intersectional identities allows us to examine how we are marginalized while, even if inadvertently, being agents of marginalization and benefactors of hegemonic narratives. While marginalization based on race, ethnicity, and language is visible within the field of bilingual education, marginalization based on gender, colorism, sexual orientation, social class, and immigration tends to be less visible. Our lived experiences allow us to understand bilingual education through different lenses and to share our unique perspectives with future bilingual teachers. As cisgender, heterosexual, light-skinned faculty with unchallenged citizenship statuses, we perpetuate the silencing and marginalization of transgender, LGBTQ, and immigration issues in bilingual education if we do not critically analyze how we benefit from and contribute to the majoritarian narrative in bilingual education.

3. Incorporate Explicit Navigation of the Politics of Bilingual Education and Provide Opportunities for Networking and Mentoring

The decision to enter bilingual education is political. Bilingual educators work to advance the third goal of dual language education, sociocultural competence, equity, and diversity (Howard et al., 2018), which has gained paramount importance given the escalation of anti-immigrant sentiments and policies in the Trump presidency. We are preparing bilingual teachers in a time when Latinx immigrants are villainized and dehumanized and resources aimed at supporting our communities are threatened. At the time of writing this article, the U.S. government has sanctioned the separation of children from their immigrant caregivers, and young children are held in mass detention centers (Domonoske & Gonzalez, 2018). As we discussed earlier, family separation and fear of deportation can result in trauma (Perreira & Ornelas, 2013; Phipps & Degges-White, 2014). The bilingual communities we serve are directly impacted by these anti-immigrant and dehumanizing policies. Supporting communities targeted by anti-immigrant dehumanizing policies requires networks outside and within the communities themselves, and mentors with advocacy experience.

Recently, the U.S. secretary of education proposed eliminating the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) that guides policies and practices impacting students identified as ELs (Mitchell, 2018). As Alfaro and Hernández (2016) have noted, bilingual teachers work with children and families from the economically poorest populations in the United States and need mentors to prepare them to resist and disrupt hegemonic pedagogies. University professors, including bilingual teacher educators, and countless supporters have rallied to sign collective letters that oppose the elimination of OELA (Cutler, 2018) and demand the immediate reunification of children with their caregivers (Quintana, Simonton, & Zahneis,
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2018). Given attacks on public intellectuals denouncing biases, injustices, and racism in education (Toledo, 2018), future bilingual teacher educators need explicit guidance, mentorship, and networks to resist dehumanizing and unjust policies to advocate for underserved communities while maintaining their platform for advocacy (Guerrero & Lachance, 2018).

In state politics, California’s Proposition 227 severely limited bilingual education in 1998. For nearly 20 years, signed parent waivers were required for bilingual education. Although the effectiveness of bilingual education had been proven to result in higher academic achievement for students identified as “limited English proficient” (LEP; Goldenberg, 2013), California voters did not repeal Proposition 227 until 2016. Importantly, Proposition 58 was publicized as promoting multilingualism for all children in California in an effort to prepare them for a global economy (California Department of Education, 2018). It was supported by a wide array of advocacy organizations, but lack of access to the people in these organizations makes it difficult to participate in advocacy work. Formal and informal networks could facilitate access and increased advocacy. Proposition 58 is an example of interest convergence (Milner, 2008); California voters approved bilingual education only when it included bilingualism in languages beyond Spanish and served students beyond those identified as LEP. To be clear, we view California’s passing of Proposition 58 as a win for bilingual education, however, we cannot ignore that it passed without calling attention to immigrant and bilingual children.

Institutions of higher education also contain White-centric policies and systems (Gutiérrez et al., 2012; Peguero, 2018). Some universities that traditionally prepared bilingual teachers in programs separate from the larger teacher education program have opted to integrate future bilingual teachers into the larger program, with mixed results (Evans, Arnot-Hopffer, & Jurich, 2005). Sometimes decisions to integrate these programs are made for the benefit of White future teachers and faculty. For example, Allison recently had a conversation with a well-intentioned White student in which the student expressed frustration that the bilingual students were not better integrated into the monolingual English teacher preparation program. The student had learned a lot from being in a literacy methods class with 10 future bilingual teachers and argued adamantly that the bilingual preservice teachers should be distributed among all course sections so that other White students could also learn from them. Allison explained in great detail, but with little success, that although it might benefit other White students, such a change could negatively impact bilingual students. To the student, the benefit to White students was more important than considering what would best meet the needs of bilingual future teachers.

In another example, Claudia received her teaching credential and bilingual authorization in a program specifically focused on bilingual and multicultural education. Nearly all of the future teachers in her cohort were bilingual and firmly believed in education for social justice. Outside of Chicano studies courses, this
was the first time she was not faced with having to push back on deficit and racist perspectives as a minority in the classroom space.

As bilingual teacher educators, we confront unjust discriminatory policies and systems that affect us and our bilingual communities. Sometimes our attempts to resist and disrupt have been unsuccessful and potentially detrimental to our future as faculty. Race-conscious senior faculty mentorship has been shown to be of critical importance to junior scholars of color (Dancy, 2015), particularly women of color academics (Whitaker & Grollman, 2019), as they navigate and resist oppressive systems serving the dominant White community. Discussions with experienced and knowledgeable mentors on how to navigate the politics of bilingual education while holding precarious faculty positions could help sustain early-career bilingual teacher educators in the profession.

Conclusion

Collectively, we endured, and continue to combat, linguicism and oppression on our journeys to prepare bilingual teachers. For varying reasons, our right and ability to do this work have been questioned regardless of our linguistic backgrounds. If none of us is qualified to prepare bilingual teachers, who is? Delineation of who is and is not linguistically qualified to prepare bilingual teachers is ideological and, in our experience, often made based on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, and the dominant and formal exigencies of the bilingual teaching profession. Grounded in notions of “teaching-specific” or “pedagogical language competencies” (Aquino-Sterling, 2016), and the guiding principles described earlier, we propose a reconceptualization of the “linguistically qualified” bilingual teacher and bilingual teacher educator. We follow Aquino-Sterling in recommending a focus on the development of “pedagogical Spanish competencies” that emphasize the language and literacy competencies bilingual teachers require for the effective work of teaching in Spanish across the curriculum in K–12 bilingual schools and for competently meeting the professional language demands of working with students, colleagues, administrators, parents, and the larger bilingual school community. (p. 51)

When implemented from a culturally, linguistically, and professionally relevant approach (Aquino-Sterling & Rodríguez-Valls, 2016), developing “pedagogical Spanish competencies” in bilingual teacher education is not necessarily contrary to or exclusive of our main proposal, meaning that linguistically qualified bilingual educators should also continually work toward developing democratic language ideologies, equitable pedagogies, pedagogical language knowledge, critical consciousness, and skills to navigate the politics of bilingual education.

In this article, we argue for combating the linguistic hegemony of purported “academic” English and “academic” Spanish, yet we understand that neither we
nor our future bilingual teachers can escape dominant logics requiring that we communicate our argument in an academic journal and abide by the journal’s “standard” stylistic rules, including writing in a manner “appropriate for a scholarly audience.” In her afterword to an anthology of narratives by women of color academics, Pathak (2019) stated that publishing work that disrupts and reimagines the academy through traditional academic modes adds to the powerful resources from which we can “continue building an academy owned by all of us, where our work is not ‘alternative’” (p. 150). By publishing our work here, we resist the marginalization of our stories and insist on an academy “owned by all of us.”

Developing bilingual education faculty within traditional academia and working within the same discriminatory setting places many of us at risk of racial battle fatigue (Giles, 2015). The guiding principles we propose here are intended to reduce the fatigue associated with the battle, providing future bilingual faculty with the knowledge and internal resources to acknowledge, address, and respond to linguistic hegemony. We hope that this article moves the field toward the development of bilingual teacher educators who are prepared to support bilingual teachers to navigate and combat the oppressive hegemonic context of American public schools.

Notes

1 We use the gender-expansive term Latinx to refer to individuals with ancestral ties to Latin America.

2 Chicana is a self-selected term adopted by some Mexican American women. Chicana suggests a sense of pride in a shared cultural and community identity and communicates historical and political consciousness.
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