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ABSTRACT

This study grew out of a growing awareness of the severe lack of quality and authentic Spanish literacy instructional practices. There were two major purposes. The first was to examine the relationships between Dual Language (DL) teachers’ views on Spanish literacy instructional practices, their students’, and the texts from which they taught to enact their practice. A second purpose was to identify and inform three DL educators of Spanish literacy pedagogical views so that they could consider those views in light of their current practices. The research design was three case studies of the three DL teachers and addressed four research questions: What are the Spanish literacy instructional practices of three dual language teachers?; How do these teachers view their students?; What are their expressed literacy ideologies for Spanish literacy instructional practices?; How does critical dialogue affect their literacy ideologies and practices? The twenty-week study consisted of thirty-two (one hour) classroom observations, six (one hour) critical dialogue sessions, two pre/post interviews, and related classroom documents. Findings suggested the impact of examining DL teachers’ views through critical dialogue was successful in identifying how teachers
negotiated their Spanish literacy instructional practices. A major contribution of this study is pedagogical clarity. This concept is the increased consciousness that teachers have of their own practice. This consciousness becomes a frame of mind from which they draw as they reflect upon their practice and make decisions about what to enact with their students. The teachers in this study developed pedagogical clarity, a term developed to explain their process in serving their students’ literacy needs, desires, interests, and inquiries.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

A Border Crosser is an individual who is able and willing to develop empathy with the cultural ‘other’ and to view as equal the values of the other while conscious of that cultural group’s subordinated social status in the greater society.

*Lilia Bartolomé, 2002*

Imagine a river that serves as the border between two pedagogical realities; on one side was what the three teachers in this study knew about literacy pedagogy. On the other side was what they actually enacted in their classroom. Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy knew that providing an equitable literacy education to their students in Spanish needed to involve holistic and authentic literacy approaches that embraced their student’s background and experiences, including their home language, culture, and ethnicity. These beliefs were on the first side. On the other side of the river were the teachers enacted pedagogies. The teachers were conscious of the reality that their Spanish literacy practices, on the second side, drew from a translated pedagogy based for the most part on reading programs developed from English reading methodology, thereby making them culturally and linguistically inappropriate. Furthermore, the teachers recognized the dominant pedagogical ideologies imposed by educational policies such as the No Child Left Behind Act (2002) and wanted to transform their Spanish literacy practices into a more holistic literacy experience that developed the students’ multilingual literacy.

This dissertation is about these three teachers who became border crossers. Each one had experience on the “dominant side” of the river, where prescribed literacy programs and pedagogy subordinated notions of equitable, authentic, appropriate instruction. But, they chose to cross the border by creating multiple literacy pathways that countered the
subordinated conditions of the literacy instruction offered to the students. The teachers developed clarity about their Spanish literacy instructional practices because they could see both sides of the river and were willing to transform their literacy pedagogy towards more inclusive, authentic, and holistic views. Also, the three border crossers in this study understood that the academic and linguistic success of their students resided very much in the quality of the relationships and interactions established with them, as well as how they viewed their students. They were able to understand their school’s purpose for having a dual language program at the heart of a predominantly *barrio Hispano*. I use the term *Hispano* since the community, school, and teachers used this term to refer to their students. Indeed, Vista del Sol elementary established an enrichment program, dual language that helped desegregate ethno-linguistic groups (New Mexican, Mexican, and other Latin Americans), implement equitable educational approaches for their students, and create an environment to include the voice of parents, community, teachers, and students. In keeping with the confidentiality I agreed to provide during this study, I use pseudonyms throughout the dissertation for names of teachers, students, administrators, staff members, the school, and the neighborhood. Although I introduce the teachers in greater depth in Chapter 3, a brief introduction is in order now. I also include myself in this introduction since during critical dialogues and classroom observations I was a participant as I interacted with the teachers and students in the study.

**Amanda**

“¡A mí facina el idioma español!” [The Spanish language fascinates me!] Amanda, an Anglo teacher, learned how to speak Spanish as an adult. Amanda learned Spanish through various courses and other activities, such as listening to the Spanish radio and watching
telenovelas [Mexican soap operas] to analyze this type of medium of communication.
Amanda’s major as an undergraduate was Bilingual Education/English as a Second
Language at the University of Santa Barbara in California where she learned about “funds of
knowledge” (Moll, Vélez-Ibáñez, Greenberg, & Rivera, 1990) and other important topics
(e.g., second language acquisition and methodology). She then attended graduate school at
the University of California-Los Angeles. After completing graduate school, she taught in the
Los Angeles Independent School district for three years. Amanda was married during these
three years and her husband was offered a job opportunity in New Mexico. Prior to moving
to New Mexico, Amanda had done research on schools in New Mexico and knew that Vista
del Sol had the tradition of a well-established, a highly regarded dual language program, and
so she applied for a position there. Amanda had the good fortune to be offered a position at
Vista del Sol elementary where she has been teaching for the last six years.

Marisol

Marisol, a Latina teacher, grew up speaking Spanish, having been born in
Barranquilla, Colombia. She first learned English in secondary school. She began her
teaching career seventeen years ago at the time of the study in Colombia as an English as a
second language teacher for adults. Marisol once mentioned how ironic it was that “in-
Colombia I taught English and in the United States I teach Spanish.” Most of Marisol’s
educational schooling was in private schools within a dual language immersion context.
Marisol received a Bachelor of Science in Colombia from the Jesuit Universidad de Bogotá-
Colombia. Soon after graduating, Marisol, her husband and their two children immigrated to
United States at the suggestion of her mother who had relocated to New Mexico. Marisol’s
mother knew about potential teaching positions in Albuquerque and suggested that Marisol
apply to a middle school for a position. Marisol attributed her ability to obtain the position to her experience of attending a dual language school in Colombia. As a middle school teacher, Marisol taught in the dual language strand provided for middle school students for three years. After teaching at the middle school, Marisol decided to apply at Vista del Sol Elementary, where she had been teaching for seven years as a third-grade dual language teacher, at the time of the study.

**Tracy**

Tracy is a New Mexican Anglo who attended high school in the district in which she taught. Tracy learned Spanish at the university level and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in *Literatura de Hispanoamérica* [Literature of Hispanic America]. She participated in a student exchange to Spain and spent a summer in Mexico and Honduras. After earning her bachelor’s degree, she joined the Peace Corps and went to Bolivia. Bolivia is where she further developed her Spanish. She shared that the language variety was very different in the small village of 400 people than the Spanish studied in college. Therefore, she had to learn the local Spanish dialect in order to better communicate with the village inhabitants. She was a Peace Corps agricultural volunteer while in Bolivia and worked with the local schools to further develop their agricultural harvest. It was at this point that Tracy learned she wanted to explore the teaching profession because she realized how much she enjoyed teaching children. Upon returning from the Peace Corps to New Mexico, Tracy co-taught as a kindergarten instructional assistant at Vista del Sol. While working there, Tracy pursued her teaching license and graduated with a Master’s in Education. She accepted the fifth-grade teaching position at Vista del Sol and had been teaching there for three years at the time of this study.
Susana

I grew up in a small border town named Eagle Pass, Texas adjacent to Piedras Negras, Coahuila, Mexico. Growing up, I was an agricultural farmworker and an emergent bilingual student, attending 15 different schools throughout my K-12 schooling experience that included the northwest, southwest, and pacific regions of the United States. I grew up bilingually at home and attended a bilingual school in the 1970’s. I earned my Bachelor of Science at the University of Texas at San Antonio in Kinesiology. Then, I earned my Master’s degree in the area of bilingual education at Texas A & M University in Kingsville, Texas. After graduate school, my husband and I moved abroad to Madagascar where I taught English as a second language as well as helped my husband coach the Madagascar national track and field team. Upon returning from living overseas, we lived and taught in Indio, California for one year and Riverside, California for three years, where I was a bilingual educator. Then we moved to New Mexico where I taught as a bilingual educator for four years. I then transitioned from the classroom into a district support teacher for culturally and linguistically diverse students for six years at the time of the study.

Un Barrio Hispano [A Hispanic Neighborhood]

Vista del Sol (VS) is in a neighborhood or barrio that is primarily Hispano (a native or resident of Spanish descent living in the southwestern United States), though there is a small percentage of Native Americans and Anglos in the community. I used the term Hispano throughout the research study to make reference to the parents, community, and student body of this neighborhood rather than distinguish them by ethnicity (Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican, etc.). In some instances, I did indicate the specific ethnicity in order to point out an important fact or detail.
Nestled in the heart of one of the city's oldest areas—right off the Historic Route 66—Vista del Sol (VS) Elementary is a ten minute walk from downtown and the cultural amenities the city has to offer (museums, theaters, restaurants). During the five months of the research, as I drove into the neighborhood from one of the main thoroughfares of the city, I noticed that the architecture on the east side of the street, which was the *Vista del Sol barrio* with a more southwestern Pueblo style and flat or pitched roof adobe homes was conspicuously different than the other side, which had old world, Spanish style European homes. Turning into one of the central streets of this *barrio Hispano*, I passed several murals that represent cultural and religious images done by local artists. The mural on the wall next to the barber shop had the image of the *Virgen de Guadalupe*, two stories high, with her arms wide open. Another was on the local corner store wall and had the image of a family walking along a path. Next to these images were the words *leche* [milk], *dulces* [candy], *pan y fruta* [bread and fruit] accompanied with a visual representation of these products and produce. This central street becomes a wide one-way street two blocks before arriving at the city’s zoo. Along this street are twelve 20 foot high light posts that hold small flags with the name of the city’s zoo; also draped from these posts are banners listing the current events being held by the local zoo and community. The flags had this year’s annual charitable run to benefit the local zoo race with date and time of the event and the image of a runner crossing the finish line. This street often reminds me of the thousands of runners that sprint past the finish line as they try to beat their personal best from the previous year. This annual foot race has always been well supported by the school, neighborhood, and community residents who provide water and cheers to those who run by their homes. Bordering this wide street, I passed by a variety of homes that were colorful and pleasant. For several centuries, this
neighborhood has been primarily the home of *Nuevo Mexicanos* (New Mexicans). Since the late 1980’s the neighborhood and school demographics have shifted from *Nuevo Mexicano* residents to an increase in Mexican and other Latinos from Latin American countries (Ortiz, 2010). On days when I stopped, I often heard Spanish spoken on the streets and in the stores, and there were many Spanish/English bilingual billboards advertising local cultural events. Even as I left school for the day, I heard students as they exited the school grounds shouting “*Vamos a tomar el* bus, hurry or we will miss it!”

**Vista Del Sol Elementary School**

Vista del Sol Elementary School serves children in grade pre-k through grade 5. The entrance to the school faces a baseball field and playground (across the street) that is maintained by the city’s parks and recreation department. Each morning I visited the school, the first thing I heard before stepping out of my car in the school parking lot were the zoo animals—often the chimpanzees and other apes; they sounded restless and eager for their morning feeding. It was also very common for me to see the streets filled with families as they walked their children to school. This sight of families walking their children to school happened every day regardless of weather conditions or any other circumstances. I frequently heard parents giving instructions to their children of where to meet after school and heard expressions such as ¡*Recuerden, siempre pórtate bien!*” (Remember, always behave yourself!)

Figure 1.1 at the end of this section shows the layout of the school grounds and some rooms in the main building. The entrance of the school was tiled with earth-tone colors and an arched doorway that stands about twenty feet high. The family room that was to the left of the entrance, and to the right is an enclosed empty space with one of the walls covered with a
mural of children reading, playing; the school mascot is placed at the center of the mural. To the right of the main building entrance is the hallway that leads to the upper grade (third – fifth grades) classrooms and the school nurse’s office. To the left is the school’s administration office with large windows that faced the hallway of the main entrance; the occupants of the office are always in view because of the glass windows instead of solid walls. Across from the main office is a bulletin board where announcements are posted (in English and Spanish) of upcoming trainings or classes such as adult English as a second language (ESL) classes. There are more announcements on the door as well as other notifications for health fairs, tutoring, and child care. Also, posted on this bulletin board is the school’s mission statement that reads:

The Vista del Sol Dual Language Bilingual School mission is to produce bilingual, biliterate students through the implementation of a systematic, effective balanced biliteracy program Pre-K through 5th grade. Providing competent, knowledgeable and well-trained staff at every grade level and involving parents, the students will have a learning environment in which every student can be successful academically, emotionally, and socially.  — Mission statement from a school brochure (Vista del Sol Elementary, 2010)

Other posted information included future events of the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) events. The bulletin board was also used to network as parents often posted messages that offered child care or cleaning services. Teachers posted their informational flyers (written in English and Spanish) that offered after school activities such as running, soccer, dance, and tutoring for reading and writing.
The staff lounge was next to the school office. On any given day, I passed the staff lounge and often saw teachers talking about their school day or enjoying their lunch. On one occasion as I ate lunch in the lounge with the principal and instructional coach, we talked about the amount of testing going on. It was here that the instructional coach reported on the number of weeks that the students were tested in the spring semester: 10 weeks in all. The lounge was also used to teach Kids Cook, a bi-weekly class that taught students how to cook. I always knew when Kids Cook was taking place because of the rich aromas that permeated the hallway.

Walking out of the main building of the school, I faced six portable buildings that were utilized primarily for the support teachers, such as the reading specialists. These portables were adjacent to the neighborhood homes. The chain-link gate that connects the neighborhood to the school was often left opened so that students, family members, and other community members could come in and out of the school. The chain-link gate was rarely locked up with a padlock, with exception of the summer months when the students were on summer break. Next to this gate is a patch of dirt, with twigs and other decomposed vegetable remains of what looked to be a vegetable garden. I was told by one of the kindergarten teachers that the garden is replanted each spring and maintained by the staff and students of the school.

In preceding sections, I described the setting of this study, describing the neighborhood and school. I provided a portrait of the broader context and will later describe the specific teaching and learning environments of the dual language teachers. The connection to the community and families is an essential part of this barrio’s dual language elementary school. The connectedness to their immediate surroundings, the barrio, is the
source of their life-ways, knowledge, and vitality. The teachers, as border crossers, are fully aware of the social and physical contexts of Vista del Sol. This contextual background is the backdrop of the detailed discussion of the views of the DL teachers in their Spanish literacy instructional practice, their students, and literacy views.

I purposely selected a school that is known to serve a diverse community in a positive light. I had the honor of working with Vista del Sol as a district support teacher for a year prior to my research and found through experience that the school staff as a whole had positive attitudes and beliefs about their student body—an asset, as I have described in Chapters 4 and 5. As it happens, there is a research gap of what and how dual language teachers teach Spanish literacy to their upper grade students (3rd – 5th grade). This being the case, I pursued the possibility of collecting data from the three teachers of Vista del Sol in order to learn more about how a positive outlook affects the teaching and learning cycle, rather than focusing in a school that perceives their students, school, and community from a deficit viewpoint.

![Figure 1.1 School Map](image-url)
Statement of the Problem

Approaching my research through a critical inquiry theoretical framework, which will be fully explained in Chapter 2, was vital since the examination of dual language education needs to be further explored in regards to Spanish literacy pedagogy, especially in light of the many monolingual educational policies in the U.S. The study that has resulted in this dissertation came out of the necessity to problematize the Spanish literacy instructional practices and teachers views influencing dual language education in three elementary classrooms.

I hope to demonstrate that teachers’ view of the students and Spanish literacy instructional practices have been overlooked and can directly influence the quality of education that is being afforded to students in dual language programs, and in turn, influence the enacted Spanish literacy practices. Furthermore, this study examined the influence that critical dialogue had on interrogating the Spanish pedagogy of literacy explored and actualized by the teachers. Specifically, this study examined the instructional dynamics, that is, the interactions between the teacher, students, and texts within a dual language context and how these variables intersect with Spanish literacy. For example, the instructional dynamic is what happens in the classroom during the guided reading lesson with the teacher and a small group of students using a chapter book to read while addressing literacy mediated through the Spanish language. Finally, even though biliteracy is an integral goal in dual language education to gain two world views and literacy codes, I argue that biliteracy itself is not sufficient, and that, as literacy educators, we must teach towards a more holistic literacy education that includes multicultural literacy and critical literacy. This perspective on
bilingual entails, as Freire puts it, “each individual winning back the right to say his or her own word, to name the world” (1974, p. 33).

The overarching problem that this research focused on was to learn the Spanish literacy instructional practices of the teachers and the beliefs from which those practices emerged. We just do not know enough about Spanish literacy in dual language upper elementary classrooms.

**Research Questions**

The essential question that guided this research study was: What are the Spanish literacy instructional practices of three dual language teachers?

The following sub-questions guided me toward addressing the main question:

1. How do these teachers view their students?
2. What are their expressed literacy ideologies for Spanish literacy instructional practices?
3. How does critical dialogue affect their literacy ideologies and practices?

**Significance of the Study**

The main area of focus will be Spanish literacy instruction in the upper grades (3rd – 5th grade). Dual language education (DLE) strives to develop biliterate students throughout the K-12 educational trajectory. For some students, dual language education may end at fifth grade either, because parents choose another educational option or the opportunity to continue in a dual language strand (K-12) may not be available. Fortunately, at Vista del Sol a dual language education strand exists in which most of the fifth graders move on to middle and high school in dual language programs. At the completion of this DL strand, when they graduate from high school, the students are given a bilingual seal. As a researcher, it was
imperative to document the Spanish literacy practices of three teachers in depth at the upper grades of elementary, in order that they might better serve students for the remainder of the students’ biliteracy educational trajectory (6th – 12th grade). In this regard, it was imperative to document the teachers’ views of their students and literacy views that influenced their teaching and learning.

As a bilingual and biliterate individual, I have the capacity to read in English and in Spanish. Being able to read and write in Spanish throughout the years has kept me connected to my cultural and linguistic heritage. But most importantly, it has allowed me to be an active participant in the education of other native Spanish-speaking students and teachers in my community. Furthermore, learning to read and write Spanish enriches our own lives and those around us.

Definitions

The definitions are clustered by theme as presented in the proceeding chapters.

*Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices* include the teachers’ planning, collaboration with colleagues, and delivery of instruction in Spanish that focused on the students’ educational success.

*Dual language education* is an enrichment program that uses two or more languages as a medium of instruction for content area studies and literacy and language development.

*Maintenance program* is an additive form of schooling since students are using their native language to communicate and learn while developing a second language to better understand the content areas.
Transitional program is a subtractive form of schooling since students are allowed to use their native language as a strategy to better understand the second language, gradually moving the student to a predominantly English classroom.

Barrio dual language school is a community of learners reflecting the rich and diverse Hispano, Latino/a, and Chicano culture, language, and knowledge integrated into instruction.

Spanish literacy to biliteracy continuum is a literacy development band that often begins with a minority language, such as Spanish, and continues by adding the majority language, which is English in the U.S. The student’s movement on the continuum is dynamic in that it moves fluidly from one end of the continuum to the other in order to make sense of a text.

Biliteracy is the holistic, interdependent practice of listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiencies from two linguistic and cultural systems to make meaning (Connery, 2011; Reyes & Halcón, 2001; Goodman, Goodman, & Flores, 1979). In my research, I also use the term multilingual literacy interchangeably with biliteracy in order encourage the development of proficiency in more than two literacies and cultures.

Biliteracy Seal is awarded to students that complete their K-12 schooling within a bilingual education context.

View is the underlying ideological orientations that influence a teacher’s beliefs and attitudes about subject matter, teaching, learning, and students (Bartolomé, 2008; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Giroux, 1983; Nieto, 2003).

Literacy ideologies are the views used in the teaching of reading and writing to students.
Ideological elements are the dominant beliefs and attitudes that influence educational policy and permeate into curriculum, instruction, and assessment of all students.

Native-like competence is a level of language proficiency reached by a second language learner that is equivalent to that of a native speaker of that language.

Simultaneous bilingual is a child who uses two languages to communicate with family and community and to learn at school (Escamilla, 2012; García & Kleifgen, 2010; Valdés, 1994).

Sequential bilingual is a child who learns to communicate with family and community in one language first, then, upon entering the school, learns a second language (Escamilla, 2012; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010; Valdés, 1994).

One-size-fits-all is an approach by educational publishers to create texts and lesson guides that prescribe a progression of curriculum for one set of students, usually from the middle-class socioeconomic status. The expectation is that all students learn the same way with the same materials, regardless of their cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic status (Commins, 2010; Reyes & Halcón, 2001; Grant & Wong, 2003).

Conceptual tools are a research method that supports the theoretical bases of the study through the use of metaphorical models.

A culture circle is a discussion that brings forth specific themes that individuals experience in certain circumstances in their lives. These themes are then examined by noting the vocabulary that represents the pragmatic use and phonetic complexity of the word. This creates generative words that are derived from the students’ vocabulary and have existential meaning to them. This process allows students to become the “Subject” of their literacy learning. For example, in Mexico the following palabra generadoras (generative words)
were created by the Secretaria de la Educación Publica (SEP) used for their adult literacy campaign: Mexico, *cantina* (bar), *piñata, vacuna* (inoculation) *trabajo* (work), *familia* (family) (Freire, 1974).

*Codification* is a process that presents a problem-posing situation to be viewed by the student in form of a picture, video, audio recording, or a slide show (Freire, 1974).

*Decodification* is an extensive analysis (dialogue) of the situation being represented by the image (codification) that in turn provides students with an opportunity to develop a critical consciousness of the situation represented by the code (Freire, 1974).

*Critical consciousness* is the observation of “things and facts as they exist empirically, in their causal and circumstantial correlations” (Freire, 1974, p. 39) to the reality being addressed.

*Dialogue* is the process in culture circles that attempts “through group debate either to clarify situations or seek action arising from that clarification” (Friere, 1974, p. 38), becoming both the object of the teacher-learner dialogue and the context for teaching and learning.

*Dual language pedagogy* is the ongoing examination of teachers’ views, approaches, challenges, and strategies being implemented in their classroom during Spanish literacy instruction in a dual language context.

*Pedagogical clarity* is the increased consciousness that teachers have of their own practice. This consciousness becomes a frame of mind from which they draw as they reflect upon their practice and make decisions about what to enact with their students.
Organizational Structure

The organizational structure of this dissertation is not typical in that I use portraiture to describe the context and metaphors to explain my analysis and findings. I will describe briefly what happens in each chapter.

Chapter 1: Introduction provides the background information of the teachers, setting, and research study. It begins with a description of the teachers’ personal and educational experiences. This is followed by a detailed description of the context in which the teachers taught, including neighborhood, school, and classrooms. Finally, there is an explanation of the research study problem, questions, significance, and definitions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review provides the scholarly background for the present study. It begins with a description of how I positioned my dissertation within a critical inquiry model, showing how the selected literature from fields of critical pedagogy, ideological clarity, and critical literacy informed my theoretical framework. A critical inquiry model grounds the study not only in critical pedagogy theory, but also highlights the significant role of teachers examining how they view students and their Spanish literacy practice.

Chapter 3: Methods details how the study was conducted. It defines qualitative case study and demonstrates why it is the most appropriate methodology for examining the teachers’ Spanish literacy instructional practices. Additionally, in this chapter, I describe in detail the participants (teacher and students) and the setting (the classroom of each teacher). Furthermore, Chapter 3 outlines the chronology of the study and I explain comparative analysis and how it was used as a research tool for this study.
Chapter 4: Analysis and Findings provides a description of the analysis of interviews and classroom observations. Additionally, Chapter 4 is an analysis of interviews and classroom observations that supported the findings of the teachers’ views of students, their Spanish literacy instructional practices, and literacy views. The metaphors used in this chapter are essentially the main findings (categories) from the data expressed as metaphors.

Chapter 5: Facets of Dual Language Pedagogy provides a description of the analysis of the critical dialogues and collaborations. Moreover, Chapter 5 encompasses an analysis of the critical dialogues that substantiated the teachers’ expressed and enacted literacy views during the teaching and learning of Spanish literacy in a dual language context. The agricultural metaphor (Santa Ana, 2002) constellation was used as a framework describing the teachers’ dual language pedagogy.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Implications extended the study into the area of applications and implications. Given what has been argued about developing political and ideological clarity in education, the application of these terms helped generate the idea of pedagogical clarity in the teachers’ dual language pedagogy. This specifically outlines a continua that articulates pedagogical clarity depicting how the teachers negotiated their teaching and learning practices. In this chapter I provide the most salient conclusions and insights that the teachers developed through our critical dialogues and collaborations. I offer some ideas of how to develop more holistic and organic literacy practices drawing from the DL teachers’ Spanish literacy practices.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

This research explains how three dual language teachers changed their knowledge and skills of learned approaches and methods of their teaching and learning cycle by placing the students’ cultural, historical, critical, and socio-academic knowledge and skills at the center of their Spanish literacy education—cultivating holistic literacy pedagogy.

In the literature review that follows, I will further elaborate key terms and contextualize the major theoretical constructs selected from a vast quantity of scholars that supported my research study. The main sections to follow are: Critical Inquiry, Dual Language Education, Literacy Ideologies, Views, and Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices as they have been and are currently understood within the field of dual language education.

To date, there are 900 dual language programs in forty-six states in the U.S. (Eaton, 2012), an enormous increase from the thirty-five dual language programs reported by the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1990. These dual language programs have been established mainly due to the interests of a diverse population of bilingual students, families, teachers, and community activists (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Ovando, Combs, & Collier, 2006) wanting to maintain their home languages and cultures. A succession of court cases has further supported and upheld their commitments to bilingual education and maintenance of home languages and cultures (Bilingual Education Act 1968; 1968 East Los Angeles Chicano Walk-outs; Castañoeda vs. Pickard of 1981; & LULAC-GI FORUM v. STATE OF TEXAS 2008) (Valencia, 1991). The literature in the field of dual language programs is growing; however, limited knowledge is available about the Spanish literacy to biliteracy continuum, literacy ideologies, and Spanish literacy practices employed in dual language education. In
the age of standards-based education, dual language educators must be aware of the literacy ideologies (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004) and practices implemented in their classrooms. It is particularly urgent for teachers to develop the ability to critically analyze the texts from which they teach, how they view their students, and how they teach (Bartolomé, 2008). For example, the tendency in teaching Spanish literacy is to take a reading program and translate it to Spanish, since both languages are viewed as alphabetic and Latin-based, for the most part. Spanish and English draw from various language bases, i.e. English is a primarily Germanic language and Spanish is Romance language, with Spanish being a more transparent language, while English a more opaque language (Birch, 2007). Also, the societal status of Spanish is viewed as lesser than English within a United States context (Escamilla, 2000). Thus, these factors influence how dual language teachers view Spanish and enact it in their classroom context.

**Critical Inquiry**

Positioning this dissertation within a critical inquiry overarching framework can offer a better understanding of the humanistic issues and literacy ideologies that teachers encounter in their Spanish literacy instructional practices within a dual language context. In this study, I will use critical pedagogy, ideological clarity, and critical literacy to define the critical inquiry framework I am using to frame the literature in this study.

**Critical pedagogy.**

According to Kincheloe (2004), an important aspect of critical pedagogy is to “understand that every dimension of schooling and every form of educational practice are politically contested spaces” (p. 2), thus recognizing that teaching is political. For example, the fact that teachers make decisions about teaching a certain science curriculum
(Creationism versus Darwinism) or literacy program means taking a political stance.

Consequently, in critical pedagogy, educators need to recognize how race/ethnicity, class, and gender function in educational practices (Kinchenoe, 2004) for equity in the classroom. Furthermore, “critical pedagogy is primarily concerned with the kinds of educational theories and practices that encourage both students and teachers to develop an understanding of the interconnecting relationship among ideology, power, and culture” (Leistyna et al., 1996, p. 3). Therefore, from this perspective, teachers must know the educational theory informing the literacy programs they are using in their classrooms in order to develop more sound literacy practices for their students.

Giroux (2001) suggests that “the hidden curriculum is those unstated norms, values, and beliefs embedded in and transmitted to students through the underlying rules that structure the routines and social relationships in school and classroom life” (p. 47).

Moreover, Giroux (2001) states that “the hidden curriculum functions not simply as a vehicle of socialization but also as an agency of social control, one that functions to provide differential forms of schooling to different classes of students” (p. 47). The current hidden curriculum in our schools is for federal and state education agencies to gain control through Standards-Based Assessments (SBA), by categorizing students according to race/ethnicity, class, and language, and establishing proficiency levels that determine the educational achievement gap, all enacted by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (Spring, 2001). That is, the educational control happens by using supposedly “research-based” literacy programs that continue to emphasize the technical or surface skills aspects of reading rather than reading for comprehension and analyzing the text in a critical way. Further, these “research-based” reading programs, as discussed in the National Reading Panel (August & Shanahan,
include a preponderance of research on special education programs and students and none focusing on English language learners. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (2002) has changed bilingual education to a “vehicle of socialization” (García, 2008) and social control by emphasizing the learning of English as a priority and the preservation of the home languages only secondary, even though former U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley established Title VII funding and program priorities for dual language education (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Also, because of the influence on education policies that grew from NCLB, many schools and districts with high numbers of English Language Learners (ELLs) are being asked to teach more English due to the Standards-Based Assessment (SBA) requirement that a student who has been in the United States school system for three consecutive years must take the English version SBA.

The hidden curriculum has three approaches; these are: traditional, liberal, and radical (Giroux, 2001). The traditional approach functions as a vehicle of “transmission and reproduction of dominant values and accepted as a positive function of the schooling process” (Giroux, 2001, p. 48). Students are “defined in reductionist behaviorist terms, and learning is reduced to the transmission of predefined knowledge” (p. 49). A prime example of predefined knowledge is NCLB’s premier reading initiative, “Reading First,” which provides funding for schools that adopt “scientifically based” reading programs for grade levels first through third; these publisher programs are to be followed with fidelity. The latest report from the U.S. Department of Education and Sciences (2006) has shown that students in many Reading First programs have done well in phonics skills, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and oral language, but poorly in comprehension.

The liberal approach:
Rejects most top-to-bottom models of pedagogy, with their conservative view of knowledge as something to be learned rather than critically engaged, as well as their equally uncritical notion of socialization, in which students are viewed simply as passive role-bearers and recipients of knowledge. (Giroux, 2001, p. 50)

Giroux offers an example that high school teachers differentiate instruction according to the social class and, no doubt, the racial identity of the students involved in these classrooms. He notes that the perception of the teachers classifies middle-class students as having higher expectations of learning than the working class students (Giroux, 2001). A characteristic of the liberal approach is the teacher’s negative or positive assumptions often brought into the classroom in regard to their students. And since some students are viewed as “passive role-bearers” (Giroux, 2001), often they are labeled as a certain type of student learner, and teachers teach them accordingly to the teachers’ preconceived assumptions. For example, the working class students are taught rote and structured lessons while the middle-class students are offered more critical and challenging projects (Giroux, 2001).

Third, the radical approach:

argues that the social relations of the school and classroom roughly mirror the social relations of the workplace, the final outcome being the reproduction of the social and class divisions needed for the production and legitimating of capital and its institutions. (Giroux, 2001, p. 57)

I view this approach as a tracking device for students to be placed in certain vocations that are recommended by the school and society. As Giroux (2001) indicates, “schools became factories for the working class, and, it was alleged, performed an insidious but efficient job of reproducing the existing class structure and labor force” (p. 57).
After reviewing the three hidden curriculum approaches, the need to learn how to interrogate and challenge these views becomes critical so that teachers in dual language classrooms have a better understanding of the educational opportunities they promote or demote in their teaching and learning.

**Ideological clarity.**

To better explain how ideology plays a role in Spanish literacy, think of Michelangelo’s painting of the Sistene Chapel. The overall impression of the painting is the hidden curriculum and the individual brush strokes, paint, light and color that contribute to the impression you get are the different ideological views. The problem is that too often the hidden curriculum is what we walk away remembering, and yet to understand the painting or Spanish literacy learning for that matter, you must see the brush strokes created by ideology. Bartolomé (2000) states that ideology “refers to the framework of thought that is used by members of a society to justify or rationalize an existing social (dis)order” (p. 168). Ideology is a social construction of knowledge that is created by special interest groups that influence the schooling system, for example. Part of normalizing a set ideological view such as standards-based education is to influence educators into believing that this ideology is a set norm in our society, although it promotes disorder in our educational system.

Escamilla’s research asserts that there is a lack of teacher preparation in reading methods for Spanish texts. Secondly, she states (2000) that after becoming certified, teachers continue to learn how to teach reading in Spanish by learning about English literacy methods through local school district in-service programs. Essentially, the ideology into which teachers are enculturated is a translated pedagogy with roots in the teaching and learning of
English, rather than in Spanish language and culture. One focus of this research is the depth and consciousness of teachers’ ideology, formed by the teachers themselves.

Escamilla (2000) refers to a training of “Phonics They Use: Words for Reading and Writing” (Cunningham, 2000) where teachers questioned the appropriateness of applying these reading concepts to Spanish literacy. The trainer’s response was that it could transfer from English to Spanish. The article continues with addressing the differences between Spanish and English phonics. She suggests that dual language educators are not taught (in some universities) how to teach Spanish literacy during their undergraduate studies, and many, after becoming bilingual/dual language teachers are expected to adapt English reading methodology to Spanish in their dual language classrooms. In essence, this practice draws from an “English Only” ideological position that Macedo (2000) asserts “points to a pedagogy of exclusion that views learning English as the sum total of education itself for linguistic-minority students” (p. 22). Macedo goes on to propose that the attempt to institute proper and effective methods of educating linguistic-minority students cannot be minimized simply to issues of language rather than understanding of the ideological elements. There are many ideological elements that need to be examined in Spanish literacy education. All of them seem to be rooted in what Macedo suggests as a “colonialism” ideology that “imposes ‘distinction’ as an ideological yardstick against which all other cultural values are measured, including language” (2000, p. 23). Moreover, this ideology equates the success of a dual education program to how well the students in the program acquire English. The dual language teachers in this study, through critical dialogue, examined their practice through a critical pedagogy lens in order to challenge the dominant ideology that existed in their classroom, school, and district. Juxtaposing their Spanish literacy instructional practices to
the literacy ideologies represented moving the teachers towards *ideological clarity*, as coined by Bartolomé (2008).

Ideological clarity requires that teachers’ individual explanations be compared and contrasted with those propagated by the dominant society. It is to be hoped that the juxtaposing of ideologies forces teachers to better understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and support unfair and inequitable conditions, the process by which individuals struggle to identify both the dominant society’s explanations for the existing societal socioeconomic and political hierarchy, as well as their own explanation of the social order and any resulting inequalities. (p. 168)

Thus, the theoretical concepts and practices presented by critical pedagogy were selected out of the work of the many scholars in this field because of their focus on developing a more transformative dual language education pedagogy.

**Critical literacy.**

Paulo Freire’s contributions to critical literacy offer a liberating type of teaching through problem-posing education. The problem-posing principle asserts the following:

…people develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation. (1974, p. 83)

This transformative process can be recognized in many Latin American countries and Mexico in their use of *palabra generadora* (generative word/theme) a literacy approach based on critical literacy principles such as culture circles, codification, decodification, critical consciousness and dialogue. This process begins with culture circles that attempt,
through group discussions, either to clarify situations or seek action arising from that clarification. These discussions bring forth specific themes (codes) that individuals experience in certain circumstances in their lives. These themes are then examined by noting the vocabulary that represents the pragmatic use and phonetic complexity of the word (Freire, 1974). This creates generative words that are derived from the students’ vocabulary and have existential meaning to them. The purpose of codification is to represent a problem-posing situation in the form of a picture, video, audio recording, or a slide show to be viewed by the students. Decodification is an extensive analysis (dialogue) of the situation being represented by the image that in turn provides students with an opportunity to develop a critical consciousness of the situation represented by the code. A critical consciousness interrogates “things and facts as they exist empirically, in their causal and circumstantial correlations” (1974, p. 39) and compares them to the reality being addressed. Only when students have a critical understanding of the reality being viewed and discussed extensively can the teacher then begin with introducing the phonemic families represented in the generative word.

Using metaphors is a fruitful means to clarify critical literacy. Freire (1970) used the empty vessel metaphor as a banking model of education—a system in which teachers deposited information into the heads of students, but students were required to return it in the same form as it was issued. The use of metaphors deemed appropriate in my research since I wanted to capture the essence of the teachers’ views and practice. Specifically, I have drawn from Santa Ana’s (2002) research, influenced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and focused on the contemporary American public discourse concerning education to identify how the teachers perceive themselves as educators and how this influences their literacy practices. Metaphors are emerging as a powerful tool for interrogating, consistent with Freire’s work.
Santa Ana (2002) has found two main metaphoric themes that are portrayed in American public discourse towards teaching: these are “Factory” and “Empty Vessel” metaphors. Santa Ana’s groundbreaking research on the study of educational metaphors brings to light the underlying meanings of metaphors in the public sector. The factory metaphor implies that teachers view themselves as mere technicians that take standard materials (students) in order to produce a standard product, rejecting any nonstandard materials in their production (education). The empty vessel metaphor assumes that the students need to get filled with knowledge since their background knowledge has no worth in school, thus needing to get filled with the standard knowledge. Furthermore, Santa Ana (2010) named two counter educational metaphors that best represent bilingual education that I integrated into my analysis and findings; these are “Education as Cultivation” and “Education as Construction.” In the Education as Cultivation metaphor, the teacher is seen as a cultivator who knows the science of her practice and at the same time is able to create a nurturing teaching environment integrating the students’ everyday knowledge with schooled knowledge. In Education as Construction, the teacher is viewed as an architect. The teacher designs a learning environment and, together with students, they co-construct new knowledge, new skills, and sense-making strategies when reading texts. In my study, these educational metaphors were useful conceptual tools to describe how the teacher viewed her teaching and the approaches used during Spanish literacy practices.

One review of research on the definition of critical literacy was completed by Lewison, Flint, and Van Sluys (2002). They synthesized this information into four dimensions of critical literacy; literacy may be involved in: “(1) disrupting the commonplace, (2) interrogating multiple view points, (3) focusing on sociopolitical issues, and (4) taking
action and promoting social justice” (2002, p. 382). In order to disrupt the commonplace, one has to take the typical school day, leading educational theories, and belief systems used in the school day and critically examines them by questioning the ordinary (Lewison, Flint, and Van Sluys, 2002). The teachers in this study were asked to disrupt the commonplace by critically viewing the different literacy texts and ideologies within texts. They also realized, at the end of our last critical dialogue, that one can pick any book and be able to “disrupt” by asking such questions as: From what perspective is this book written? Who is not represented in the book? What information is missing from the text? The goal of these questions is to cultivate more equitable literacy practices. Other critical literacy scholars will be discussed below under the heading of Literacy Ideologies: Critical Literacy.

**Dual Language Education**

In 1968, the Bilingual Education Act (Valencia, 1991), also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act, provided federal funds for schools implementing bilingual education to linguistic-minority students (Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans) (García, 2008). Throughout the United States, many forms of bilingual education were developed, including maintenance and transitional programs. Some dual language (DL) programs are classified as enrichment, with the primary focus of the continual employment of two languages, biliteracy, and multicultural education through the students’ social, cultural, and linguistic identities. For example, Coral Way Elementary School in Dade County Florida, (School Choice and Parental Options, 2013) established in 1963, is recognized as the first dual one-way immersion (only linguistic-minority students) program primarily serving Cuban refugees wanting to maintain their mother tongue, Spanish. Another pioneer of dual language programs is the one at Oyster Bilingual School in Washington D.C., established in
1971 to provide students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds the opportunity to become bilingual (Spanish/English) through a multicultural perspective.

As a primary schooling tool for developing two or more languages, the field of dual language education and its teachers have the task of educating students in various content fields within a 50/50 model or 90/10 model. Further, dual language programs provide an opportunity for linguistic-minority and linguistic-majority students to learn from each other’s language, culture, and literacy. To do this, the language distribution itself can be structured in various ways, either in a 50/50 model or a 90/10 model. In a 50/50 model, time distribution can be half of the day in Spanish, and the other half of the day in English. Other 50/50 models may implement by alternating the language by day, week, or thematic unit. A 90/10 model begins with 90 percent of the school day in the linguistic-minority language in kindergarten and 10 percent in linguistic-majority language. The language distribution decreases by 10 percent each year, ending in a 50/50 model in fifth grade.

The success of Dual Language Immersion programs has been extensively documented (Calderon and Minaya-Rowe, 2003; Estrada, Gomez, and Escalante-Ruiz, 2009; Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri, 2005; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Potowski, 2007; Soltero, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2002, 2009). The academic research has determined that students learning through a dual language model perform academically at or above grade-level standards and are linguistically and culturally proficient in two or more languages. For example, the Collier and Thomas (2009) longitudinal research from 1985 to the present of 6.2 million student records of students with no proficiency in English and low socioeconomic status finds that out of the seven program types (90:10 dual language education (DLE), 50:50 DLE, maintenance bilingual education, structured English immersion, English as a second
language content, and transitional bilingual education), dual language programs better prepare students for the academic rigor expected beyond elementary grade levels. A wide range of information has been written about dual language programs being instrumental in closing the academic achievement gap and fostering high English proficiency levels. However, much more needs to be explored in the Spanish language and literacy development of students in dual language programs (Potowski, 2007; Soltero, 2004). Despite the enormous literature on dual language education, it would not be an unfair generalization to assert that we do not know enough about the Spanish literacy practices employed by dual language teachers, especially in the upper grades, and this remains very much a field to be studied (Escamilla, 2000; Escamilla, Ruiz-Figueroa, Hopewell, Butvilofsky, & Sparrow, 2010).

García (2008) believes that dual language pedagogy (DLP) “build[s] on the children’s collaborative spirit to learn, play and imagine, and in so doing,… it integrates the children’s bilingual practices and their attitudes toward their own bilingualism…” (p. 50). Garcia’s work is important because it doesn’t limit the learning of language to an achievement score. Indeed, students in dual language programs have differing backgrounds and strengths not easily captured in a score.

**Dual Language Education: Language users & learners.** In the dual language classrooms described in this study, the students were emergent bilinguals, dynamic bilinguals, recursive bilinguals, and dual language learners. Emergent bilinguals are defined by García and Kleifgen (2010) as English language learners (ELL) that “through school and through acquiring English, these children become bilingual, able to continue to function in their home language as well as in English—their new language and that of school” (p. 2). While, from a dynamic bilingual perspective, “languages are not seen as autonomous systems
that people ‘have,’ but rather as practices that people ‘use,’” (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 42) in their home and community language practices. Recursive bilinguals are students who have experienced language loss and who did not begin as monolinguals; rather, “they recover bits and pieces of their existing ancestral language practices as they develop a bilingualism that continuously reaches back in order to move forward” (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 42-43) in using and learning both languages. Lastly, a dual language learner is a monolingual English speaking student attending a dual language program in order to become bilingual.

Although I have used multiple labels to name the students involved in the dual language classrooms I observed, this was done mainly to describe the diversity of learners and users of language and literacy involved in this dual language classroom. The learners are learning a second language in a sequential pattern while the users have obtained an oral communication of both English and Spanish, thus making them more users of the first and second language used for school literacy by means of translanguaging practices (Garcia, Kleifgen, & Flachi, 2008; García, 2008; Valdés, Capitelli, & Alvarez, 2011). Translanguage is, “hybrid language use that is part of a sense-making process,” (García & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 140) including code-switching, translating, and processing information in one language and then in another. In the chapters that follow, I refer to all students mentioned simply as students because, although all these types of learners are present, the focus of the study is the teachers and their teaching.

**Dual Language Education: Teachers’ native-like competence.** In recent discussions of teachers’ Spanish language proficiency, a controversial aspect has been that teachers have not acquired the native-like academic Spanish needed to teach in the bilingual context. On the one hand, some argue that if a teacher does not speak and write with native-
like competence, they need more Spanish language practice before teaching (Guerrero, 2000, 2002, 2003). On the other hand, some argue that if the teacher is learning Spanish as a second language, then she should not be expected to reach a native-like competence since only five percent of second language learners achieve native-like competence (Valdés, 2011). Neither of these arguments, however, considers the alternative view that most teachers used and learned Spanish and English in their home and community as was the case for most of the dual language teachers at Vista del Sol. The prerequisite for obtaining native-like competence in both Spanish or English, whether learned sequentially or simultaneously (Escamilla, 2012) should not be an obstacle to any dual language teacher. However, Guerrero (2003) has argued that in order for bilingual educators to improve their academic-Spanish language development, they must be provided ample educational opportunities to do so. Instead, dual language teachers such as Tracy and Amanda continue to improve their Spanish language and literacy competence inside and outside the classroom, moving along a bilingual continuum that takes into consideration their dynamic bilingualism (García & Kleifgen, 2010) as an asset and not a deficit.

**Dual Language Education: Border crossers.** Although much progress has been made in bilingual education through the implementation of dual language programs throughout United States, much more has to be examined. Valdés (1997) cautions the bilingual education community by asserting that while DL programs look promising, we must continuously advocate for equal power status of the language-minority students involved in these programs. Maria, an educator, acknowledged in Valdés’ (1997) research, courageously speaks out in a community meeting addressing the concept of dual language programs. She states the following: “*Si se aprovechan de nosotros en ingles, van*
“aprovecharse de nosotros en español” [If they take advantage of us in English, they will take advantage of us in Spanish] (Valdés, 1997, p. 393). The issue with María is not the bilingual education approach but the “intergroup relations and the place of the powerful and the powerless in the wider society” (Valdés, 1997, p. 393). Valdés’ (1997) concerns have to be taken seriously by all teachers involved in dual language programs in order to promote a social justice educational approach, rather than solely focusing on the economic benefits of DL programs.

Dual language education in the twenty-first century, therefore, needs to include and promote a social justice educational approach through the efforts and example of border crossers.

Bartolomé (2002) coined the term cultural border crosser as:

an individual who is able and willing to develop empathy with the cultural ‘other’ and to authentically view as equal the values of the ‘other’ while conscious of the cultural group’s subordinated social status in the greater society. Border crossers are persons who will critically consider the positive cultural traits of the ‘other’ and, at the same time, are able to critique the discriminatory practices of their culture that may be involved in the creation of the cultural ‘other’ in the first place. In other words, a border crosser, while embracing the cultural ‘other’ must also divest from his/her cultural privilege that often functions as a cultural border itself” (p. 189).

The teachers in this study were conscious of the diversity of students in their classroom both culturally and linguistically. Thus, elevating the students’ culture and Spanish language status at Vista del Sol was a commitment made by all teachers. The teachers’ critical consciousness, cultivating spirit, and dedication towards dual language education
demonstrated their border crossing or *profesionalismo* (professionalism). This border-crossing attitude was also expected from the students as well. At Vista del Sol, practicing a classroom culture that promoted students as equal “Subjects” (a person who acts upon and transforms his world) (Freire, 1970) rather than “objects” or “others” was the prevailing praxis for teachers, students, and parents.

Ultimately, as dual language educators we must advocate for students to be border crossers, as Sercombe, principal of The Amigos School at Cambridge, Massachusetts (Eaton, 2012) expressed as one major goal of dual language education. She explains that we must teach students to “…cross over into different cultures, using language as a tool for fostering friendship and working relationships across cultures and ultimately for playing a role in sustaining a peaceful, pluralistic society” (p. 4). Elevating the status of the Spanish language and the non-dominant cultures brought into the dual language classroom were embraced by the teachers in this study while constantly recognizing their “privilege,” thus moving them towards a more critical consciousness of their practice. Considering one’s practice means understanding the literacy ideologies upon which it rests.

**Literacy Ideologies**

Cadieró-Kaplan (2004) and Bartolomé (2004) believe that by naming the literacy ideologies guiding the practice of educators, they can then determine if their literacy pedagogical approaches provide an equitable education for all students. These literacy ideologies provided common knowledge from which to draw during the VS critical dialogues.
Cadiero-Kaplan (2004) outlines four literacy ideologies influencing bilingual education in literacy curriculum and pedagogy; these are functional, cultural, progressive, and critical literacy. I will provide a brief description of the four literacy ideologies.

**Literacy Ideologies: Functional literacy.** Functional literacy ideologies teach students certain skills that will enable them to become part of the workforce and society with the specified literacy skills needed to operate in this societal context (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). Functional literacy utilizes basal readers that are accompanied by phonics, vocabulary building, and test strategy skills practice booklets. In addition, each reading selection in the basal reader has specific reading comprehension questions that require the student to have a specific reply rather than more open-ended questions for reflection. The discourse developed by many of the major Spanish publishers in United States, in order to make “itself legitimate by promoting beliefs and values congenial to it” (Eagleton, 1991, p. 5-6), is the Anglocentric functional literacy view that dominates in Spanish basal readers. The development of Spanish instructional resources have focused primarily on early literacy through a functional literacy ideology (e.g., *Estrellita, Cancionero, and Días y Días de Poesía*). Core reading programs such as *Villa Cuentos* (Story Town) (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011), the program adopted by Vista del Sol, focuses on kindergarten through fifth grade reading textbooks that address the reading components of fluency, oral language, phonics, comprehension, and vocabulary so as to conform to the state requirements of “No Child Left Behind.”

There are several pedagogical problems with using a core reading program originally developed for English literacy. For example, after attending a presentation about Houghton Mifflin/Harcourt School Publishers’ *Villa Cuentos/Storytown* reading program which was designed to inform the teachers about the layout of the reading program, I found three main
problematic issues with their reading selections in Spanish. First, the Spanish reading text consisted of six themes that contained thirty reading selections, only two of which were authentic Spanish literature by Latin@ authors. Children are therefore mostly reading translations from English and not developing an appreciation for fine children’s literature in Spanish. Second, many of the English and Spanish reading selections (e.g., text, vocabulary, and comprehension questions) are exactly the same throughout the comparison textbook series and draw essentially from Eurocentric cultural capital. Third, a new addition to this reading program is the critical thinking questions at the end of each theme. The authors of Villa Cuentos emphasize critical thinking through a functional literacy approach. That is, reading comprehension questions require the student to have a specific reply rather than more open-ended questions for reflection and “active involvement with cultural issues” (Meyer & Manning, 2007) represented in the text.

**Literacy Ideologies: Cultural literacy.** Cultural literacy ideology is a predetermined discourse that is developed by students through the use of literary works from mainstream society (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). A strong advocate of cultural literacy is Hirsch (1991) who developed grade-level literature texts that hold the common values, morals, and beliefs representing mainstream America. The cultural knowledge that is represented in the “What Every American Wants to Know Series” includes plays, fairy tales, and other stories that are very Eurocentric. However, Hirsch has tried to become more inclusive in that the literature selections in his books include tales and stories from around the world. Nevertheless, the cultural literacy approach promotes that by reading this “select” group of texts, students can develop the “cultural knowledge” needed to function in mainstream society.
**Literacy Ideologies: Progressive literacy.** Progressive literacy ideology development is student-centered and allows discourse which respects the students’ voices and cultures through the use of literature selections (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). The whole language movement has often been referenced as a progressive literacy stance (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). A vital tenet of whole language is that students learn through the act of reading and writing rather than doing reading and writing exercises to learn how to read (Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991). Whole language is an approach that advocates for a learner-focused curriculum that places the learner at the center (Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991). Progressive literacy recognizes the background knowledge that students express in discussions, but it often fails to critically analyze a text’s biases that often further marginalize culturally and linguistically diverse students. In recent years, whole language educators have been moving more towards including a critical literacy perspective (Meyer & Manning, 2007).

**Literacy Ideologies: Critical literacy.** Critical literacy ideology is literacy that questions the social construction of the self, power, position, authority, and capital (and its distribution). In this sense, capital is defined broadly to include financial wealth, but other wealth, such as access, affordance, opportunity, and rules of entitlement that are often accepted, but rarely interrogated, within other views of literacy. When we are critically literate, we examine our ongoing development to reveal the subjective positions from which we make sense of the world and act in it (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Luke and Freebody, 1999; Shor, 1999). Luke and Freebody’s (1999) framework for teaching critical literacy offers a multi-method approach towards reading instruction through coding competence, semantic
competence, pragmatic competence, and critical competence. This Four Resource Model (1999) draws on the following competencies:

1. Coding competence is recognizing the fundamental features of written texts (e.g., alphabet and spelling conventions);
2. Semantic competence is the participation in the meanings of the text by comprehending written, spoken, and visual texts from the meaning system of different cultures and communities;
3. Pragmatic competence uses texts’ functionality (i.e., the text user negotiates social and cultural relations around texts);
4. Critical competence is understanding and acting on the knowledge that texts are not neutral, that they represent particular views and silence other points of view, and that the reader can critically examine and transform the text.

The critical literacy framework includes the importance of the technical skill of reading through the coding, semantic, and pragmatic competences. Yet, Luke and Freebody’s model (1999) includes a critical competence that serves to thoroughly analyze the teachers’ and students beliefs in relation to the text. Only then can students begin to exercise their agency in a space that lifts their suppressed voices and allows them to emerge through critical dialogue (Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999).

Views

In my research, I refer to Cadiero-Kaplan’s literacy ideologies as views. In changing the terminology, the term “view” means the ideological perspectives that influence a teacher’s beliefs and attitudes about their literacy teaching and learning. “Views” may
provide a more accurate understanding of how each teacher’s deeply held understandings, theories, and beliefs were enacted in their classroom.

The dialogues teachers often have could possibly affect their ideological stances and are reflected in the ways they interact, treat, and teach students in the classroom (Darder, Torres, & Baltodano, 2002; Bartolomé, 2004; Cochran-Smith, 2004). Darder et al., (2002) discuss that many educators internalize hegemonic ideologies and are often manifested at the personal level. Further, Darder et al. (2002) argue that these social world views need to be interrogated and brought forth from the unconscious to the conscious level so that teachers can then resist accepting ideologies that can translate to inequitable classroom practices. Bartolomé (2004) argues that we know very little about teachers’ views. She explains that we need to know “how teachers view and rationalize the existing social order in terms of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, and so on, and whether or not their views influence how they treat and teach subordinated students” (p. XV). Cochran-Smith (2004) explains that teaching is an intellectual, cultural, and contextually local activity and not just based on technical trainings. She also argues that teacher education is a political problem “connected to issues of social justice rather than simply a policy problem” (p. 2). By identifying teachers’ views, we can then explore the possible effects of “uncritical and narrow ideological belief systems” (Bartolomé, 2004, XV).

Since at the center of teaching and learning is the student, it was imperative to describe the teachers’ views of the students reflecting how the teachers’ expectations influenced their Spanish literacy practices and their learning community. The views presented in the next section reflect the Hispano Sociocultural core values that the literature offers these are: con cariño [with affection], con respeto [with respect], and como familia [like family] that exist
in the literature. These views rose within the data of this study and the scholarly literature serves to confirm them.

Views: Con cariño [with fondness]. Noddings describes the concept of authentic caring as one “which views sustained reciprocal relationships between teachers and students as the basis for all learning” (cited in Valenzuela, 1999, p. 61). The concept of authentic caring in the field of bilingual education and English as a second language was studied by Valenzuela (1999) and Bartolomé (2008). Valenzuela’s seminal work on the subtractive schooling of the U.S.-Mexican youths expressed how these students viewed schooling in their high school. In Valenzuela’s research the teachers viewed their students from a deficit view; thus they taught them through a remedial and low standards approach. The students viewed their teachers as not caring about their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Contrary to Valenzuela’s research, the teachers in Bartolomé’s (2008) study understood the importance of native-language instruction and the sociocultural factors (e.g., childbearing practices of the children’s home cultures) which influence their positive attitudes towards their students’ literacy and language education. Most importantly, these teachers understood that they could either maintain the status quo, or they could work to “transform the sociocultural reality in the classroom and in schools…[so that] the culture at this micro-level does not reflect and reproduce macro-level inequalities” (Bartolomé, 2008, p. 14). Bartolomé (2008) argues that there is a need “to help both classroom teachers and preservice teachers understand the ideological and political dimensions of caring” (p. 3). The reader will see that I found that Tracy understood the political and ideological implications of teaching in a dual language context and yet viewed her students and teaching practice through a caring and
respectful lens, as demonstrated in her teaching interactions with students and described in the analysis chapter.

**Views: Con respeto [with respect].** Valdés (1996) defines *respeto* [respect] as “a set of attitudes towards and/or the roles that they occupy…while important among strangers, [respeto] is especially significant among members of the family” (p. 130). Valdés’ (1996) *respeto* is more than just roles that an individual has to take on, but in her research, it is also how the families view these roles and behaviors within the family context. Carrasco, Vera, and Cazden, (1981) identified teacher respect for student leaders in their classroom research through instructional chains; these are “interpersonal aspects of the teacher-student relationship” through classroom discourse that encourage student-centered and meaning-based approaches. Although Amanda approached her teaching with high regard to all her students, she also advocated for a “*como comunidad*” sociocultural context. That is, Amanda brought in the knowledge and skills from the community that helped her create new instructional routines for homework and classroom interaction.

**Views: Como familia [as family].** Beauboeuf-Lafontant (2008) describes what it is to be a teacher as “mother” in the classroom in calling educators to become “Politicized Mothers” by first developing political clarity, i.e., the recognition of the macro-level structures of society (e.g. educational policies) to micro-level structures (e.g., school practices) that largely determine the successes and failures of students (Bartolomé, 1994). According to Beauboeuf-Lafontant (2008), politicized mothers treat others as their own and are responsible for making comprehensible the world around them and demonstrating actions that promote more humane and democratic education for all. Further, Ochoa (2007) identified Latina teachers as role models that through their mentoring “enhance educational
experiences, raise student self-esteem, and decrease absenteeism and disciplinary referrals for students of color” (p. 6). Bartolomé (2008) also found that Latina teachers provided what Freire calls (1985, 1994) “armed love”:

It is indeed necessary that this love be an armed love, the fighting love of those convinced of the right and the duty to fight, to denounce, and to announce. It is this form of love that is indispensable to the progressive educator and that we must all learn. (p. 41)

The teachers in Bartolome’s (2008) study taught their students with “armed love” through the use of *palabras suaves* [soft spoken words] used “as a strategy to humanize the classroom for all children, but in particular for children who historically have not been welcomed at school” (p. 11). In her study, the native language of the student was also a key in promoting this “armed love” as well as a positive attitude towards students (Bartolomé, 2008). In addition, Flores-Dueñas (1999) recommends using pláticas as a mother’s way of showing care to Latino students. Marisol’s *como familia*, described in Chapter 5, portrays many characteristics of a politicized mother or more specifically a Latina teacher as mother (Bartolomè, 2008; Ochoa, 2007). Marisol used *plática* [talk] as a form of communication with her families. Flores-Dueñas (1999, p. 1) coined the term *plática* and describes it as:

*Plática* to most Spanish-speakers is talk but not just any talk, it’s talk about sharing inner truths, life’s challenges and achievements, and more importantly, to “catch-up” with someone you deeply care about. This special type of talk is common among close friends and family members of Latino communities.
Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices

Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices (SLIP) is creating lesson plans, collaboration with colleagues, and delivery of instruction in Spanish that focused on the students’ academic success. The educational literature seems to indicate a one-size-fits-all (Reyes & Halcón, 2001) attitude towards teaching literacy; that is, if one literacy theory fits all, then one set of methods fits all. For example, many publishing companies such as Pearson, Harcourt-Brace, and Santillana have developed teacher language arts guides that provide pacing guides to follow throughout the year. These curriculum guides follow a one-size-fits all model. However, a teacher needs to consider many factors such as literacy methods and approaches, learning styles, and sociocultural profiles of the students in their classroom. Additionally, many publishing companies are developing literacy programs for students in dual language classrooms drawing from research from monolingual English learners in mainstream classrooms, as was stated earlier.

Dual language teachers prepare, whether in preservice or inservice, for teaching in a dual language context by transferring best-practice English literacy strategies to Spanish instruction (Escamilla, 2000). In fact, teachers in dual language classrooms often believe in the teaching of Spanish literacy but frequently overemphasize English literacy because of policy and assessment concerns (Bartolomé, 2000; García, 2008). For example, The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2002) policy that requires all students be tested in English after three years of attending public school in the United States has convinced many dual language educators that they need to keep the English literacy block intact while the Spanish equivalent can be minimized. Another example of (mono) literacy ontology is the fact that the literacy industry (publishing and pedagogical methodology) has been led by North
America, Great Britain, and Australia, thus influencing educational policy (Bartolomé, 2008; Escamilla, 2008; Rapoport, 2011). In addition, about 80% of the research on literacy teaching and development has been predominantly done by monolingual English speakers on monolingual English students (Escamilla, 2008; Grant and Wong, 2003; Halcón, 2001). As a last example of the need to develop more SLIP in the field of dual language education, Escamilla’s (2008, 2012) Spanish literacy research in the past decade has brought to light the treatment of all bilingual students as if they were the same, whether English/Spanish or Farsi/English. Developing a Spanish literacy instructional practice that promotes the students’ first literacy and language by using biliteracy ontology rather than a (mono) literacy ontology is important to all dual language educators in order to build a society with multiple literacies, multilingualism and multiculturalism.

The importance of Spanish literacy instructional practices for students in DL classrooms should be evident since it is an essential tool for literacy learning in the DL context throughout the grade levels. Furthermore, Escamilla (2007) in a keynote speech at New Mexico Bilingual Education conference stated that “improving academic achievement for the five million English language learners in U.S. schools is a national imperative …. of whom 75% speak Spanish as a first language.”

In the past, much research has documented initial literacy in Spanish native language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Braslavsky, 1962; Cummins, 1981; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Freeman & Freeman, 1993; Hayes, Bahruth, & Kessler, 1998; Goldenberg, 1987, 1998; Miller, 2001; Vernon & Ferreiro, 1999). Others have studied initial biliteracy in early primary grades (Diaz & Flores, 2001; Escamilla, 2000; Escamilla et al., 2010; Flores, 1990). Still, much more needs to be investigated in the Spanish literacy practices in upper grades.
(third through fifth grade) in a dual language context so that we may better understand the
Spanish literacy pedagogy that leads and supports sustained biliteracy.

One of the first contributors to the field of bilingual education emphasizing the
importance of native language and literacy was Cummins (1981). Cummins developed the
linguistic interdependence hypothesis that is a key premise underlying the efficacy of native
language literacy:

To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx,
transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly
(either in school or in the environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly.

(Cummins, 1994, p. 19)

Cummins’ contribution emphasized the importance of first language and literacy
development in order to better understand a second language and literacy. That is, once the
student’s first language is acquired, the student can transfer this linguistic competence to
understanding the second language only if there is motivation for it and sufficient exposure to
it. Cummins also addresses the issue of “language proficiency” in bilingual education.

According to Cummins (1981a), English proficiency consists of two dichotomies; the basic
interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency
(CALP). In 1994 he renamed these as “cognitive” and “contextual” demands. These terms,
cognitive and contextual, in essence “identify the extent to which students are able to cope
successfully with the cognitive and linguistic demands made on them by the social and
educational environment in which they are obliged to function” (Cummins, 1994, p. 10).

Many of the concepts and principles that Cummins has developed have influenced the
Spanish literacy instructional practices of bilingual educators. Some of Cummins’ theories
are seen as taking a deficit view of bilingual students. For example, the interdependence principle suggests that your second language will only be as good as the first, which could mean that a student might be considered “semilingual,” not knowing either language (Cummins, 1979). Spanish literacy instructional practices are important in dual language education since the goal is for the development of biliteracy. If a dual language teacher were to wait for full proficiency in Spanish literacy before learning a second, then the student may be at a disadvantage, according to Cummin’s linguistic interdependence hypothesis. Rather the work of García (2010) and Hornberger (1989) offer a different perspective on Spanish literacy instructional practices.

García (2010) outlines four dichotomies that are dominant in language and literacy practices; these are:

a) English only versus bilingual use;

b) Teacher-centered language use versus student-centered language use;

c) Language or literacy-based language practices versus subject matter-based language practices, and

d) School-based language practices versus community-based language practices

(p. 16)

García (2010) offers a twenty-first century solution to dichotomies established in the academy. She draws from the continua of biliteracy of Hornberger (1989, 2009); these continua:

define the contexts, individual development, and media of biliteracy, and are as follows: micro-macro, oral-literate, monolingual-bilingual, reception-production, oral language-written language, first and second language transfer, simultaneous-
successive exposure, similar-dissimilar language structures, and convergent-divergent scripts. An understanding of the intersecting and nested nature of the continua has implications for teaching and research in biliteracy. (p. 271)

Hornberger (2009) and García (2010) argue that instead of creating dichotomies in language and literacy practices, we should approach teaching and learning on a continuum. The student can decide during Spanish literacy instruction, for example, to draw from both linguistic and communicative repertoires, the social and academic, in moving fluidly from one end of the continuum to the other in order to make sense of the content and literacy. Cummins’ work on social and academic language may be considered not as a dichotomy, but as a developing continuum that integrates the social and academic language (Figure 2.1) students are bringing in to the classroom. Creating a continuum that is interrelated and dynamic for the students will open up a literacy space so that they can better understand the meaning of a text that often involves drawing from both social and academic language.

Social Language---------------------------------------------Academic Language

**Figure 2.1 The Social Language and Academic Language Continuum**

There are also social and political issues that deal with Spanish literacy instructional practices. Grant and Wong (2003) estimate that “30–40% of school-age English language learners fail to reach acceptable levels of English reading by the end of their elementary schooling” (p. 387). They found that one of the factors for the students’ failure to read was the barrier of the educators’ deficit view of the students they were teaching. That is, many teachers assume since these students speak a language other than English, they are automatically placed as remedial and low performing. Grant and Wong (2003) propose that
teacher preparation programs should emphasize the uncovering of educators’ ideological stances (views) of race, language, ethnicity, and power.

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices: Methodology.** Much of the Spanish literacy methodology focuses on and emphasizes a skill-based activity format that uses “bottom-level strategies” (Birch, 2007, p. 6), such as phonological, orthographic, lexical, and syntactic cues, all of which are often labeled as a phonics approach to reading. Also, the Spanish language is described as a transparent language, defined by Birch (2007) as follows: “the alphabet writing system represents both the consonant and vowel sounds of the language with fair regularity; for these languages the connection between the writing system and sound system is transparent” (p. 25). Spanish literacy methods, for the most part, focus on phonics-based reading mainly due to the belief in the transparent nature of the language. These “bottom-level strategies” to reading are being practiced in the lower grades of elementary. The tendency is to teach Spanish literacy to upper grade (third – fifth grade) students with synthetic approaches rather than generative approaches to learning. In the following sections, I provide a brief description of these methods.

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices: Synthetic methods.** The first synthetic method for Spanish reading instruction began with the use of the alphabet or *El Método Alfabético* (the Alphabet Method). This method originated with *Dionisio de Halicarnaso* (Braslavsky, 1962), a Greek scholar, who wrote the book “The Composition of Words” in which he described the method as, “We first learn all the names of the letters, then the shape, then its value, and later the syllables and modifications, then the words and their properties” (translated from Braslavsky, 1962, p. 25). That is, the alphabet method begins by teaching the name of the letters and not the sounds; this means that the students begin by learning the
names *ese* (*s*), *eme* (*m*), *ene* (*n*), etc. To be able to translate the visual representation of the letter (letter recognition) to the sound the student needs to be able to write the letter representation and sound on paper to create a word (Braslavsky, 1962; Romero, 2007; Secretaria de Educación Pública (SEP), 2008; Escamilla, 2000; Miller, 2001; Freeman & Freeman, 1997). Memorizing the letter visually, then combining the sounds to develop a word is called *deletreo* (spelling) that begins first with learning the vowels preceded by consonants, then combining them to form a word. In Buenos Aires, Argentina, the *silabario de Navarro* (alphabet manual of Navarro) was used to facilitate the teaching of the written language. Further, this *silabario* (syllable book) was organized to learn various syllables in a format that did not have any meaning for the student such as:

```
Da     fe     li     mo     nu
De     fi     lo     mu     na
Di     fo     lu     ma     ne
Do     fu     la     me     ni
Du     fa     le     mi     no
```

(Braslavsky, 1962, p.163)

This alphabet manual was later changed to a more meaning based format in order to facilitate students’ understanding by using “catchy” phrases, such as “*se me debe leche*” (you owe me milk) and “*te veré jefe*” (I will see you boss), followed by the syllabic families.

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices: El Método Fonético o Fónico (The Phonics Method).** The phonics method is different from the alphabet method in that it teaches the letter-sound correspondence. This method first originated from Stephani (Braslavasky, 1962) in Germany. The phonics method was later transported to the United
States and called the “phonetique method” and progressed into Mexico by 1884 (Braslavsky, 1962). The first stage of the phonics approach is to learn the sounds of the letters (vowels then consonants), followed by forming syllables, then words (Braslavsky, 1962; Escamilla, 2000; Freeman & Freeman, 1997; Miller, 2001; Romero, 2007; Secretaria de Educación Publica (SEP), 2007). In practice, students often fill their notebooks with a progression of vowel/consonant combinations that form words, phrases, and sentences by using various exercises. For example, the syllables forming the words ma-má, ma-mi, mi-ma, a-ma form the words mamá (mother), mami (mommy), and mima (to coddle), and ama (to love) which can be formed into a phrase such as: Mi mamá me mima. After these exercises are completed and mastered, and only then can the students proceed to reading a text related to the phonics lessons being learned during reading instruction.

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices: El Métodos Silábico (The Syllabic Method).** As the final synthetic approach, the syllabic method seems to follow a phonics progression of learning the letter-sound correspondence. However, the syllabic method uses as its starting point the teaching of vowels with the help of an illustration or word. The vowels then unite into a syllabic unit in sequence to form words and phrases from the combination of syllables (Braslavsky, 1962; Escamilla, 2000; Freeman & Freeman, 1997; Miller, 2001; Romero, 2007; Secretaria de Educación Publica (SEP), 2007). For instance, an example of teaching the vowels by displaying an illustration with that vowel might be: the vowel u would have a picture of grapes written the vowel/syllable combination of u-va to form uva (grape). This will help students learn the vowels in context and then combine with a syllabic unit to make a word, followed by the construction of a phrase and then a sentence. The syllabic method is a consistent manner of teaching the Spanish language. This method
linguistically makes much sense since the Spanish sound system is transparent, as opposed to English, that is an opaque language system and needs to be taught with word families and rhyming words in an attempt to adjust to the seemingly random nature of English phonics.

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices: El Método Global (The Global Method).** Analytic methods have the following characteristics: 1) an emphasis on meaning, 2) making the student responsible for finding meaning, 3) using literature and authentic texts instead of phonetically constructed texts 4) analysis of specific words and phrases from these texts to develop phonetic and syntactic knowledge. This global approach to reading never begins by teaching the students the letter-sound correspondence. Instead, the student learns through predicting and their own intuition about what he/she thinks a word represents or means in the context of the whole (Braslavsky, 1962). In addition, learning takes place only when the following factors are present: effect, skill exercises, association, and motivation to learn from the text. The analytic method to be described first is the “global” method that has also been referred to as the ideo-visual and natural method. Decroly in the 1920’s began abandoning the synthetic methods that long had been practiced by many in the classroom. He is one of the founders of the global methods, and it is often referred to as the Decroly method.

The global method, based on “global” psychology, is premised in the belief that all children from 5 to 6 years are intuitive and spontaneous. They perceive the global (ideas), and they discover differences, but not the similarities (Braslavsky, 1962; Romero, 2007). In essence, the global or ideo-visual (visual concept) starts with whole and breaks them into parts (SEP, 2008). That is, a visual representing a child playing in the park is introduced to the class. The students discuss the situation in the visual from which a sentence is formed
that represents the situation. Lastly, the class analyzes the sentence from whole to part. Again, as with the synthetic methods, the analytical methods are concerned with parts of a sentence or phrases before reading the short text.

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practice: La Palabra Generadora (The Generative Word/Theme).** *La palabra generadora* (generative word/theme) is considered an analytic method in that the word selected has to be an idea that the students will be able to use to bring their prior knowledge into the lesson, such as *la familia* (the family). The students are then engaged in dialogue, and the teacher transcribes the sentences that are being constructed using the word *familia*. These sentences are then used by the students to write a narrative to be shared with the class. By contextualizing the reading lesson to students’ knowledge of the idea of family, teachers can then bring in their students’ experiences into the reading and writing lesson (Freire, 1974).

**Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices: Sociocultural approaches.** The educational research literature offered by sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996.; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Moll, 1992; Flores, 1990; Meyer, 2000; Gibbons, 2009; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2012) is congruent with the Spanish literacy practices that the VS teachers enacted in their classroom to further advance the repertoire of Spanish Pedagogy of Literacy. The central Vygotskian instructional approaches represented in this dissertation were the mediational tools to teach to the students’ Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978) and the role of culture and language in human development.

Vygotsky (1978) claimed that to create a learning environment for literacy development:
Teaching should be organized in such a way that reading and writing are necessary for something…that writing should be meaningful…that writing be taught naturally…and that natural methods of teaching reading and writing involve appropriate operations in the child’s environment. (p. 117-118)

Thus, sociocultural approaches support the importance of developing the fundamentals of literacy within native language and culture through natural, meaningful methods, taking into consideration the students’ learning environment. For example, Valdés (1996) studied *Mexicano* families and how they constructed meaning at home. The home literacies that these families practiced and identified within their households, such as the parent’s use of *consejos* (advice) to teach the children a moral lesson, are not the conventional or mainstream ones used in our schools. As noted before, the teachers in this study showed *respeto*, *cariño*, and treated their students *como family*; similarly, Ochoa (2007) describes the Latino teachers in her study as fostering self-confidence, kindness, and respect. In addition, both the teachers in my study and those in Ochoa’s (2007) developed meaningful lessons with student-centered approaches that created an inclusive school environment, thus creating a learning environment that drew from the students’ culture and language and thereby further their Spanish literacy education.

John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) provide a Vygotskian framework that provides methodological approaches to many of Vygotsky’s theoretical concepts. In their overview, they state that sociocultural approaches to learning and development “are based on the concept that human activities take place in cultural contexts, are mediated by language and other symbol systems, and can be best understood when investigated in their historical development” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p. 5). Flores (2005) created an approach that
takes into consideration the students’ knowledge and experiences for writing by connecting a mediated structure to facilitate the format and process of the final text. This mediated tool takes into consideration the student’s cultural context and historical development in order to make meaning of the learning situation. Diaz and Flores (2001) document a case study of a kindergarten student who co-constructs a written text using the interactive dialogue journal approach. The journals provided an opportunity to interact and at the same time mediate learning through the teacher’s response. The outcome was a positive introduction to writing and interaction with the teacher. The co-construction between the teacher and student follows an essential tenet of Vygotsky’s theory, which basically argues who we are and how we think is a function of the social interactions in which we partake (Diaz & Flores, 2001). Further, Diaz and Flores (2001) claim that school failure is connected to teacher expectations. If a teacher has previous assumptions of a certain type of culture or language, then the educator will transfer this to the teaching approaches. Diaz and Flores (2001) submit that, “if students’ language and cultural experiences are not included in socioeducational contexts, then they will have great difficulty reaching their level of potential development” (p. 33). That is, if students cannot reach their potential because their language and culture are denied in the teaching practices of the teacher, then this will place them in a negative zone of proximal development (Diaz & Flores, 2001). Rather, teachers need to challenge their negative assumptions of students and develop an environment that is nurturing and supportive which is reflective of their students’ home practices. Diaz and Flores (2001) conclude by pointing out that teachers need to be the mediators in the classroom. Put another way, they are the tool that students have access to and interaction with to further develop in academics, their language, and home culture. Educators need to remember that interactions between teacher
and student vary from culture to culture, and, in a public school classroom the spectrum of learning styles and development will be different and dynamic.

Vygotsky (1978) describes the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as an approach for collaborative learning and further defines it as:

It is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peer. (p. 86)

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) integrated the ZPD concept into their research with the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP). Their ethnographic study of the program investigated the theory of teaching as assistance performance, i.e., starting at the “zone” of the teacher and then progressing to mastery. The study revealed the importance for teachers to understand the process of learning new methodologies and theories which need to be infused into already learned strategies and classroom routines. For instance, the instructional conversation strategy is discourse in which teacher and students thread together spoken and written language with prior understanding (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Even though the teachers understood the theoretical construct behind the strategy, they needed assistance by more capable others and themselves to master the learning.

Another Vygotskian inspired scholar, Moll (1992), describes the role of culture and language in human development by advocating for the need to include connections to the social and cultural practices of the students in the classrooms or in the community context. Thus, sociocultural approaches (Reyes & Halcón, 2001; Perez, 2004), as a pedagogical tool, place the student at the center and emphasize the interdependence of social and individual
processes in the co-construction of knowledge. Perez’s (2004) view of literacy in a sociocultural theory stresses the importance of the cultural context in which children learn and develop their literacy. Further, Perez (2004) points out that this theory “seeks to understand how children interpret who they are in relation to others, and how children have learned to process, interpret, and encode their world” (p. 4). This explanation of sociocultural theory as related to literacy heightened my knowledge of how important Spanish literacy development is to the many Spanish-speaking students involved in dual language education and the many who are not.

In discussions of sociocultural approaches, one controversial issue has been how teachers accommodate learning styles, home literacy practices, and language varieties. On one hand, Halcón (2001) argues that we have an abundance of evidence that has proven the power of two languages, importance of identity, and literacy. But, more critical literacy practice and approaches that draw from the child’s own culture and native language are essential for literacy learning. In his years as a university professor, Halcón claims that many of the students want the strategies to teach “them” to learn English (Halcón, 2001). He states that “the majority of these teachers find it difficult to consider bilingualism an asset, and as a consequence view biliteracy as an impossibility” (Halcón, 2001, p. 74). On the other hand, Snow and Biancarosa (2003) contend that certain sociocultural factors—language registers of students, a home literacy based on oral traditions versus written literacy, and different rhetoric styles that follow certain structures influencing the students’ literacy education—were important but difficult to account for students’ not overcoming the achievement gap. The present study is rooted in the idea that integrating sociocultural
approaches to literacy education is essential since the students draw from their cultural, social, and historical context to make meaning of the text.

In short, educational research on sociocultural theory has contributed a venue that incorporates the students’ experiences that have shaped their lives before schooling begins. Students’ cultural identities and languages should never be separated; if so, the students’ identities become fractured beyond repair. Therefore, this dissertation addresses the dual language teachers’ goal of teaching Spanish literacy within a sociocultural context, drawing from the students’ first language and cultural background to process and better understand the school literacy curriculum.

**Summary of the Literature**

Literacy learning in the U.S. has been focused and studied from the perspective of general mainstream English speakers and not on students learning in a dual language context. In this review of literature, I informed, evaluated, and integrated the literature from the position of critical inquiry, drawing from Paulo Freire’s literacy contributions and considering the process of comprehensively and socio-politically understanding the educational issue, critically analyzing the issue, and imagining potential possibilities (Bartolomé, 2008; Freire, 1985). Critical inquiry constructs of critical pedagogy, critical literacy, and ideological clarity provides the space for teachers and students to exercise their democratic views for further agency in and empowerment of their educational rights.

Examining dual language education through a critical inquiry lens, I first considered the importance of naming the students involved in the dual language classroom so that, as educators, we embrace the diversity offered by dual language education. Next, I underscored the ways in which the literature articulates the importance of considering the Spanish
language proficiencies teachers bring into the classroom as an asset rather than a deficit. The literature includes the importance of teachers becoming border crossers across linguistic, racial, ethnic, and cultural borderlines, actualizing dual language education as a pathway to a more pluralistic society.

Literacy ideologies offer an explanation about what we teach in the classroom related to the Spanish literacy instruction influencing schooling practices. Also, how the teachers view their students shapes their approaches towards Spanish literacy instructional practices. Being able to recognize and identify the literacy view imbedded in the prescribed literacy texts brought forth ideological clarity to the teachers in this study.

Describing and comparing various Spanish literacy methods better informed my research in that I became more aware of the Spanish literacy methods and approaches afforded to the teachers. I came to various conclusions with the information I reviewed and compared; including the fact much more needs to be investigated to come to a deeper understanding of Spanish literacy instructional practices used in a dual language context. Yet, the educational implications for Spanish literacy in the dual language classroom were notable in identifying the potential of dual language education for student achievement as well as the literacy ideologies that have influenced the educators, students, and Spanish literacy methodologies.

The literature in reference to Spanish literacy instructional practices for students in dual language classrooms primarily focuses in emergent literacy from kindergarten to second grade. The research informing this dissertation points to the need to investigate the literacy practices of the upper grades (third through fifth) in order to further develop the students’ biliteracy learning. The sociocultural approach provides educational practices that draw from
the students’ cultural experiences and language. Moreover, sociocultural theory takes into account how the student develops and learns literacy at home that many times is incongruent with the literacies of school. The researchers cited in this literature developed approaches and strategies that are congruent with that of the home literacy practices and that promote biliteracy learning for the students in dual language classrooms.
Chapter 3 – Method

In this chapter, I describe the five sections of the research study. I begin with the research design section followed by the data collection section, and the data analysis cycle. I end with my research positionality section and the limitations to the study section. These methodological tools were applied to generate the findings and implications of this study.

The Research Design

This research design was three case studies of teachers developing pedagogical clarity that took place during a five month period of participant/classroom observation, ten hours of audio digital recorded critical dialogues, and six hours of audio digital recorded interviews held by the researcher and individual participants. The research question driving the study was what are the Spanish literacy instructional practices of three dual language teachers? The sub-questions of the study were the following 1) How do these teachers view their students? 2) What are their expressed literacy ideologies for Spanish literacy instructional practices? 3) How does critical dialogue affect their literacy ideologies and practice?

Qualitative research is an inductive process in which a context is studied by using various methods that assist in interpreting the participants’ perspectives (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). A central characteristic of the qualitative research approach used in this study was the continuous dialogue about the inquiry process by the researcher and the participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Within this paradigm, the researcher observed the natural environment and interactions that brought forth the reality of each participants’ world. In addition, the experiences of the participants were documented to better understand their occurring phenomena. For this study, I used three exploratory case studies (Yin, 2009) for the purpose of suggesting a generative process in understanding how dual language
teachers expressed literacy ideology relating to the classroom practice in instructional dynamics during Spanish literacy time.

This research took place at Vista del Sol (VS), where I documented the interactions among the teacher, the students, and the content being taught. Ball and Forzani (2007) further describe the instructional dynamic as: “Teachers interpret and represent subject matter to students, who interpret their teacher, the content, and their classmates and then respond and act. In turn, teachers interpret their students, all of this in overlapping contexts and over time” (p. 530). These interactions, specifically the instructional dynamics with the teacher as the focus, were the centerpiece of the research study.

The three case studies design used in this study involved “a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository of documents” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 60). These dual language (DL) teachers in this study were part of a school that promoted sustainable bilingualism and biliteracy by implementing a dual language program. In order to better understand their Spanish literacy practices, participant observation allowed me to see, on site, teachers who interact and collaborate together for the common goal of improving their literacy practices. As noted above, these case studies were multifaceted and involved the instructional dynamic that occurs among the students, the teachers, and the content. The ‘single depository’ in these cases relied mostly upon the teachers’ understanding of their practices.

Case study research allows for a wide variety of data collection and analysis techniques, including a combination of positivistic and interpretive methods. A positivistic method was a possibility since I did have access to students’ Spanish literacy performance. However, I decided that the focus of this research was to study and describe DL teachers’
Spanish literacy practices in relation to their instructional dynamic rather than quantitative measures that so often have been the focus in school settings. Therefore, this study can best be represented through qualitative techniques that capture the quality of participants’ instructional practice. The technique of portraiture captures the complex and unique descriptions in context but also the main themes that then develop a strong and true narrative (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). Lawrence-Lightfoot and Hoffman Davis (1997) further describe this method as “a careful, systemic, and detailed description developed through watching, listening to, and interacting with the actors over a sustained period of time, the tracing and interpretation of emergent themes…” (p. 12). Narrating the DL teachers’ stories through portraiture captures “the essence and resonance of the actors’ experience and perspective through the details of action and thought revealed in context” (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 12). Other interpretive methods used for gathering and analyzing data about the phenomenon of understanding the Spanish literacy practices of DL teachers were participant observations, narrative interviews, and critical dialogues.

Participant observation methods suggest that “knowledge or evidence of the social world can be generated by observing, or participating in, or experiencing ‘natural’ or ‘real-life’ settings, interactive situations and so on” (Mason, 2002, p. 85). These participant observations provided the opportunity for gathering extensive field notes that brought to light the Spanish literacy practice of DL teachers within the natural context of their teaching and learning space throughout the five-month study. In addition, the participant observation allowed the researcher to document the joint interaction between the student, teacher, and the text materials used for Spanish literacy instruction. Thus, I was able to document the instructional dynamic as it occurred.
Narrative interviews analyze the stories and lived experiences of the participants in the research (Schram, 2003). Perspectives and insights into their teaching gave me a window into their thinking as the VS teachers employed Spanish literacy practices in their classrooms. The questions in the narrative interviews (Appendix A) provided insightful knowledge about the participants in regards to Spanish literacy practices, view of their students, and literacy ideology. These narrative interviews provided a rationale of why certain teaching methods or curriculum were delivered in their classroom rather than others.

The focus group as a method is a structured process used to obtain detailed and specific information about a particular topic (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). I referred to these focus groups as critical dialogues which were conducted both in small group and individual teacher settings. Critical dialogues examined more fully the connections among ideology, policy, and teacher practice in order to guide dialogue, nurture collaboration, foster questions, and promote reflection—not dictate it. Critical dialogues provided crucial reflective processes that can support further dialogue and understanding of Spanish literacy practices and curriculum for students. Critical dialogues allowed me to further build a relationship with the teachers thus building trust among each other an important aspect of research. Further, critical dialogue enabled me to do member checking with the teachers in order to have a deeper understanding of their enacted literacy practices and any clarifications that needed to be addressed about the study.

The Data Collection

In this section, I describe the data collection of the study that consists of the following: selection procedures, the participants, the setting, the timeline-chronology of the study, and other data.
Selection procedures. The field portion of this study was conducted in January through June of 2010 in a large city in the southwestern United States. In my previous employment position as a district support teacher, I presented and facilitated professional development numerous times in the participants’ school site. This provided me with background knowledge of the participants in regards to Spanish literacy instruction in the dual language program. Permission was granted by the principal to work with the teachers and observe in their classrooms in the fall of 2009. The principal, in turn, presented the research study at one of the school’s professional development sessions for upper grades. Next, initial contact was made with teachers via email, to which the teachers could respond expressing a desire to participate in the research study. This initial interest was followed by an observation of the classroom’s instructional dynamic while teaching Spanish literacy. Also, I conducted an initial interview of each 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade DL teacher to explore their teaching backgrounds and interest in the study. The following criteria guided the selection of participants:

1. Teachers had understanding of the nature of the educational system in the United States in regards to policy and programming for dual language students.
2. Teachers taught third through fifth grades and Spanish literacy.
3. Teachers were proficient in Spanish language speaking and literacy.
4. Teachers were from different racial/ethnic backgrounds and with various amounts of teaching experience.
5. Teachers agreed to participate in the study.

The participants. Screening and pre-interviews revealed basic information about the teachers, such as teaching experience, language and literacy proficiency, and motivation for
wanting to be in the study. The roles and responsibilities essential to the study were teachers who taught the Spanish literacy instruction component of the 50/50 model (Spanish instruction is taught for about 50% of the school day and the other 50% is in English) in a third-fourth-and-fifth grade dual language classroom. All participants were White, one being of Hispanic ethnicity. Two are American-born; one immigrated to the United States as a young adult from Colombia. All three teachers taught at Vista del Sol, where the study took place.

**The setting.** In this section, I used the qualitative approach of portraiture to describe the school context. Portraiture provides a physical context. According to Lawrence-Lightfoot (1997) “the portraitist insists that the only way to interpret people’s actions, perspectives, and talk is to see them in context” (p. 11).

**A portrait of the school.** Describing where the teachers taught was important since I spent the majority of my time observing their interactions and approaches to the teaching of Spanish literacy at Vista del Sol. I spent several days during the first week of my study in the school and in each classroom, sketching and recording the layout of these places to capture how the teachers interacted and taught in relation to their students. The following descriptions portray the school setting and each individual teacher’s setting as it was in the semester I conducted this study.

As mentioned previously, VS is located in an older section of the city. The students are from the neighborhood and the majority of the students have resided in this community for many years. The school is named after a native New Mexican who was often referred to as *La doctora* (the professor). I attended a ribbon cutting ceremony for *La doctora*’s historical marker placement in front of the school. It was fitting to name the school after this
long-time pioneer in bilingual education. *La doctora* believed strongly in the “importance of bilingual education and that children should learn both Spanish and English so that their culture, history, traditions and most importantly, the Spanish language would be preserved” (Program Brochure, 2010). *La doctora’s* legacy in bilingual/multicultural education continues in this school.

**School demographics.** The following demographic chart (Table 3.1) was taken from the School Accountability Report (PED, 2008-09) for grades third through fifth. Since the research study focused on upper grades in elementary, I decided to include this important information to get a better demographic perspective of who the students are in Vista del Sol.

**Table 3.1 Student Demographics at Vista del Sol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th># of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students Third through Fifth grade</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Accountability Report (PED, 2008-09)

The school demographics began to shift as a much larger group of immigrants from Mexico arrived. In order to meet the linguistic and cultural needs brought about by the shift
in demographics in the 1990s, the school developed two programmatic approaches, establishing a 50/50 Spanish/English dual language immersion strand (kindergarten through fifth grade). As described previously, the 50/50 program model time distribution can be half of the day in Spanish and the other half of the day in English. Other examples of 50/50 program models may be implemented by alternating the language by day, week, or thematic unit. Yet, another option that many of the VS teachers implemented was a team teaching approach. That is, they distribute the content areas (language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics) by language and teach for an entire theme or unit in that selected language and content area. The second model, the bilingual strand at Vista del Sol Elementary was implemented in kindergarten through fifth grade. All content areas were taught in English. However, teachers utilized support materials such as books in Spanish and explaining certain content in Spanish for those students needing home language instruction. Students in the bilingual strand also received one hour of Spanish as a second language five days a week and learned social and instructional language. The goal of the bilingual strand was for students to become bilingual. This brought programmatic changes to the bilingual education programs that had been established for the benefit of the mostly heritage language learners (HLL) at the school’s, that is, students learning the language of their parents, grandparents, or community. The school bilingual program was primarily taught as Spanish as a second language in the 1990’s.

In VS Elementary the 50/50 dual language program model was modified in early 2000 to better meet the literacy education of all their students. The following description was in a school pamphlet distributed to all visitors:
Students receive direct and explicit instruction in literacy in their first language. The focus is the development of early literacy skills in the student’s first language. Students also develop second language oracy through content areas as well as English as second language (ESL) and Spanish as a second language (SSL).

(Vista del Sol Elementary pamphlet, 2010)

**Literacy instruction at VS.** In essence, first language literacy, as identified by the administration and teachers at VS Elementary, supported initial literacy instruction in the students’ first language, either English or Spanish. VS Elementary encouraged sequential literacy instruction because they believed that it gave the emergent reader an opportunity to develop a measure of proficiency in his/her first language before using a simultaneous literacy instruction approach. A sequential view of biliteracy posits that literacy in the second language should not be introduced until a child has a competence in speaking, reading, and writing the first language (Collier & Thomas, 1989; Hakuta, 1986; Wong-Fillmore & Valdés, 1994). The debate between sequential versus simultaneous literacy learning continues to be an issue that needs to be further researched in the dual language education community. The National Dual Language Consortium (NDLC) (2009) gathered educational researchers from around the United States in Santa Fe, New Mexico, to prioritize research topics and questions in dual language. The following question addresses sequential and simultaneous literacy:

“What is the long-term effect of simultaneous versus sequential biliteracy development on levels of biliteracy achievement across the curriculum from pre-K through 12?” (p.1).

Although we do not know the long-term effects of sequential v. simultaneous biliteracy, Vista del Sol Elementary has taken a stance by implementing sequential biliteracy in their school, a decision endorsed by administration and staff to better meet the biliteracy education
of all their students. The founding scholars of biliteracy are Goodman, Goodman and Flores (1979), and they define biliteracy as mastery of reading and writing in two languages. Most recently, Pérez and Torres-Guzmán (1996) define biliteracy as “the acquisition and learning of the decoding and encoding of and around print using two linguistic and cultural systems in order to convey messages in a variety of contexts” (p. 54).

In the United States, dual language education programs have been established as enrichment programs that follow a two-way developmental or one-way developmental plan. Some dual language education programs were given magnet school status helping to desegregate ethnolinguistic groups in the school district. Vista del Sol is a balanced two-way language education school since it does have at least one third of their classroom population as English speakers, one-third as Spanish speakers, and another third who are bilingual students. Interestingly, the majority of the English-speaking students are Nuevo Mexicanos learning Spanish as a heritage language. A “heritage language learner is an English speaking monolingual who wants to acquire as a second language the tongue of their cultural group which their parents or grandparents relinquished” (Guitart, 1981, p. 36). I refer to Vista del Sol as a Barrio Dual Language (DL) school in accordance with Luis Moll et al. (1990) who have expressed the need to document the “barrio” schools that primarily serve Hispano and Latino communities. Further, the term barrio refers to the community one belongs to, that familiar local environment with similar language variety and cultural identities reflected in the gente [people], hogares [home], and escuelas [schools]. In the past, most of the literacy and language research in dual language immersion education has taken place in magnet status schools in United States, such as Oyster Elementary School in Washington, D.C., Key

I began visiting the school in November, 2009, when I first met with the teachers to brief them on the research timeline for the following year. On a typical day, I divided my time between the three different dual language classrooms that I studied: Amanda’s third-and fourth-grade combination class, Marisol’s third-grade class, and Tracy’s fifth-grade class.

**Amanda’s third/fourth-grade classroom.** Since VS is a well-known dual language school, many visitors would come and go throughout the school year. For example, one day in January, before going to Amanda’s classroom, I stopped by the lounge to sharpen my pencil. A community volunteer began to talk to me and mentioned “*Qué frío*” [how cold] to which I replied “*Sí, esta muy frío*” [Yes, it is very cold]. She continued to briefly share with me about her positive experiences as an *abuelita* [grandmother] in VS elementary and how it helped her stay connected to the school. Abuelitas/os were community volunteers who came to VS once a month to help out in classrooms. I mentioned that I was sure the teachers and students enjoyed her support and knowledge in their classrooms. She then extended her arm and said “*Yo soy Graciela, mucho gusto conocerla*” [I am Graciela, pleasure to meet you] I said “*Mi nombre es Susana*” [My name is Susana]. To which she said “*¡Qué bonito nombre!*” [What a nice name!], and I replied “*Gracias, hasta luego*” [Thank you, see you later]. These types of encounters with community members and parents were typical. Throughout the twenty weeks I was there, I had brief conversations with local politicians, parent volunteers, visiting teachers, community members such as Graciela, and university professors. Many of these individuals I often only met once or twice.
Amanda team taught and job-shared the teaching position with her partner teacher and worked part-time (only mornings) due to family obligations. When I arrived in January, 2010 at Amanda’s classroom to sketch the layout of her classroom in order to document the seating arrangement, classroom instructional tools (e.g., chalkboard and technology placement), the first thing I noticed was that the twenty-three students were sitting in a unique formation. Amanda placed the desks to form three “U” shapes organized in the center of the classroom that is located in the main building of the school. All the desks were connected and were facing towards the front of the class, some desks more than others. She often had students interact with the language and literacy or content being learned and would often tell the students, “Habla con tu compañero/a de …” (talk to your partner about…) or “pónganse en grupos y hablen de …” (get in groups and talk about…). The student interactions often created a loud classroom environment since it seemed as if they were all talking at the same time. In addition, she has three other desks that were placed outside of this layout. Students who sat by these desks were students who need some time to refocus on the given task or work better when sitting alone.

Amanda’s desk had a desktop Dell computer positioned on top of it. In addition, the surface of her desk had stacks of student work and her lesson plan booklet. Behind her desk, she had a small bulletin board with pictures of her family and students along with fire drill notices and school schedule. Adjacent to her desk were two file cabinets used for storage. As I moved around the classroom counter clockwise, I noted a rotating carousel book holder with many chapter books both in English and Spanish. Behind this there were two bulletin boards that were labeled *Palabras increíbles* [Incredible Words] and *El carácter cuenta* [Character Counts]. Next to this section was an exit door that led to the playground and
cafeteria and the only window (in a long rectangular shape) in the classroom. In front of the window was an octagon shaped table with a blue covered bulletin board as its backdrop where the teacher placed that acronym R.A.C.E., which stood for “Restate, Answer, Cite, and Evaluate.” I would later learn that the children were expected to use this mnemonic device during their literacy time so that they could ultimately use it for the annual standard-based assessment. This area is also where the teacher often met with small groups to teach them new concepts and discuss their meanings to be applied later in their reading and writing. At the front of the room was a large white board that covered about half of a side of the front wall. Most of the teacher’s instruction was from this point of reference.

On the south wall was another bulletin board labeled Actividades principiantes [Beginning Activities]. The teacher had placed index cards with the following labels: Sinónimos (synonyms), Trabalenguas [tongue twisters], Metáforas [Metaphors], and Prefijos/Sufijos [Prefix/Suffix]. Throughout the semester, I observed Amanda doing the actividades principiantes [beginning activities] with a level of energy that I often could not keep up with. Amanda often only had about thirty minutes to teach the students about specific Spanish literacy and language elements since she had to teach science and mathematics before the morning ended. As soon as Amanda taught the students metáforas [metaphors], for example, she often expected the students to then create their own metaphor, which the students did with great enthusiasm and then shared with the rest of the class.

The last object on this front side of the classroom was a television placed on a large stand for a television and video recorder. As I returned full circle to the “kidney” table where I began, or the entrance to the classroom, I noticed that this side of the classroom was used for student storage. There was a large storage bin with thirty cubby holes to hold students’
school work and books. As I left Amanda’s classroom, I took note of the “El ciclo del agua” [The Water Cycle] with student artifacts placed on display for other students to see. The inner walls of Vista del Sol classrooms had a strip of cork wood installed so that all teachers could display their student projects, art, and other work.

Marisol’s third-grade classroom. I arrived at Marisol’s classroom and was greeted by her student teacher. He mentioned that she was absent, and he was teaching the class for today. I asked, “¿Está bien si me quedo un rato para dibujar la clase?” [Is it okay if I can stay to sketch out the room?] ¡Sí claro, adelante! [Yes, of course, go right ahead!] From the hall door (north end of the classroom) I stood in front of a large white board with many different messages written on it. For example, the school schedule and homework assignments for the week were written in Spanish. In addition, she had written a bilingual sign with Clase [classroom] Aquí / Afuera [In/Out] to indicate which student was in or out of the classroom either for the restroom or any other reason. Marisol often let the students self-regulate in going to the nurse, bathroom, or any other outside-of-classroom business. Next to this white board was a small table with the classroom’s sharpener, hand sanitizer, and Lysol®. In between this table and the next storage area was the classroom trash can. This storage area had about 30 cubby holes where the students stored their classwork and books. A bulletin board with student expectations had the following written “Lo que vamos aprender…” [What we will learn…]; these expectations changed throughout the semester. Next to this storage area were two shelves that held leveled books and chapter books used for literature circles that were done twice a week. The front of the classroom was next to a door that led to Marisol’s teaching partner’s classroom. I often saw her partner teacher step into the classroom to check on homework or collect a book that a student had taken from her
class. Marisol also had a rug that was placed at the center of the classroom. This space allowed the students to sit next to their peers and listen to a book being read aloud by the teacher or discuss *el dicho del día* (the saying of the day), which was one of the students’ favorite activities. In addition, the students enjoyed this space because they learned from the teacher and were able to discuss with their peers in order to get a better understanding of the concepts and skills being taught to them. Lastly, the desks were placed in groups of four to five to allow collaborative work between students.

As I exited Marisol’s classroom, there was a Columbian poster depicting a Columbian scene with flowers and mountains in the background. Being from Colombia, Marisol often speaks to the students about her schooling experience and other childhood anecdotes, something the students enjoyed from *la maestra* [the teacher]. Marisol was never short of “lessons-to-be-learned” stories to tell her students about behavior, expectations, and responsibility as a student. She regarded her students as her own children. Many times I walked in to her classroom, and she was letting the students know how she felt about a topic or incident occurring in the school.

**Tracy’s fifth-grade classroom.** Upon entering Tracy’s classroom, the first thing that I saw was a portrait of President Obama hanging underneath the United States flag. Tracy’s desk was placed in the north end of the classroom with a bulletin board behind it. She had a picture of herself and her fiancé as well as many pictures of her students and drawings that they created for her. The classroom was arranged in “pods” or groups of four to five arranged throughout the classroom. Tracy also had a space in which the students sit on the floor and listen to her read aloud or discuss a topic being learned. This sharing/dialogue space served as a forum in the classroom where the students listened or talked about topics being covered.
The wall space of Tracy’s classroom was covered with a variety of long and short pieces of butcher paper that burst with colorful ink of relevant information being learned in her classroom. The poster-to-mural-size documents were artifacts of the teaching and learning going on in her classroom. I have seen her guide her students through this teaching/learning process that was interactive and inclusive of student’s knowledge. Some of these large sheets of paper were informational charts in Spanish. To provide some cross-linguistic connection, Tracy often created some charts in English.

Tracy’s classroom had two doors: one connected with another fifth-grade teacher and the other led to her teaching partner’s classroom. These doors often seemed like revolving doors. The fifth-grade teacher next to her classroom had an exit door that led to the parking lot and required him to walk half way around the school in order to have access to the main office, nurse, and cafeteria. As a result of the school main building layout, the fifth grade teacher [and other teachers] found themselves walking through Tracy’s connecting door at least ten to fifteen times a day. Tracy often commented to me that “no me molesta porque ya me acostumbré.” [It does not bother me because I am accustomed to it].

The Chronology of the Study

Table 3.2 Summary of the Chronology of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-interview</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>3 (1 per teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>1/2010 – 5/2010</td>
<td>32 (per teacher) ½ to 1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Dialogues</td>
<td>2/2010 – 6/2010</td>
<td>6 throughout the semester of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Interview</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>3 (1 per teacher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this section, I outline the timeline of the teachers’ initial and final interviews that provided teacher educational and personal background and insight into their background, classroom observations throughout the five-month period at Vista del Sol from January to May 2010, and the critical dialogues that took place on a bi-weekly basis throughout the study as a reflective tool to better understand the teachers’ instructional dynamic in their classroom. Researcher’s field notes were taken during and after each classroom observation in order to reflect and develop further questions to address during the critical dialogues about the teachers’ instructional dynamic. The notes were subsequently transcribed in order to be input into Nvivo© qualitative software (2008) for analysis. The transcriptions in Chapters 4 and 5 are basic transcriptions in that I italicized the Spanish transcriptions followed by the English transcriptions enclosed in brackets and non-italicized. The purpose of the transcriptions was to describe the instructional dynamic, interviews, and critical dialogues as a whole rather than dissecting the language and interactions through use of discourse analysis. Thus, in this study there were no specific transcription conventions used other than the ones mentioned above.

**Interviews.** Teachers were interviewed twice: pre-interview and post-interview. For the pre-interview, I asked the participants to share their personal, educational, and teaching backgrounds. I also asked them to share specific information about their Spanish literacy instruction using the literacy web questions (see Appendix B). In the post-interview, my goal was to ask the teachers about their view on dual language (DL) programs, Spanish literacy practice, and future teaching goals. I asked all three teachers the following questions: How effective are DL programs? What aspects of DL need to be improved upon? What changes
can you make (if any) to your Spanish literacy practices? Post-interviews varied by participants. Depending on their responses, I asked probing questions in order get a deeper understanding, since some responses needed further clarification. Tracy was brief and to the point in her responses since she already had clear ideas about effective dual language programs and knew which aspects of Spanish literacy instruction she needed to improve upon. Amanda was also sure about what she wanted to improve upon in her Spanish literacy instruction and had clarity on the direction of DL programs in the future. Marisol’s interviews centered on the issue of creating Spanish literacy instruction that allowed the student to become more independent in his/her Spanish literacy time.

**Classroom observations.** The classroom observations began in January and ended May 2010 and were held on a weekly basis, with exception of the week of March 15, 2010, to accommodate school spring break for all three teachers. An average of thirty-two classroom observations per teacher that lasted from a half an hour to an hour and a half were conducted by the researcher. The first classroom observation was used to sketch the classroom setting and students’ seating arrangement to better identify the students and their environment during the observations. Also, I used the Framework for School Literacy Curriculum & Program Review (Appendix A) for the several observations to focus on the instructional dynamic being enacted and provide guidance while I observed the teachers’ teaching and learning processes. After three observations, I decided not to use this framework but rather to rely on the teachers’ input during our critical dialogue and the generative themes being coded throughout the study. I made this decision because the framework seemed too structured to follow; rather, I wanted to be able to document all that was being said and done in the classroom. Classroom observations were done at the teacher’s
classroom with exception of several times when Marisol co-taught with her partner teacher in order to introduce literature circles to both group of students. All three teachers taught in a 50/50 dual language program model that required teachers to team teach throughout the year. Team teaching was divided by language use and content area. Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy all taught the Spanish portion of the day in a specified content area throughout the study. All classroom observation examples that I have documented in this dissertation were collected in Spanish, the language of instruction for all three teachers. As I present them later on, the classroom examples were italicized for the Spanish, followed by the English translation. I take full responsibility for the translation from Spanish to English in all the transcripts presented in this research.

Since Amanda job-shared and team taught, her teaching responsibilities during this semester of the study were to teach Spanish literacy integrated with science and social studies content-area standards for about one and a half hours. In addition, the remainder of the morning, on average one hour, was used for the teaching of mathematics to her students. As a researcher, Amanda’s schedule was the most predictable in that she had the same schedule throughout the study, mainly due to the fact that only one group of students were being taught by two teachers throughout the day. On the other hand, Marisol and Tracy also team taught with other teachers. However, they were responsible for teaching Spanish literacy and other content areas throughout the year to two groups of students (their own homeroom and that of their partner teacher). The semester I observed, Marisol taught literacy, social studies, and mathematics; however, she alternated these content areas with her partner teacher on average every six weeks or when a specific unit ended. For the most part, Marisol taught literacy and social studies in Spanish during the study. Her schedule (8:05 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.)
began with teaching her homeroom class (students designated to her for whom she was responsible for grades, absences, and parent contact). At mid-point of the school day, around 11:45 a.m. (after lunch), she taught the same content and language as in the morning to her partner teacher’s students. Likewise, Tracy team taught and was responsible for teaching Spanish literacy year round and alternated science, social studies and mathematics with her partner teacher on average every four to six weeks. She also taught her homeroom class first, then rotated her students to her partner teacher in order repeat what she taught in the morning to her partner teacher’s students. In sum, all three teachers had different schedules and responsibilities throughout the day; however, they all team taught and were in charge of delivering Spanish literacy and content, teaching either through an integrated approach or literacy-based approaches. I included the information above because it suggests the complexity of scheduling observations.

All classroom observations field notes were handwritten then later transcribed and analyzed using Nvivo© qualitative software (2008). I also wrote observational comments which contained questions, comments, and suggestions that we would discuss during critical dialogues.

**Critical dialogues.** All six critical dialogue (CD) sessions were held at a local coffee shop close to the school. The six critical dialogue sessions were recorded and transcribed. The questions used for the dialogues derived from the elaborated notes that I wrote while each teacher taught. The observer comments were the source of questions and thoughts that I had while the teacher taught. For example, Tracy used a certain reading protocol called R.A.C.E. I was not familiar with the purpose and goal of this protocol. So, I wrote out critical dialogue questions that addressed the reading strategies used in the teachers’ classrooms.
Session one took place February 17, 2010. The first hour was spent on reviewing the purpose of the study and negotiating procedural matters such as meeting times and classroom observation schedules. I positioned the study for the teachers by emphasizing the qualitative characteristics, especially its interest in the emerging categories relevant to the instructional dynamic phenomena in their classrooms. As was done numerous times throughout the study, I emphasized the importance of the critical dialogues that opened a space for the teachers to reflect and share their teaching and learning insights as were noted during the classroom observations. Moreover, I underscored my interest to listen to their view of their students, themselves, and their practice in relation to their teaching processes. Before each CD, I sent the teachers an email with suggested topics with questions to discuss during our time together, reminding the teachers that they could modify the suggestions.

The essential topics covered by the group during the CD Session One are listed below (selected materials given to the teachers are indicated below and are in the Appendices).

These materials and questions were emailed to the teachers:

1. Orientation to the study by explaining the purpose and stating the main research question;
2. Definitions of the four literacy ideologies from a critical pedagogy framework (Appendix C);
3. Teacher role as a Spanish literacy educator in a dual language context;
4. Students’ benefits and challenges as they become dual language students, and
5. Teachers’ view of their instructional dynamic.

CD Session One concluded with asking the teachers to read and provide input on the next CD session questions as homework. The homework given to the teachers were often the
proposed CD questions. I asked the teachers to read and change questions if for some reason they did not make sense or were irrelevant to their Spanish literacy practices.

Session Two, held on March 10, 2010, began with a few minutes to talk about how classroom observations should be scheduled around the New Mexico Standards-based Assessment (NMSBA). The essential topics for this section were as follows:

1. Discussion of CD Session Two questions with special attention to comprehensive strategies used during their teaching and learning cycle, advantages/disadvantages of being a dual language teacher, and how teaching changes before and after state testing (Appendix D), and

2. Dual language teachers’ challenges at the school level.

The session ended with a discussion of the importance to provide input to me about what CD topics we wanted to discuss that were of higher relevance to them.

CD Session Three was held March 31, 2010. The agenda contained the following topics that originated from my classroom observations as the teachers prepared for the New Mexico Standards-based Assessment (NMSBA). I wanted to make sure I was providing a space for them to talk about testing since it was going to occupy about six weeks of their teaching and learning time:

1. Views towards their students, and

2. Views towards the New Mexico Standards-based Assessment (NMSBA).

The session concluded with a discussion of placing the NMSBA testing in perspective rather than just focusing on test outcomes. The teachers concluded that too much emphasis on test-taking detracted from important teaching and learning.
Session Four took place on April 20, 2010. The following information and questions were sent to the teachers for them to review and make content changes if needed (Appendix E). The group’s agenda included the following items, sent beforehand by email. These questions included the literacy ideologies enacted in their classroom—one of the stated questions I asked the teachers in the first CD. However, I felt that I did not explain well the first introduction of these literacy ideologies, and I wanted to provide more concrete examples and give the teachers time to explain their literacy ideologies.

1. Discussion of literacy ideologies (views) based on Cadiero-Kaplan’s literature review on literacy ideologies influencing the field of bilingual education and English as a second language (ESL);
2. Teachers provided “in their own words” and with classroom examples how they interpreted each literacy ideology, and
3. Reflection on the research process, in particular the critical dialogues.

Teachers raised questions about the literacy ideologies (views) that were incorporated in the agenda:

1. Marisol questioned the definition of the cultural literacy view and wanted to further discuss this view;
2. Amanda also questioned the cultural literacy view and wanted me to expand on this literacy view, and
3. Tracy interpreted the cultural literacy view as being focused too much on one culture as opposed to a multicultural view. In essence, Tracy wanted me to further expand on this view to make sure she understood the definition correctly.
In response, I discussed the following points. I explained that cultural literacy, based on work by Cadiero-Kaplan (2004) and on the work of Hirsch, is largely influenced by Eurocentric views of teaching and learning literacy and language. I provided a personal example of Eurocentric literacy approach (the teaching of William Shakespeare in high school) and the lack of understanding of the linguistic and historical context. At the conclusion of the session, teachers were asked to express their understanding of cultural literacy as they define it.

Session Five was on May 12, 2010. In the interim, classroom observations were conducted to continue collecting data on the teachers’ instructional dynamic while teaching Spanish literacy. The teachers were asked to continue their Spanish literacy instruction so that I could get a better understanding of their teaching methods and approaches. I did meet with the teachers at a school collaboration meeting prior to our CD session. The information I gathered had to do with the teachers wanting me to provide ideas on literacy education for students learning a second language. Recognizing this request, I decided to offer a reading from Gibbons (2009) English learners’ academic literacy and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone and the work of Luke and Freebody (1990) that dealt with different ways to teach reading. Moreover, I developed a synthesis, síntesis de actividades de lecto-escritura [Synthesis of the Spanish literacy activities] (Appendix F), of the various approaches and strategies implemented in their classrooms—their Spanish literacy activities as gleaned from the data collection thus far. This classroom data collection was continuously being processed and analyzed using Nvivo® qualitative software (2008) as I observed their classrooms in order to depict an accurate “picture” of their instructional dynamic. The teachers agreed that
the synthesis of their Spanish literacy was accurate and did describe in fact their Spanish literacy instruction.

Session Five was designed to depend heavily on contributions from the teachers and offer a response to their perspectives on Spanish literacy instruction. The planned agenda included the following:

1) Classroom Spanish literacy instruction to that point by Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy, and
2) Discussion about the Gibbons’ (2009) chapter on characteristics of second language literacy.

I began the CD session with sharing the teachers’ Spanish literacy activity synthesis, coded and categorized utilizing the Nvivo© qualitative software (2008), to be discussed in the next section. I wanted to provide examples of the literacy activities that the teachers were already implementing in their classroom before we discussed the Gibbons’ piece. Another purpose for discussing their Spanish literacy classroom application was to highlight aspects from the teachers’ teaching and learning experiences in order to reflect on their Spanish literacy practices. To this end, we began our dialogue by incorporating their knowledge and skills into what the Gibbons’ readings had to offer.

The session concluded with a discussion of integrating the work of Gibbons (2009) into their teaching and learning cycle. I also mentioned that the next session we would further discuss the student as text analyst role.

The final CD session, Session Six, took place on June 10, 2010. The prime topic of discussion was to review the four roles of students while they read and to experience critical literacy through the use of a text. I provided a review sheet describing the four roles of
readers (Luke & Freebody, 1990) as defined by Gibbons (2009). In addition, I described the critical literacy practice for the CD session (Appendix G).

Session Six concluded with me thanking them for their time and allowing me into their classrooms and for their openness in discussing their literacy practices with such honestly and for critically looking at how they taught. The teachers thanked me and offered a few final comments in regards to the study.

**Other data.** I collected other data that the teachers shared with me and used in their classrooms while I was observing. These consisted of gathering texts such as exams, copies of reading materials, and pictures of student and teacher work related to the Spanish literacy activities enacted in the teachers’ classrooms. The following teaching and learning artifacts are examples: Amanda’s concept map (Appendix H) used to plan her teaching of science or social studies concepts before reading the text; Tracy’s cuéntame algo teaching process (Appendix I); and Marisol’s literature circles (LC) wheel used during LC to guide students’ conversation after the students read (Appendix J).

Other data were collected during certain school meetings. The *Hacia el Avance del Lenguaje Dual* (HALD) meetings were held once a month at 7:30 a.m. at Vista del Sol elementary. All teachers interested in advancing their Spanish literacy knowledge and language skills often attended these meetings. All meetings were conducted in Spanish. The teachers in my study attended these meetings and invited me to attend with them. I attended since Spanish literacy instructional practices included the teachers’ planning, collaboration with colleagues, and delivery of instruction. The focus of the HALD meeting during the time of this study was Spanish literacy, and all teachers were required to read the book *La*
enseñanza de la lectura y la escritura en español en el aula bilingüe [Teaching Reading and Writing in Spanish in the Bilingual Classroom] by Freeman and Freeman (1997).

**Data Analysis Cycle**

Following a constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), the Data Analysis Cycle was developed in order to create the process needed for the generative themes to emerge from the data collected according to the research questions of the study. The Data Analysis Cycle (Figure 3.1) consists of the following phases: free nodes, tree nodes, cases, and relationships. Congruent with a constant comparative method, all data nodes were compared considering each teacher’s case study, in turn, creating the final array of categories gleaned from the data.
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**Figure 3.1 The Data Analysis Cycle**

**Free nodes phase.** The purpose of free nodes was for me to begin coding my data after it was transcribed. This enabled me to begin the refining process by taking chunks of data and naming what it was wit in my research context. Free node coding at a word/ phase begins with the open coding of transcripts throughout the course of the study and creating
categories according to the properties of the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Participant observations, critical dialogue sessions, and other data were being gathered and entered into the Nvivo© 8 qualitative software for analysis (2008). The Nvivo© 8 qualitative software enabled me to open code any incident and compare this to the data already existing as a category according to given elements (dimension and property). Free node coding at a word and phase level generated a total of 268 categories throughout the course of the study (Appendix K). Comparing free node categories was vital at this point in the study; thus, I began the process of allocating codes to broader categories and creating tree nodes to follow.

**Tree nodes phase.** The purpose of the tree nodes was for me to begin condensing the amount of data I had transcribed and coded thus far. The tree nodes provided me with a tool to start naming my categories into smaller units of study. To create tree nodes, I first returned to the analysis of all the free node categories that I defined in my research. Through the Nvivo© 8 software (2008), I then integrated categories and their properties, basically delineating the categories even further, enabling me to have a manageable number of categories saturated with more cohesive data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I delineated 35 tree node categories (Appendix L).

Further analyzing the data, the process consisted of developing a category for each tree node by establishing parameters such as the dimensions and properties of the data. For example, as I looked at the category CHALLENGES within the Spanish literacy instructional practices of dual language (DL) teachers, I noticed that some of the teachers focused on the students’ learning during Spanish literacy, while another DL challenge emphasized instructional practice, i.e., how the teachers taught within a DL context. Some of the
dimensions were due to decisions that are made by the DL teacher in regards to the text to use for instruction, the strategy, and other attributes that affect the delivery of the literacy approaches in their classroom.

**Case phase.** The purpose of the case phase was for me to finalize the main themes that supported my research questions, although, I had been thinking and re-thinking throughout the analysis of where each chunk of data belonged. This stage of the data analysis required me to see the connection between the research questions and my final themes that derived from the data. The case phase relies on defining the theory through the process of ongoing category refinement, leading to the development of a final category array (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Generating theory was a rather complex task. It requires that the analyst “take apart the story within his data” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 108). Defining the theory began to develop as I saw the different parts of the whole story. That is, as I saw each part of the story, I then created the following cases: Pedagogical Clarity, Spanish Literacy Instructional Dynamic, and Views (Appendix M). Further, I created mediated structures that better represented a visual image of my analysis and findings (Appendix N).

**Relationship phase.** The purpose of the relationship phase was for me to observe the commonalities and differences of the three broad themes found in my data. This process helped me see the whole picture of what the teachers in my study were doing during their Spanish literacy instructional practices, and how they viewed their students and their notions of literacy views. Defining the theory embedded in the data of the teachers’ Spanish literacy practices was a process throughout the study. That is, writing the theory means that as social incidents are recorded, classified and compared across categories, the process of relationship
discovery began. (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). At this phase of the process of qualitative analysis, the data has been coded, 18 memos and observer comments have been written, and a “generative” theory has been formulated. A generative theory is developmental in nature in that, from the start of data collection, incidents were noticed and coded for their properties and dimensions, eventually generating broad categories that were integrated and saturated with data, finally leading to the generative theory. Further, the reduction of the data to three main categories was possible by the review of literature, utilizing the research questions as a framework to capture the findings, and through researcher experience. The use of the literature and experience as tools to examine the data provided a theoretical lens through which, rather than, “reinvent [ing] the world around us,…we draw upon on what we know to help us understand what we do not know” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 80).

**Other data analysis methods.** Throughout the data analysis, I wrote memos in regards to the data being analyzed. Modified versions of memo writing were applied to my analysis method by merging informed data to observer comments (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) about the teachers’ teaching and students’ learning. Observer comments were also written after the participant observations. However, most of the observer comments were written during the participant observations in order to capture the student and teacher interactions within the given context. I wrote extensive field notes from the classroom observations, interviews, and critical dialogues that I transcribed into Nvivo© qualitative software (2008) in order to code line by line and place in a node, tree node, and finally a case phase as indicated in the preceding section.
Spanish Pedagogy of Literacy matrix. The Spanish Pedagogy of Literacy (SPL) matrix (Appendix O) entails the four literacy practices influencing this study (e.g., Banks, 1993; Bartolomé, 2008; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Freire, 1985, 1994; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Gibbons, 2009; Luke & Freebody, 1999; Sleeter & Grant, 1987). To reiterate, those practices are: critical literacy, functional literacy, multicultural literacy, and progressive literacy. Throughout this study, the teachers’ enacted Spanish literacy instructional practices were functional and progressive and are included in this SPL matrix. As a result, the SPL matrix was created to document the teachers’ Spanish literacy practice by means of a visual representation.

Research Positionality

As with any research, I brought the biases of my experience to this study. I was a participant of this study by being a resource during the classroom observations and other collaborations thus positioning me as an insider and outsider in this study. As Lawrence-Lightfoot (1997) reminds us, “The researcher is the stranger, the newcomer, the interloper—entering the place, engaging the people, and disturbing the natural rhythms of the environment—so her presence must be made explicit, not masked or silenced” (p. 50). In qualitative research, the researcher has to position herself/himself in the field in order to gather data and then be able to generate data in an analytic method (Schram, 2003). Although I analyzed the data methodically, the study was affected by my beliefs and theoretical stance on the topic. As I did the research—observing, asking, documenting—I continuously processed and acknowledged my position in relation to that of the context being studied through triangulation of the data and having a critical friend that provided feedback about the study.
The triangulation of the data began with taking the expressed views and Spanish literacy instructional practices that the teachers shared with me during the pre and post interviews. Then, I took extensive field notes of the teachers’ enacted views and SLIP and compared to the interview data. Further, to triangulate the data I used CD as a forum to better understand their views, SLIP, and provide any feedback on their teaching and learning if needed.

I believe in the importance of preserving and developing one’s home language and literacy in order to self-identify as a member of that specific family and community of speakers of that language. I am a Spanish-speaking Mexican Chicana. I was born and raised in a bilingual community that encouraged multilingualism at home, community, and school. The border between Mexico and United States only separated my Mexicano family and community in that one had to pass an imaginary, if (not) political, line to exist in either. This transnational existence has taught me to embrace my Mexicana heritage and respect my American status. As a bilingual educator, the primary educational goal was to offer an opportunity for all my students, through bilingual education, to acknowledge both home and second language/culture.

Moreover, I strongly advocate for dual language programs with the purpose of fortifying the student’s language, social, cultural, and literacy identity. To this end, this research study provided a better understanding of the DL teachers’ Spanish literacy practices in order to build upon the existing bilingual education pedagogical tools. Of importance to this research study were the DL teachers’ views of dual language students, expressed literacy ideology and the literacy content utilized to employ their practice; thus, it was vital to analyze and take inventory of all of these. To do this, I utilized the Framework for School
Literacy Curriculum & Program Review for students (see Appendix A & B) as a reflective tool to further understand the literacy practices and curriculum being offered to the students. As indicated in the section “Classroom Observations,” this conceptual framework was employed as a discussion tool in order to better analyze the teachers’ ideological stance towards Spanish literacy.

It is important for me to define literacy since I asked the teachers to do the same. I believe that by disclosing my personal definition of literacy, I will make transparent my perception of what literacy means. I define literacy as a threefold approach to understanding the act of reading. I refer to this dialogic relationship between the student and his/her teacher as literacy triangulation: a dialogue of critical engagement, transformative multiculturalism, and linguistic variety/dominant academic discourse.
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**Figure 3.2 Literacy Triangulation**

To explain the first intersection, critical engagement, I draw from Giroux’s (2001) description of discourse of responsibility —that is, an educator who advocates for a discourse that identifies, mediates, and experiences critical engagement on issues that have to be “politicized” in order to reveal the hidden agendas in the curriculum and texts. For example, a critical engagement approach helps students become aware of messages that texts communicate about power, race, and gender: Who should receive privileges? and Who
continues to be marginalized? Also, teachers must provide an opportunity for students to question the beliefs and practices that dominate in the curriculum and texts. Teachers should lead students to question oppressive ideologies and practices through a critical literacy lens, that is:

- Comprehensively constructing the problem;
- Deconstructing the issue, and
- Reconstructing the problem by naming potential solutions

(Bartolomé, 2008)

In summary, by recognizing the problematic nature of society through a critical lens, the teacher might begin by providing a scenario of inequality. Then, the teacher would have students reflect on the scenario by asking questions:

- What is happening in this scenario?
- Who are the participants?
- Who dominates here?
- Describe the scenario in your own words.
- What steps need to be taken to change the situation?

The second intersection of the literacy triangulation is transformative multiculturalism. It has been a struggle to integrate multiculturalism into bilingual education programs and into the reading instruction of students. Macedo and Bartolomé (1999) address this issue and propose that in order for multicultural and multilingual education to be transformative, several concerns have to be analyzed. First, language has been excluded by many proponents of multicultural education (MCE), and, equally, multicultural education has
been substituted for multiethnic literature in bilingual education with only a few exceptions. Macedo and Bartolomé (1999) assert the following:

…multicultural education correctly stresses the need to valorize and appreciate cultural differences as a process for students to come to voice, the underlying assumption is that the celebration of other cultures will take place in English only, a language that may provide students from linguistic and cultural backgrounds with the experience of subordination. (p. 34)

In order for students to come to voice, they must be able to express their thoughts in their mother tongue for it is the only means through which one comes to consciousness (Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999). Marginalized students will develop their voice only if educators create structures that facilitate submerged voices to emerge (Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999) in order to develop agency and solidarity.

Second, another concern with multicultural education is the need for an ideological analysis of the position of MCE education within bilingual education. The view of many multicultural educators, in regards to students in bilingual education, has been one of dismissing the issue of language when teaching multicultural education. That is, multicultural education can be fully implemented in English-only, and native languages should not be of concern. The English-only position is the “pedagogy of exclusion that views learning English as the sum total of education itself for linguistic-minority students” (Macedo, 2000, p. 22). Moreover, Macedo (2000) submits that the English only movement derives from colonialism. That is, colonial ideology “imposes ‘distinction’ as an ideological yardstick against which all other cultural values are measured, including language” (p. 23). In order to employ a transformative multicultural education, I advocate that teaching and learning about cultural
and linguistic knowledge be in Spanish and English, thus building student agency and solidarity amongst diverse student populations.

Linguistic variety and dominant academic discourse is the final intersection of the literacy triangulation. It is important to build and incorporate linguistic variety/academic discourses into the teaching content put forth to students. Linguistic variety entails the linguistic knowledge related to students’ cultural backgrounds, speech patterns, and dialects found in their community. Dominant academic discourses are the rhetorical structures (learned skills of language use), and phonological, lexical, and syntactical knowledge. Also, students need to be exposed to ample reading selections and given the time to dialogue about them in order to use language in real life situations. Teachers also need to give students opportunities to create texts using the non-dominant and dominant writing structures. By including and validating the multiple literacies and language varieties brought from culturally and linguistically diverse students, plus teaching the dominant academic discourses in reading and writing, educators will create pedagogy of hope rather than pedagogy of entrapment (Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999).

In order to refrain from imposing my position and literacy ideology on the teachers, I set parameters by triangulating my data through the narrative interviews. I wrote questions that would allow participants to answer freely without me imposing my views and audio recorded the conversation so that I could check for further understanding of the teachers’ voice. In participant observation sessions, I took notes and wrote observer comments. For Critical Dialogues, I wrote the questions and had the teachers review the questions for any biases I might have imposed through the questions being asked. In addition, audio recording the CD sessions provided a better understanding of what was said by whom throughout the
session. Finally, the teachers read Chapter 4 and 5 (Analysis and Findings) in order to check for understanding and accuracy.

Limitations of the Study

This study focused on the Spanish literacy practices of dual language teachers. The findings from this qualitative observational case study will be particular to this teaching community. Due to the nature of this study, the number of participants was limited and the demographics and geographic focus of this study was limited to one school within a district in the southwestern region of the United States.

Further, I was of the opinion that my developed relationships with each teacher would blossom and that each teacher used her personality and experience to shape her view. As I expected, it was a gratifying learning experience to observe and document their teaching, interactions, and relationships during the semester I was there. However, an observer might say that the teachers’ blossoming relationship might have been because they adjusted their teaching to meet my needs as a researcher. I have returned since I last collected the data and the teachers have continued to strive towards more holistic and authentic literacy practices that include literature circles and multicultural instruction.
Chapter 4 – Analysis and Findings

In this chapter, I describe my analysis and findings of the teachers’ interviews and classroom observations related to their views of students and Spanish literacy instructional practices. The main sections to follow are: Interviews, Classroom Observations, and Discussion. Each section will have examples followed by an analysis of the interviews or classroom observations and findings related to each individual teacher case study. Metaphors will be pointed out as essentially themes expressed as metaphors.

Interviews

In the following examples, I illustrate how teachers’ view their students and their Spanish literacy instructional practice (SLIP) through selected interview excerpts that best represent each individual teacher’s view throughout the study. In the pre/post interviews, I asked a series of questions in order to better address the research questions driving my research. I used the Literacy Curriculum and Bilingual Education Web (Appendix A) questions that provided guidance in identifying the teachers’ views about their students and Spanish literacy practices. I adapted this literacy web from the seminal work done by Cadiero-Kaplan (2004) on bilingual education practices, and applied this tool as a conceptual framework in order to provide reflective processes that encourage further dialogue and understanding of teaching practices and curriculum for their students. I represent the data in this section individually. That is, I characterized each teacher’s view of her students and practice separately since they all had a particular viewpoint. In a later chapter I will present a cross-analysis of the teachers’ views.

Amanda’s view of students. The con respeto [with respect] metaphor was evident in Amanda’s classroom as she often reminded students that they needed to be nice to one
another and to never try to exclude anybody during whole or small group instruction. Valdés (1996) defines *respeto* [respect] as “a set of attitudes towards and/or the roles that they occupy…while important among strangers, is especially significant among members of the family” (p. 130). Valdés’ (1996) *respeto* is more than just roles that an individual has to fulfill; it also refers to how the families view these roles and behaviors within the family context. Amanda viewed *respeto* in a similar manner, except that Amanda’s context came from her “*como comunidad*” [a sense of community] view. Amanda’s community view stemmed from her own research while attending the University of California Santa Barbara where her thesis addressed building communities within the school context. Amanda explained that many of her students come from “*familias diversas culturalmente y lingüísticamente entonces tenemos que demostrar respeto uno al otro: trabajando juntos, ayudando nos uno al otro, no reírse si alguien dice o hace algo incorrecto y ser amable siempre*.” [diverse families culturally and linguistically then we have to demonstrate respect to one another: working together, helping each other, not laughing when somebody says or does something incorrect, and be nice]. Amanda did not have ten statements on how to demonstrate *respeto* on any of her classroom walls. Instead, Amanda modeled *respeto* as she said “*tienes que primero darles respeto y luego ellos te respetan para atrás.*” [you have to first respect them and then they will respect you back].

Amanda developed a *respeto* and *comunidad* view that started with her own work at the university level where she learned about the “Funds of Knowledge” (Moll, 1992) and classroom discourses (Cazden, 1988) that vary according to the sociocultural (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978) contexts. After graduating from the University of Santa Barbara, Amanda applied her teaching knowledge and skills when she taught at the Los
Angeles Independent School District. She encountered many “familias diversas culturalmente y lingüísticamente” [culturally and linguistically diverse families] and explained that in order to build a community of learners, teachers and students need to “demonstrar respeto uno al otro.” [demonstrate respect to one another]. Amanda’s view of respect was something she first modeled towards her students, and she expected the same from them. I asked Amanda during an interview what she would do “si los estudiantes no demuestran respeto en la misma manera que tú…” [if students do not demonstrate respect the same way as you…]. Amanda responded, “creando una comunidad en mi salón incluyendo los padres, los estudiantes y la maestra creamos nuestra comunidad” [creating a community in my class that includes the parents, the students, and the teacher; we create our community]. As a follow up question to her response, I asked Amanda how she included parental support in her classroom. Amanda’s response was the following:

Amanda (A): ¡Claro! Al principio del año yo siempre comienzo mi año con “el estudiante espectacular.” Tomo fotos de todos mis estudiantes y pongo sus fotos allí [teacher points to the pictures that are placed on the wall in the shape of a sun with rays around it] para que todos sepan que son parte de esta clase. Entonces cada semana escogemos el estudiante espectacular e informamos a sus padres para que venga toda la familia a este evento durante el día escolar. Yo les digo a los padres que si pueden traer fotos, objetos, libros que son importantes a su niño/a. Los padres y el niño/a espectacular entonces muestran y hablan sobre estas cosas a toda la clase y luego los estudiantes pueden hacerles preguntas sobre lo que presentaron.

[Of course! At the beginning of the year I always start my year with “the spectacular student.” I take pictures of all my students and I place their photos there (teacher
points to the pictures that are placed on the wall in the shape of a sun with rays around it) so that they all know that they are part of this class. Then every week we select a spectacular student and inform their parents of this event so that the family can come during the school day. I ask the parents too if they can bring photos, objects, and books that are important to their child. The parents and the spectacular child then show and talk about these objects to the class and the students can then ask questions about what they presented on]. (Interview, January 19, 2010)

This community building activity was central to Amanda’s goal of creating a “como comunidad” [a sense of community] classroom. Amanda further explained how her students then were asked to write something positive about the spectacular student. The students learned a lot about each other with this activity. All of Amanda’s families participated in this activity at the beginning of the school year. This activity was one of the ways that Amanda built community in her class and in her own words, “¡Una buena actividad para crear comunidad!” [A good activity to create a community!]

Involving the student’s families in her classroom’s initial community building days was very important for Amanda. Since she had a combination class, she needed to do this community building activity so that they can learn from one another and the families had a big part in this community building activity. Amanda also knew that Vista del Sol valued their community and their families so bringing them into this community building day was of high importance to her and Shelly (Amanda’s teaching partner). I did not have the opportunity to see and hear the students and their families present on selected objects that held a strong significance to his/her life because I started my research in the spring semester. I observed the pictures of all the students set upon a sun with sun rays that beamed positive
thoughts for all to view. Bringing the family and students into the classroom to talk about *el estudiante espectacular* demonstrated the *respeto* Amanda had towards her students and parents.

**Amanda’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices.** One of the main purposes of this study was to understand the relationships between the teachers’ Spanish literacy instructional practices, their students’ learning, and the texts from which they taught. Spanish literacy instructional practices are defined as planning, collaboration with colleagues, and delivery of instruction.

During the pre-interview, I asked Amanda if she could define literacy for me. I thought this was important since the focus of the study was to better understand how the teachers taught Spanish literacy in their classrooms. Asking Amanda to define literacy was an important place to begin. Since I had sent Amanda the questions I would be focusing on before the interview, she came prepared and had her answers prewritten; she glanced at her paper before she responded to the question. Amanda replied,

*A:* *Esta pregunta es interesante.* Porque tenía que pensar de mi definición de lecto-escritura. Para mí es leyendo el texto al nivel de cuarto grado, por ejemplo. Pero no solo eso también poder analizar el texto y pensar más avanzado cuando lean el libro. Y poder aplicar lo que aprendieron ya sea ciencias, estudios sociales, matemáticas, proyectos, exámenes o lo que escriban. Esto es algo difícil para los alumnos/as porque a veces cuando les digo que den su opinión ellos/as no tienen nada que decir y les digo bueno si no saben piensen un poco más y luego regreso por tu repuesta. Y cuando regreso, ellos tienen una explicación. A veces no entonces yo les ayudo a construir una respuesta o explicación. Para mí es importante que puedan leer en
español y no solo en inglés. Quiero que estén en el mismo nivel de lectura en los dos idiomas. Esto es importante para mí. Por eso quiero que primero practiquen hablando sobre el tema que van a estudiar haciendo esto se les facilita la lectura y escritura porque saben sobre lo que van a leer y escribir, yo pienso. Es buena práctica para todos, pero especialmente los estudiantes que hablan español como segundo idioma y también los heritage language learners. Claro, los estudiantes que su primer idioma es español no es un problema aprendiendo español, pero de todos modos tenemos que seguir aprendiendo el idioma español.

[A: This question is interesting. Because, I had to think about how to define literacy. For me, it is being able to read a fourth grade text, for example. But, not only just that; it is also being able to analyze the text and to think in more advanced ways when reading the text. Also, being able to apply what they learned from science, social studies, mathematics, projects, exams or their writing. This is something that is difficult for the students because sometimes when I asked them to give me their opinion they have nothing to say and I tell them okay if you have nothing to say yet think about it and I will return to ask for a response. When I return, the students then have a response. Sometimes they don’t and then I help them construct a response or explanation. For me, it is important for the students to read in Spanish and not just English. I want them to be at the same level of reading in both languages. This is important for me. This is why it is important for the students to begin with speaking about the topic to be studied; by doing this it facilitates reading and writing because the students know about what they are reading and writing about I think. It is good practice for everybody, but especially for the students who speak Spanish as a second
language and also the Heritage language learners. Of course, the students who have Spanish as their first language. It is not a problem to learn Spanish, but at any rate we have to continue learning the Spanish language. (Interview, January 19, 2010)

Amanda defined literacy as students being able to “analizar el texto y pensar más avanzado cuando lean el libro.” [analyze the text and to think in more advanced levels]. Amanda expected the students to not only read at grade level but also to be able to analyze the text. She believed literacy was also being able to apply what students read across the curriculum. In other words, the concepts and skills that they learned while reading in language arts should be applicable to other subject areas such as mathematics and social studies. Further, Amanda emphasized the need for students to talk about the topic or theme before reading about it. This classroom talk was an integral part of Amanda’s Spanish literacy instruction; she believed that “se les facilita la lectura y escritura porque saben sobre lo que van a leer y escribir yo pienso.” [it facilitates reading and writing because the students know about what they are reading and writing about, I think]. Further, it is evidence of her commitment to community because communities engage in conversations.

Amanda structured her daily teaching/learning by setting goals based on the state standards; in her own words, “la base de mi instrucción son los estándares de cada asignatura y luego diferencio las metas con actividades creativas como grupos cooperativos, concept board y muchas otras estrategias.” [the base of my instructions are the standards of each subject and then I differentiate the goals with creative activities like cooperative groups, concept board, and many other strategies]. Amanda also explained how she studied the state standards from each subject area (i.e., mathematics, social studies, science, and language arts) and found common knowledge, concepts, and ideas that were part of third and fourth
grade state standards. She then created lesson plans that differentiated according to the levels of literacy and language. Amanda pointed out an interesting approach to programming and lesson designing. That is, “Hago una lista de los estándares y luego escojo los conceptos e ideas principales que estén en los dos niveles y luego hago planes que abarcan las ideas principales de los dos niveles [cuarto y quinto]. A veces las ideas principales son avanzadas entonces ‘I differentiate’ para todos.” [I make a list of all the standards then I select the main concepts and ideas that are in both levels, and then I make plans that encompass the main ideas of both levels (third and fourth). Sometimes the main ideas are advanced; then I differentiate for all].

Amanda’s view of students stemmed from a sense of community that she helped establish in the first month of the school year. Building a community of literacy learners meant that she valued both Spanish and English literacy instructional practices as equal through the use of standards. Also, Amanda’s Spanish literacy instructional practices were structured and standards-based. Amanda believed that “la base de mi instrucción son los estándares.” [The foundation of my instruction are the standards]. Later, I use this notion of ‘foundation ‘to describe Amanda’s teaching metaphor as Teacher as Architect.

**Marisol’s view of students.** The “como familia” [as family] theme was derived from Marisol’s own words. In my first interview with Marisol, she expressed that her students were “como familia” [as family] and in many ways her attitude and actions toward her students were of a caring mother towards her child. For example, she often spoke in a firm voice when she needed them to listen and learn just as many mothers do in their own home. Often Marisol gave a certain look when conversing with her students. Her eyes were fixed on one or two students and her eyebrows would crease downward almost to a frown. This was a
sign whereby the students knew it was time to “straighten up.” Yet, she frequently demonstrated how she could joke around and make her students laugh. For example, most of Marisol’s students borrowed pencils from her desk. One of her students said after borrowing a pencil, “Sí, maestra le voy a dar patrás el lápiz” [Yes, teacher I will give you back the pencil] to which Marisol responded, “cómo que patrás, es regresar el lápiz, porque el lápiz no puede ir para atrás.” [how is it back, it is return the pencil, because the pencil cannot go backwards]. The student chuckled and said “sí, claro regresar el lápiz no patrás” [Yes, of course return the pencil not back].

Marisol’s como familia metaphor stemmed from her own experience in Colombia, her native country. Marisol expressed that her teachers treated all students “como familia.” Influenced by her Latino/a teachers and culture, Marisol’s attitude towards her students reflected that of a teaching mother.

The following examples demonstrate how Marisol engaged and communicated with students and families “como familia” through the use of “consejos.” [advice-giving narratives]. Marisol used “consejos” to bridge understanding of the importance of schooling even amidst personal realities that some students and families had on a daily basis. For example, the consejo of “salir adelante” [coming out ahead] was a term that Marisol used as she expressed her concern about one of her student’s future in education during an interview. Marisol used “consejos” [advice-giving narratives] to encourage one of her students and his mother while going through personal difficulties. Many Mexicano and Chicano families use consejos as a form of parent engagement. Consejos given by the parents/families or teacher have been noted by a number of scholars as tool to motivate and inspire their children (Romo & Falbo, 1996; Delgado-Beltran, 1991; López, 2001) through the schooling process. During
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the pre-interview, I present Marisol with the question: Do you think parent involvement is important? To which she provided evidence of her strong advocacy towards her students and families beyond the classroom context and shared her thoughts with me. Marisol provided a vivid description of a mother’s personal struggle to keep the family intact as they faced challenging obstacles.

_Susana (S):_ ¿Piensas que involucrar los padres es importante?

_Marisol (M):_ La importancia de involucrar los padres en la educación de sus niños es esencial.

_S: _¿Por qué?

_M: _Por ejemplo, ahorita tengo un estudiante que tiene bastantes problemas.

_S: _¿Qué está pasando?


[Susana (S): Do you think parent involvement is important?]

Marisol (M): The importance of parent involvement in their children’s education is essential.

_S: _Why?

_M: _For example, right now I have a student who has a lot of problems.

_S: _What is happening?

_M: _The father of this student is a coyote (a person that crosses people across the Mexico to U.S. border) and he got arrested and sent back to Mexico. And right now I
am trying to find help for the family. Find work for the mother so that she can pay for the rent and food]. (Interview, January 20, 2010)

Furthermore, while planning with Marisol and her teaching partner, one of her students’ parents approached Marisol and asked if she could speak to her. Marisol, without hesitation, agreed to talk to her and asked if it was okay for me to stay during this conversation. Marisol mentioned “Qué pena maestra tengo que hablar con ella” [What a shame I have to talk to her]. I respond, “Por favor, habla con ella.” [Please talk to her]. After the mother left, Marisol shared with me the consejo she gave her student and his mother since Marisol was concerned about her students’ motivation in class since the family’s misfortune.

Marisol: Sé que a Ud. le importa mucho la educación de su niño, y yo sé que ahorita es difícil ayudarle. Es por eso que no obligo a su hijo que traiga la tarea. En clase no está muy enfocado en los estudios. Pero, le dije a él que tiene que hacer el trabajo para que pueda ‘salir adelante’ y ayudar a la familia en el futuro. Él me dijo ‘Maestra, yo solamente quiero ayudarle a mi mamá ahorita, para mí lo más importante es trabajar para tener dinero para la familia.’

[Marisol: I know that the education of your son is very important, and I know that it is difficult to support him right now. This is why I am not compelled to ask Manuel to bring his homework. In class he is not very involved in his studies. But, I did tell him he has to do his work in order for him to “come out ahead” and help his family in the future. He told me, ‘Teacher, I only want to help my Mother right now, for me the most important is to work so that I can have money for the family’]. (Interview, January 2010)
Marisol engaged her parents and students through plática [talk] (Flores-Dueñas, 1997, 1999) and learned about their experiences, as was demonstrated in the example above. At the time of the pre-interview, Marisol was trying to find a job for this mother and had not been successful finding her a job. She felt terrible. Marisol wanted to support the family beyond just the moral encouragement. She was frustrated for not being able to help this family out; I could hear that in her voice as it cracked and her eyes as they got watery throughout the conversation. Marisol shared this because she asked me if I knew of anybody needing a cleaning lady or any other type of work. This family lost their father since he was deported to Mexico and a newborn had just arrived. The family had lost their home and was temporarily living with a friend of the family. However, Marisol mentioned a couple a weeks after the interview that the family got assistance from various organizations that support families in need of shelter and food. I knew that the entire school staff was aware of this situation and involved through phone calls and connections with charity organizations; the school supported this family until they found a home for them. The sense of advocacy that the staff demonstrated in supporting Manuel’s family was in essence a key fundamental piece for Vista del Sol and Marisol clearly embodied this commitment to the community.

Marisol demonstrated in the pre-interview and consejo examples how she viewed her students and families “como familia” [as family] and in many ways her actions toward her students was that of a caring mother towards her child. In the quote above, Marisol knew how important education was for her student and offered him the consejo of seguir adelante [come out ahead]; however, Manuel realized that at this time in his life he had been given the responsibility of being the head of the household. For Manuel to seguir adelante at this time was to do the best he could in school considering the circumstances. And, as Manuel
expressed: “Maestra, yo solamente quiero ayudarle a mi mamá ahorita, para mí lo más importante es trabajar para tener dinero para la familia.” [Teacher, I only want to help my Mother right now, for me the most important is to work so that I can have money for the family]. Marisol respected his outlook on the situation and supported him during class time and with his homework during recess in order for him to seguir adelante in his education.

**Marisol’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices.** Marisol as a teacher was a cultivator within her Spanish literacy instructional practices. This metaphor (Teacher as cultivator) works because Marisol wanted to further cultivate her students’ academic literacy and language in Spanish and English. Marisol was concerned about the literacy levels of her students. She had observed that her students had higher reading scores in Spanish and lower in English. Marisol expected for her students to read in Spanish and English at grade level. During the post-interview, I asked Marisol about Vista del Sol’s dual language education program and instructional goals and expectations. Marisol began by explaining that she wanted to observe other schools and not just be observed, as was the case at Vista del Sol. VS had many visitors throughout the year since the school was considered a veteran dual language school and had always done well in state and district mandated tests. In the following example, Marisol explains why she wanted to observe other schools:

* M: ... ¿sabes qué creo yo que es importante, también? Salir de Vista del Sol a otras escuelas. Y mirar otras escuelas; porque lo que yo pienso es que siempre han venido a mirar a Vista del Sol y siempre... y nosotros nunca; yo nunca he tenido la oportunidad de ir a otra escuela y mirar, wow!.... Una escuela que sea... esté a un nivel más alto que Vista del Sol y, wow! Y los niños: ¿lo que saben los niños! Te acuerdas que te comenté con este niñito que viene de, de...
M: Northern Elementary, de allá cuando, ¡wow, este niño ya está multiplicando two by two, sí, y los de nosotros apenas...! Y well, y, y para ellos, para esas maestras estaba, apenas average el estudiante.

[M: You know what I think it is also important too? Leave Vista del Sol to visit other schools. And see other schools because what I think is people have always come to observe us at Vista del Sol and always …and we never; I have never had the opportunity to go to another school and look, wow…a school that is a level higher than Vista del Sol and wow! And the kids: what the kids know! Do you remember that I commented to you about a kid that comes from, from…

S: Yes

M: Northern elementary, from there, wow! This student was already multiplying by two by two, yes, and ours we were barely…! And well, and, and for these teachers this student was barely average for them]. (Interview, June 7, 2010)

Marisol commented that “Una escuela que sea... esté a un nivel más alto que Vista del Sol y, wow! [A school that is…that is at a level much higher than Vista del Sol and, wow!] Marisol had been tutoring a third grade student from her neighborhood who attended Northern elementary. Through the tutoring Marisol realized the mathematical concepts and skills being taught at Northern elementary were “un nivel más alto” [a higher level] to that of Vista del Sol. Coming to this realization of developing higher teacher expectations, Marisol reported to me that she explained her struggle to her third grade collaborative team in the following example.
This example demonstrated that Marisol became concerned about how well her students were reaching their full potential in mathematics and literacy. Marisol mentioned, “Viendo lo de afuera, como que yo también me abrí, me desperté y wow!” [Seeing it from the outside, it was like I also realized, I woke up and wow!] Marisol saw a need for improvement in her
teaching and learning expectations. Moving forward, Marisol then shared her struggles with the third-grade collaborative team, to which they responded, “ya es fourth grade standards...” [that is fourth grade standards...”]. In other words, the team wanted to focus on the third-grade expectations rather than the fourth grade. Also, Marisol mentioned that one of the teachers commented, “pero los estudiantes tienen que master it y luego seguir adelante.” [but the students need to master it and then move ahead]. I then asked Marisol, “¿Cuando tú estás haciendo un tema o cualquier enseñanza y luego después quieres analizar qué tan bien lo aprendieron, cómo sabes si los estudiantes están listos para seguir adelante en español o inglés?” [When you are teaching a theme or whatever teaching and learning you are doing and then you want to analyze how well they learned it, how do you know that the students are ready to move ahead in Spanish or English?] Marisol provided me with an example of how she did an “informal assessment” during an English literacy lesson about comparing Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King using a timeline to document their accomplishments that her teaching partner, Tammy, had taught. Marisol explained that since planning and delivery of instruction for this lesson was extensive, she wanted to interview some students whom felt did not understand everything that was being taught during this English literacy activity. In the following example, Marisol describes the “informal assessment” she did to make sure her students understood the literacy activity that day since she would be building upon it in Spanish the following day.

M: Sí, exacto. Algo, por ejemplo: Tammy enseñó sobre Abraham Lincoln. Hizo un timeline de Abraham Lincoln y les dio lecturas de Abraham Lincoln y ellos pusieron las fechas importantes, y... y compararon a Abraham Lincoln con Martin Luther King y todo Martin... todo eso... pero cuál... ¿qué quería ella con todo eso? ¿Cuál
era el purpose? ¿Cuál era el objetivo de todo eso? Y yo pienso: entonces al final, bueno, ¿y qué aprendieron? ¿Qué aprendieron? Entonces, este... yo le pregunté a ella: y, bueno, and what are you gonna assess from all of this? ¿qué quieres? Porque da muchísima información, mucha, mucha, mucha. ¿Qué quieres? Entonces este... hizo como interés, le di... hablamos y no sé qué, como compare, comparing, y hizo que los niños escribieran, eh, comparing... este Abraham Lincoln con... con Martin Luther King, en qué cosa se parecían y... y este... y hizo R.A.C.E., ah, strategies, y más o menos. Pero... ahm... pero a eso me refiero: planea uno todo un proyecto, una unidad y, y... Y fíjate que con esa estrategia de GLAD que Tammy hizo del Historical Time Line, yo estaba allí en el salón con ella cuando lo estaba enseñando; teníamos a los dos grupos juntos; entonces, yo le dije a Tammy: sólo por curiosidad voy hacer un Informal Assessment con los ELL students. Entrevisté los cinco estudiantes... para ver si esa estrategia y todo lo que ella había hecho, los estudiantes aprendieron. No. Ninguno de los cinco niños pudo contestar. Nada, y ella quedó!... ya que le [inaudible, pounding noise] no es para... que tú te sientas mal sino es para realmente... que esa estrategia no sirve o hay que modificarla o hay que cambiarle cosas porque, ah... no. los de... inglés, su primer idioma: todo lo contestaron... pero cuando yo escogía los otros, no pudieron.

[M: Yes exactly. Something, for example: Tammy taught about Abraham Lincoln. She made a timeline of Abraham Lincoln and gave them readings about Abraham Lincoln and the students wrote down significant dates, and ... and they compared Abraham Lincoln to Martin Luther King and all of Martin... all of that ... but which... what did she want to happen with all of this? Which was the purpose? Which was the
objective of all of this? And I thought: then at the end, well, and what did they learn? Then, I asked her: what are you going to assess from all of this? What do you want? Since the lesson gave a lot of information. What is it you want? Then this sparked some interest, Tammy told me that the class compared and she made the students write about comparing Abraham Lincoln with Martin Luther King, in which way are they the same and used R.A.C.E. strategies, and so. But this is what I am referring to: we plan out a project, a unit and with these GLAD strategies that Tammy did with the historical time line, I was there in the classroom with her when she was teaching; we had both groups together; then, I told Tammy: just out of curiosity I will do an informal assessment with the ELL students. I interviewed the five students ... to see if that strategy and all that she had done had the students learned. No. Not one of the five students could respond anything to me. Nothing, and Tammy was surprised and then as I [inaudible, pounding noise] it wasn’t for her... for her to feel bad. It was more to realistically... that the strategy did not work or that we need to modify or we have to change some parts because, ah... no. The ones... English was their first language: they were able to answer …but when I chose the other ones, they could not]. (Interview, June 7, 2010)

Marisol’s concern about further developing her students’ literacy potentials was clearly seen in this example in that she often took note of the teaching and learning taking place in either Tammy’s or her classroom. In this example, Tammy had developed an English Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) (Bretchel, 2005) literacy unit that focused on historical figures. Marisol observed the students learning about Abraham Lincoln since they had decided to bring both classes together for this particular activity. Thus, the instruction
that Tammy provided in this particular class example was delivered in English. As Marisol sat in back of the classroom to support Tammy, Marisol wondered if her English language learners understood the information being presented. Marisol then proceeded to interview her students to see if learning was occurring. In her own words, “Entrevisté los cinco estudiantes... para ver si esta estrategia y todo lo que ella había hecho y qué fue lo que los estudiantes aprendieron.” [I interviewed the five students... to see if the strategy and all that she had done with the students and to see what learning took place]. Marisol’s findings were that “No. Ninguno de los cinco niños pudo contestar. Nada, y nos quedamos sorprendidas! [No. Not one of the five could answer. And, we were very surprised!] Marisol explained that she did not want for her partner teacher to feel bad about her critique; however, Marisol wanted to learn from and improve upon their literacy practices. Marisol mentioned “que esa estrategia no sirve o hay que modificarla o hay que cambiarle algo...” [that this strategy does not work or the need to modify it or the need to change something...]

Marisol’s candid response to my interview question, “¿cómo sabes si los estudiantes están listos para seguir adelante?” [How do you know when the students are ready to move ahead?] demonstrated her level of commitment and expectations to the students’ literacy learning. Marisol’s reflection upon her Spanish literacy instructional practices, including her partner teacher’s English literacy practice as demonstrated in the preceding examples, showed Marisol’s determination to continuously improve upon her literacy practices for the benefit of her students. Marisol believed that her students could develop academic literacy in both languages, thus, promoting biliteracy trajectories. In a later section, Marisol’s literacy practices, as enacted in her classroom, will be described to demonstrate how she cultivated
students’ Spanish literacy potential. As a cultivator, Marisol empowered the students by providing tools needed to allow them to grow towards their educational pursuit.

**Tracy’s view of students.** Unlike Amanda’s *con respeto* [with respect] and *como comunidad* [sense of community] and Marisol’s *como familia* [sense of family] theme that was derived from their own words, I labeled Tracy’s view as “*con cariño*” [with fondness] generated from the concept of “authentic caring” (Nodding, 1992, 1984; Valenzuela, 1999). Nodding’s (1984) concept of authentic caring “views sustained reciprocal relationships between teachers and students as the basis for all learning” (as cited in Valenzuela, 1999, p. 61). The concept of authentic caring in the field of bilingual education and English as a second language was studied by Valenzuela (1999). Her groundbreaking research on the *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring* representing the U.S.-Mexican youth voiced how they saw schooling being done in their high school. In Valenzuela’s research the teachers’ view of their students was from a deficit view, thus they taught them through a remedial and low standards approach. The students’ view towards their teachers was that their teachers did not care about them because of their cultural and linguistic background. Unlike Valenzuela’s research, I found that Tracy viewed her students through a positive lens as demonstrated in her teaching as well as her interactions with families. Tracy understood the importance of sustaining caring relationships in her literacy teaching and learning. In the following example, Tracy was respectful and caring when she described her students during an interview:

*Yo sé que soy Anglo aunque siempre quiero ser a wanna be Hispanic en veces como Anglos queremos mirar los estudiantes como inferior pero yo trato de mirar las vidas*
I know that I am an Anglo even though I want to be a want to be Hispanic. Sometimes as Anglos we want to see the students as inferior but I try to see my students’ lives like very important lives just like mine. Always respecting them even though they are different from my culture…] (Interview, January 21, 2010)

In this example, Tracy mentioned “Siempre respetarlos aunque sean diferentes de mi cultura” [Always respect them even though they are different from my culture]. Tracy always tried to teach con cariño, helping the students to understand the differences in other cultures and language while still honoring their own heritage. Tracy used words and a tone that could only be interpreted as an attitude of caring and respect for her students. This was a trend that continued as she talked about their home language, literacy and culture.

For Tracy it was important to develop a supportive relationship with her students and it began with having a joint relationship that respected each other’s cultures, languages and home life. The following example taken from the pre-interview further demonstrated how she was mindful of her students’ backgrounds:

Susana (S): ¿Qué recomiendas para maestros/as Anglos que enseñan en escuelas diversas o escuelas de lenguaje dual?

Tracy (T): Recuerda que cada niño tiene su propia vida fuera de la escuela y tenemos que recordarnos de esto. Siempre me pongo a pensar solamente en la enseñanza, lo que deben de aprender y tengo que recordar que cosas pasan. Y en veces con unos niños digo, “¡Hay este niño me está volviendo loca!” Pues puede ser que su casa se estaba quemando “his house burned down.” O como uno de los estudiantes de
Amanda su papá se fue de viaje y no volverá por meses. Entonces siempre hay cosas que afectan a nuestros estudiantes y tenemos que estar consciente sobre esto.

[Susana (S): What can you recommend to Anglo teachers that teach in diverse schools or dual language immersion schools?

Tracy (T): Remember that each student has his/her own life outside of the school and we need to remind ourselves of this. I always just think about what they need to learn and I have to remember that things happen. And sometimes with some students I say, “Oh, this kid is driving me crazy!” But it could be that his house burned down. Or like one of Amanda’s students his father went on a trip and will not return for months. Then there are always things that affect our students and we have to be conscious of this]. (Interview, January 21, 2010)

In this example, Tracy talked about “tenemos que estar consciente sobre esto” [we have to be conscious of this]. The importance of embedding ethics in her teaching practice was evident when she shared about how life circumstances and challenges often affect a student's education. This pattern was part of Tracy’s view of her students, seeing them as subjects rather than mere objects (Freire, 1970). Tracy did not just teach this but she lived it by being concerned about a student's home life, and how a specific difficulty affected them at school. For example, before the fifth grade graduation, Tracy approached me and asked, “Is it possible to borrow a nice shirt from your son since one of my students does not have one and right now his parents cannot get one?” To which I replied, “Of course.” Tracy demonstrated how concerned she was towards the students’ livelihood and constantly reminded herself that she needed to look at a student's circumstance through a more diverse lens rather than a Eurocentric and socioeconomic lens.
Tracy’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices. Tracy’s view of self as a dual language teacher developed through the following patterns found in the data. The patterns were coded to best describe the action or response that the teacher gave to me. The following examples were taken from post-interview and best justify Tracy’s voice towards her Spanish literacy instructional practice. In the first example, I will illustrate how Tracy’s layout of the lecto-escritura (literacy) lesson led the students through a process that guided them through various points of learning. In the end, students then created their own text to be used as a resource while taking their end-of-the-lesson teacher-made exam.

In the following post-interview Tracy explained how she guided teaching/learning with her students through Spanish literacy.

Tracy: En GLAD hacen los grupos expertos. Pero esta vez yo adapte esta actividad. En manera que hice una gráfica para guiar y enseñar la información en esta manera. Entonces adaptando la estrategia para guiar la enseñanza es importante, por ejemplo:

Creamos la información en la tabla, el formato con puntos, luego transforman esta información para escribir en párrafos u otra redacción. Fue buena práctica.

[Tracy: In GLAD there are expert groups. But this time I adapted this activity. In this manner, I made a chart to guide and teach this information in this manner. So adapting the strategy in order to guide learning is important, for example: Creating the information on the table, using a bullet format, then they transform this information to write a paragraph or any other writing. It was great practice].

(Interview, May 11, 2010)
Tracy explained how she guided the students in their Spanish literacy using “la tabla de información o proceso” [the table of information or process] strategy that she learned from a training on Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) (Bretchel, 2005) the summer prior to this study and adapted it to better teach her students. She took a reading selection, which students had already read, from their social studies textbook about the three branches of government. Then, Tracy wrote this information in bulleted format that was jointly generated by providing an outline for students to create a text.

In the following example, Tracy responds to my question during the pre-interview of how she monitors her students’ progress in Spanish literacy learning throughout the year. Tracy responded and mentioned that one of the components of reading that her students were missing was “critical thinking.” Tracy believes that teacher made tests should be used as a guide to better inform Spanish literacy instruction and curriculum.

Tracy: Yo solamente miré, por ejemplo, en lectura qué es lo que les faltó. Y fue critical thinking. Entonces me enfoco en esto durante mi instrucción. Yo quiero que ellos/as piensen en lo que leen y críticamente no solamente respondiendo preguntas básicas de comprensión. Pero mi guía durante el año es mis pruebas para ver que también están aprendiendo lo que hemos estudiado durante el año.

[Tracy: I only looked, for example, in reading what is it that is missing. This was critical thinking, so then I focused on this during my instruction. I want for them to think about what they are reading and critically not only responding to basic comprehension questions. But my guides during the year are my tests to see how well they are learning what we have studied during the year]. (Interview, January 21, 2010)
Tracy mentioned critical thinking as one of the Spanish literacy components that were missing from the students’ literacy repertoires in Spanish and English. The critical thinking skills topic had been addressed at a staff meeting by the instructional coach and a fifth grade teacher. This topic was a school wide concern and most teachers wanted to integrate more critical thinking skills during their literacy block. For this reason, Tracy and other upper grade teachers began to construct teacher-made exams that included more critical thinking rather than just close-response types of comprehension questions. After some research, Tracy collaborated with other teachers and created a test that reflected a more holistic way of testing rather than just emphasizing comprehension (See Appendix P). In this pruebita del gobierno [government quiz] you will see that Tracy begins with multiple choice questions followed by open-ended questions about democracy and levels of government in the U.S.

Tracy’s self-identified metaphor of Teacher as Guide demonstrated the process of teaching and learning Spanish literacy within a dual language context. Tracy mentioned that “Dual Language immersion teachers have many challenges and one big challenge is how one adapts methods and activities to best meet the teaching of Spanish literacy.” The challenge of adapting English literacy methodology to Spanish has been a topic that Escamilla (2000) points out that many teacher preparation programs and professional development trainings ask teachers to adapt best practices in English reading to Spanish. Bartolomé (2000) explains how dual language teachers believe in teaching Spanish literacy but have the pressure of overstressing English literacy because of the burdens of testing. For Tracy, guiding the students through reading and writing in Spanish meant using mediated structures so students could use as a scaffold when creating academic text.
Classroom Observations

I begin this section with the classroom examples of the teachers’ view of students. Studying DL teachers’ views was an area of education that has not been extensively explored in bilingual education classrooms. Classroom observations provided examples of how the teachers’ viewed their students throughout the research study. Then, I provide classroom examples of the teachers’ view of Spanish literacy instructional practices (SLIP) through metaphors that portray the present view of dual language education as a resource rather than a deficit. Understanding DL teachers’ views of Spanish literacy practices can then further link to how they view and teach their students. I applied Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Santa Ana’s (2002) metaphor research as an analytical framework. The cultivator and construction metaphor provided me with a “lens” to which I correlated with that of the emerging in vivo patterns (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of each teacher’s view of self as a Spanish literacy educator. Further, my findings also indicated a new metaphor, which is Teacher as Guide. In this section, I describe the metaphors the teachers taught by in order to describe and capture the essence of each teacher or the metaphors teachers taught by in this research.

I begin by describing the classroom examples of the teachers’ view of students (con respecto, como familia, and con cariño) then the classroom examples of teachers’ views of Spanish literacy instructional practices (SLIP) (architect, cultivator, and guide).

Classroom examples of Amanda’s view of students. From the very first classroom observation, I noticed that Amanda had great rapport with her students, that the classroom had an atmosphere of community and culture, and yet had a highly energetic tone of high expectations. I often found myself writing field notes as fast as I could when observing her
class. The classroom discourse generated this energy almost as if they bounced this energy off each other with an array of questions, opinions, and many other inquiring responses. In the following example, I present how Amanda demonstrated *respeto* and a sense of community towards her students by validating and valuing their input during a science lesson on space. This classroom example represented a student-centered approach. That is, when students have the regular opportunity to have the floor in the classroom, even if it is correcting the teacher in her use of Spanish, such practices became routine where a sense of community, *respeto*, and students become the center of the teaching/learning literacy process.

Amanda integrated science and social studies content and concepts while teaching the literacy process (reading, writing, and oral language). The examples you will read about are based on science concepts as Amanda had a classroom brainstorm about the solar system.

Amanda came in right on time. She had 2 bags and her purse dangled from her shoulder. She greeted me and mentioned “I hope you got my message.” I nodded and said, “Oh yes, I did. Thanks for letting me know.” The message was that she was going to be running late and her teaching partner would be there for about 15 minutes in the morning. She continued to walk to her desk by the west wall of the classroom. She then placed everything on the desk and began to talk with her teaching partner for a minute or two. Then, she walked to the front of the class and told the students in English, “We are going to move to Spanish now. Is everybody ready?” The students nodded in agreement and said an emphatic “¡Si!” [yes!] She placed a yellow chart paper on to the white bulletin board on the south wall of the room used to write student generated responses. And, then Amanda began the literacy activity. In this classroom example I indicate the student input in the plural since student talk was so spontaneous and I often could not distinguish who gave the input.
Therefore, I indicate by writing *alumnos/as* (As) for students [Ss] since for the most part it was a class effort.

*Amanda (A):* ¿Qué saben sobre el espacio?

*Alumnos/as (As):* ¡Está lejos de la tierra! [Estudiantes responden en voz alta]

*As:* flotas en el espacio

*As:* hoyos negros

*As:* estaciones: otoño, invierno...

*Amanda:* ¿Cuál otras estaciones?

*A3:* espring

*Amanda:* Espring. ¿Cómo se dice en español?

*As:* ¡Primavera! [todos dicen primavera]

*As:* verano

*As:* El espacio es infinito.

*As:* meteoritos, eje, planeta, orbitrar y girar

[Amanda: Tell me about Space.

Students (Ss): It is far away from Earth! (Some students reply loudly)

Ss: You float in space.

Ss: Black holes

Ss: Seasons: fall, winter…

Amanda: What other seasons?

S3: espring

Amanda: Espring. How do you say it in Spanish?

Ss: Spring! (everybody yells out spring)
Ss: summer

Amanda: What else?

Ss: Space is infinite.

Ss: Meteorites, axis, planet, orbit and rotate] (Classroom Observation, February 16, 2010)

This classroom example showed how Amanda accessed her students’ prior knowledge. This classroom discourse was typical in that she began with an open-ended question “¿Qué saben sobre el espacio?” [What do you know about space?] The students then called out their responses and Amanda wrote each on to yellow chart paper that was placed in the front of the class white board. A student also said, “espring.” Often Spanish speakers will add an e in front of words in English that begin with the blend “sp”, “sch”, amongst others in order to conform to the phonological rules of Spanish. For example, school in Spanish is escuela. Similar to the English term, however, the blend “sch” does not exist in Spanish, so many times the cross-linguistic transfer will be to add an e to eschool or espring as the example above illustrated. Nevertheless, Amanda does not stop and correct the student in front of class; rather, she included everybody and said “¿Cómo se dice en español?” [How do you say it in Spanish?] and was inclusive in her approach.

Furthermore, in the following example Amanda gets corrected while she continued to teach about space. This demonstrates that Amanda allowed her students to provide corrective feedback about her teaching; thus modeling to the students that she respected their input and that she did not have all the knowledge and language at all times.

Amanda (A): ¿Qué más?

As: día y noche
Amanda: y ahora qué son los objetos que están en el espacio.

As: (no response by students)

Amanda: satellite (pronounced the word in English)

[Amanda: What else?
Ss: night and day
Amanda: And, now what are the objects that are in space…
Ss: (no response)
Amanda: satellite (pronounces the word in English)] (Classroom Observation, March 2, 2010)

Throughout this classroom interaction, Amanda continued to write onto a yellow chart paper all the information that students called out. As Amanda wrote, she thought out loud and seemed to be having a little trouble writing and pronouncing the word satellite, so she got corrected by several students.

Amanda: Es sa—ti---lites…

Alumno 13 (A13): Maestra no se dice así; es satélite.

Amanda: Haber dilo otra vez, por favor.

A13 and A17: sa-té-li-te (estudiantes lo pronuncian junto) satélite

Amanda: Todos juntos vamos a decir la palabra sa-té-li-te otra vez satélite

Amanda: Muchas gracias por ayudarme aprendí como decir la palabra y deletrearla.

¡Todos nos ayudamos!

[Amanda: Is it sa-ti------lites…

Student 13 (S13): Teacher, you do not say it that way; it is satélite.

Amanda: Let’s see; could you repeat that again?
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Similar to the first example, however, this time the teacher was interrupted and corrected by two students in using the word “satélite.” [satellite] The teacher responded positively and inclusively; she respected their input and the students taught her and the rest of class how to say it, together. Amanda ended with telling the class “¡Todos nos ayudamos!” [We all help each other!] This further suggested that Amanda respected their input and she demonstrated this mutual respect by applying the students’ linguistic input into her own teaching and learning.

Amanda then looked at me and said, “Ellos me ayudan.” [They help me]. She mispronounced the word satellite, but it did not seem to affect her at all. That is, the students corrected Amanda and she then pronounced it the way the students told her. She then moved on to her next point of the lesson. She was, however, interrupted by a student who mentioned “Maestra, Usted tiene dificultad con las palabras que tienen la rr.” [Teacher, it is difficult for you to pronounce the words that have rr]. Amanda gave a big nod, “Sí las palabras con rr son difícil para mí” [Yes, the words with rr are difficult for me] and then transitioned to teaching mathematics. Although both Amanda and Tracy expressed that their Spanish was sufficiently proficient to teach in a dual language classroom, they both mentioned that sometimes it was difficult to remember or know the language of certain content areas. The “satellite” example demonstrated how Amanda was not sure of the pronunciation, so the students helped her out. I also observed Tracy forgetting the word for “county,” to which the
students reminded her that it was “condado.” In fact, I saw this correction pattern with all three teachers. Amanda, Tracy, and Marisol were approachable and comfortable in allowing students to be a part of the teaching and learning taking place in their classrooms without feeling threatened by the students’ input.

Amanda’s teaching was dynamic; that is, once she started a classroom activity such as the brainstorm, above, it was non-stop until it was time to shift to another subject matter. I often had a difficult time keeping up with teacher/student input. This fast paced classroom was admired by the students. For example, they cheered “¡La maestra llegó!” [The teacher has arrived!] as she walked into the classroom. I also noticed that most students wanted Amanda to choose them during classroom activities and sat at the edge of their seats waving their arms from side to side.

This choral calling out discourse, whereby students called out words or phrases they knew about planets and space, was a typical teaching strategy Amanda used when introducing a new concept or subject. As I mentioned before, my first impression of her classroom environment was energy flowing throughout the room from student to student and back again from the teacher. This community oriented, student-centered classroom, represents the reverence or respecto that Amanda had towards her students and was a good representation of her view of students.

Classroom examples of Amanda’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices. I did not hear Amanda use the word architect to describe her Spanish literacy instructional practices. However, Amanda’s teaching methods were well structured around standards and built upon students’ background knowledge, thus the metaphor I use for her
teaching is that of an architect. I presented this metaphor to Amanda and she approved of the
teacher as architect metaphor.

Amanda’s class was different from that of Marisol’s and Tracy’s in that she had a
combined third and fourth grade class. This combination class challenged Amanda in many
ways. For example, she had to set up a class schedule that comprised of teaching both grade
level expectations in mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts in Spanish. This,
of course, was not possible every day except in mathematics since it was a school decision to
follow the spiral Everyday Math curriculum school wide, which supposedly allowed for
many mathematical levels to be addressed at once. Amanda structured her daily
teaching/learning by setting goals based on the state standards in her own words: “la base de
mi instrucción son los estándares de cada asignatura y luego diferencio las metas con
actividades creativas como grupos cooperativos, concept board y muchas otras estrategias.”
[the base of my instruction is the standards of each subject and then I differentiate the goals
with creative activities like cooperative groups, concept board, and many other strategies].
Amanda also explained how she studied the state standards from each subject area (i.e.,
mathematics, social studies, science, and language arts) and found common knowledge,
concepts, and ideas that were part of third and fourth grade state standards then differentiated
the instruction for literacy and language. Amanda pointed out an interesting approach to
programming and lesson designing. In her own words,

Hago una lista de los estándares y luego escojo los conceptos e ideas principales que
estén en los dos niveles y luego hago planes que abarcan las ideas principales de los
dos niveles (cuarto y quinto). A veces las ideas principales son avanzadas entonces “I
differentiate” para todos.
[I make a list of all the standards. Then I select the main concepts and ideas that are in both levels and then I make plans that encompass the main ideas of both levels (third and fourth). Sometimes the main ideas are advanced; then I differentiate for all].

(Classroom Observation, March 22, 2010)

To follow, the Spanish literacy practice integrated into a theme study, I name it as “Lectura Integrada.” [Integrated Reading]. While I was in Amanda’s classroom, I observed her teach three theme studies integrated with literacy these were: solar system, New Mexico’s government and history, and soil and environmental issues, each lasting roughly six weeks. I present evidence of how Amanda taught differentiated instruction (through the use of visuals, auditory, and kinesthetic supports) and constructed knowledge through class input based on the oral responses of her students. Amanda’s strategic teaching began with student generated knowledge utilizing open-ended questions to start the class demonstration. In the following example, Amanda led the students through an array of hands-on activities that include reading text, writing, and orally restating words, phrases, etc. Amanda concluded the lesson with students writing a song that included the new vocabulary and teacher/student generated knowledge.

**Lectura integrada [Integrated reading]**. Many students’ arms were raised and waved from side to side in order to give the teacher information about space and the meaning of the new vocabulary. One student was at the edge of his seat wanting for the teacher to select her, but a student in the front of the class was selected. He began to talk about Super Nova’s. She noted his response and others on the left side of the chart placed on the white board in the front of the class. This list of student and teacher-generated words became the new vocabulary words the students would learn during this theme study.
Amanda’s students were always eager to learn and were excited about the topic at hand; they demonstrated it by many raising their hands and eagerly waiting to be called on to share. This type of response to new knowledge or theme/unit studies being introduced was a pattern that I often saw in Amanda’s classroom. The teacher and students approached learning with much energy.

Following the brainstorm, students wrote down a new list of vocabulary words that were taken from the Spanish science textbook. Prior to beginning any theme study, all the students read the science text either through guided reading or independent reading. This was done so that all students had some knowledge about the topic being studied. The activity below further demonstrates how Amanda builds upon the student’s knowledge on space and other objects.

Amanda got a globe and a flashlight and began to tell the students that she had another surprise for them. The students were enthused, and they began to clap. She then gave a student a flashlight and asked another student to turn off the classroom lights. Amanda held a globe while a student placed the light on China. Amanda demonstrated how the world rotated by saying, “Vamos a ver como gira la Tierra.” [Let’s see how the earth rotates].

_Amanda (A): Después de girar una vez... (Student gives her a post-it) Girar una vez._

_¿Qué piensan que es un día? Sí o no._

_Alumnos (As): ¡Sí!_

_A: ¿Cuántas horas hay en un día?_

_As: 24 horas_

_A: ¿Qué acción hago ahora?”_

_As: orbitar o girar_
Amanda (A): After rotating one time… (Student gave her a post-it) rotate one time. Do you think it was one day?
Students (Ss): Yes!
A: How many hours are in a day?
As: 24 hours
A: What action am I doing now?
As: orbit or rotate] (Classroom Observation, April 5, 2010)

Amanda then proceeded to demonstrate that the Earth moved a certain way, so she showed slowly how the Earth orbits around the sun. The sun was represented by the flashlight that the student was holding. As she rotated the globe or Earth, she continued to ask the students questions. “¿Cuántos días hay en un año?” [How many days are in a year?] Students replied, “365.” Amanda extended their reply and said that every four years we have 366 days.

Amanda: ¿Adrián dónde está el eje?
Alumno: Es algo que no se mira. (she showed by pointing to the imaginary line on the globe.)

[Amanda: Where is the axis?
Student: It is something that you cannot see. He showed by pointing to the imaginary line on the globe]. (Classroom Observation, April 5, 2010)

Amanda continued to question the students: “¿Cuántos planetas hay?” [How many planets are there?] The students then called out, “Nueve.” [nine]. Amanda then explained to the students that the most recent information she researched about planets stated that Pluto was not a planet. The students sigh and ask “¿es cierto?” [Is it true?] One student recalled that it was a fact, “Parece que yo oyí algo así” [It seems as if I heard something like that]. Amanda
continued to explain that the earth orbits and students continued to look at the globe. Amanda continued, “¿Hay 24 horas en un día?” [Are there 24 hours in a day?] One student responded and went up to the front of the class to show how the Earth rotated by making the motion in a circular way and continuously moving until it makes a full rotation. As Amanda continued to ask questions about the planets and space, students continued to hold their hands up and hoped they would be selected to answer. Amanda always recognized everybody who wanted to give a response, so she often said, “Edgar primero y luego Samuel, y Martha, etc.” [Edgar first then Samuel, and Martha, etc.] The students then put their hands down and waited their turn to tell the class about what they knew about space and planets. There was such eagerness to share their everyday and new knowledge that Amanda often asked her students to first share with their neighbor before they spoke out loud in class.

Amanda continued with the activity by writing verbatim the students’ knowledge onto the chart paper in front of the class. Amanda elaborated as needed in order to clarify and expand on certain information about the solar system or space. Amanda then gave the students a preview of what was to come next as they learned about the solar system and beyond; she told the students, “Pronto vamos hacer el sistema solar.” [Soon we will make a the solar system]. Students were enthused, bouncing up and down from their chair and saying “¡Sí, Sí!” [Yes, Yes!] Amanda continued on with the activity and taught more solar system facts, ideas and concepts. After the classroom demonstration, Amanda moved to the application part of the integrated lesson. Amanda had the students write a chant/song using the new vocabulary and knowledge that they had just learned. After about ten to fifteen minutes of the students working on their chants/songs in pairs or triads, the teacher asked several groups to share, “¿Quien quiere compartir su canción?” [Who wants to share their
Almost all the students raised their hand, and the class ended with two students sharing their song with the class.

In this classroom example, Amanda demonstrated a well-structured introduction to solar system that derived from the New Mexico State Science and Language Arts standards. Amanda then constructed a demonstration that scaffold the learning at various learning levels. Amanda’s demonstration strategically placed the students at the center of teaching/learning by building upon her student’s background knowledge of the topic being studied. The metaphor for Amanda, was Teacher as Architect, describes how she viewed her Spanish literacy instructional practices. Amanda structured her teaching by first planning a structure (lesson planning) then building scaffolds that provided input and intake of the ideas and knowledge. Lastly, she allowed them to construct their knowledge through creating a chant or song with all the content vocabulary and other concepts learned that day. As an architect, Amanda laid the foundation through the use of concept maps, such as the one in Appendix H that shows how Amanda made sense of the state standards then created a visual map for herself to demonstrate to her students the overall New Mexico government and history theme study. She created her lesson plans and then systemically built on each piece of learned knowledge, moving the students to demonstrate their learning in different modes: songs, expository texts, and diagrams.

**Classroom examples of Marisol’s view of students.** In many classroom observations, I heard and saw how Marisol viewed her students “como familia” by referring to students with “palabras suaves” [kind words] (Bartolomé, 2008). There was a consistent pattern in which palabras suaves Marisol used were specific to whether the student was a girl or boy. For instance, during a lesson where the students were learning about making
predictions a girl responded “*una predicción es como …*” [a prediction is like…], Marisol responded, “*sí, mi reina.*” [yes, my queen]. In other instances, I heard her address boys as “*mi hijo.*” [my son]. Another *palabra suave* Marisol used was the expression “*¡Dios Santo!*” [Blessed God!] after students did something great such as a student reciting the multiples of 12 in less than a minute; after this, one of her students said, “*Dios Santo, es lo que mi mamá dice también*” [Oh my God, that’s also what my mother says] and smiled.

Marisol was always aware of her students’ family lives outside of the school context. I often saw Marisol having a “*plática*” [conversation] (Flores-Dueñas, 1997) with a family member, as many Spanish-speaking families do around the dinner table with families after school. The *pláticas* were often about their child’s school work, but many times the conversations led to advising the family to enroll in the school’s ESL classes and family literacy nights. Marisol knew from experience that this would be good for both the parents and their child. Vista del Sol families were primarily Spanish speakers with many of the parents understanding some English.

In these small ways Marisol exhibited that she viewed her students as family and, although she was always respected as a professional, it wouldn’t be long before each student and parent saw her as family too. For instance, during mathematics lesson, as Marisol circulated the classroom to check for understanding, one student raised his hand and said “*no entiendo mami.*” [I do not understand mommy]. Students began to laugh at the students comment since the student called the teacher “*mami.*” To which Marisol replied to the class, “*mami, tía─ pero nomás no me digan abuela!*” [mommy, aunt, but never say grandmother!]

As an example of Marisol demonstrating how she viewed her students as *familia* [family], in the following exchange I focused on specific aspects of her Spanish literacy
instructional practice of *dichos* [moral saying]. *Dichos* are often used in Spanish-speaking families as a way to teach their children moral lessons, and her use of them underscores her view of herself as a mother. In many ways, Marisol used traditional and conventional *dichos* to convey an important lesson to be learned about a main concept being studied. Marisol also used *dichos* as an anchor to get the students interested in the topic at hand. For example, during a social studies lesson while reading about consumerism, she began with a conventional *dicho* “*Ser un consumidor juicioso.*” [Being a wise consumer]. She selected from the text and began a dialogue about the importance of being a wise consumer. Marisol began by connecting the *dicho* with students, and that brought forth a discussion of the multiple meaning of “*Ser un consumidor juicioso*” [A wise consumer] from their perspective.

*Marisol (M):* ¿Qué quiere decir juicioso?

*Alumno/a 1 (A1):* Significa ser amable y bueno

*M:* Puede ser un poquito. Supongamos que la Señora Ortega entra y dice ‘maestra como se portaron hoy?’ Y yo digo, ‘estuvieron muy juiciosos, atentos. ¿Hicieron todo lo que tenían qué hacer?’

*A1:* Significa escuchar...

*M:* ¿Cómo creen que sus padres obtienen el dinero para pagar la comida, bills, carro...?

[Marisol (M): What does wise mean?]

*Student 1 (S1):* It means to be nice and good.

*M:* It could be a little. Let’s pretend that Mrs. Ortega enters and says, ‘teacher how did they behave today?’ and I say, ‘they were very wise, sensible. Did they do everything that they had to do?’
S1: It means to listen…] (Classroom Observation, February, 3, 2010)

Marisol then, at this point was asking the students to think of how their parents paid for their food, etc. This opened the flood gates in that everybody had a response. Some of the students’ responses were the following: “mi mamá trabaja en asistencia, vendiendo, le prestan dinero, las taxes, arrienda, mi mamá compra nuestra ropa y comida con el dinero que mi papá le da…” [my mother works in assistance living, selling, loaned money, taxes, lease, my mother pays for our clothes with the money my father gives her…] Marisol continued talking with the students about being a wise consumer.

M: Ay mami quiero juguetes, cine, albercas, Cliffs, ITs y el Fun center. Todo eso cuesta dinero. Para poder pagar todo esto tengo que ser juicioso. Y si me gasto todo el dinero en el cine…

Alumno/a 11 (A11): ¡Bad choice, maestra!

M: Me pueden correr de la casa, quitar el carro…

A11: la ropa

A5: ¡Ay no!

[Marisol (M): Oh mother I want toys, movies, swimming pool, Cliff’s, ITs, and Fun center. All of this costs money. In order to be able to pay for all of this I have to be wise. And, if I spend all my money at the movies…

Student 11 (S11): Bad choice, teacher!

M: They can chase me out of my house, and take away my car…

S11: Your clothes

S5: Oh, No!] (Classroom Observation, February, 3, 2010)
Marisol used *dichos* as a tool to promote social and academic participation in the classroom. By introducing the students to the dicho “*Ser un consumidor juicioso*” [Being a wise consumer], she began to include their social knowledge of the word *juicioso* [wise]. The students’ social knowledge counted in the classroom dialogue. One student said “*juicioso*” meant “*amable y bueno.*” [nice and good]. Although many did not know the exact meaning, Marisol allowed for any response even though it was inaccurate. Marisol acknowledged and said, "*Puede ser un poquito*" [it could be a little bit] or used some of their knowledge and expanded the meaning. This led to *conexiones familiares* [family connections] where the examples that the students gave were related to how their family got and spent money or not (e.g., *Mi mamá compra nuestra ropa y comida con el dinero que mi papá le da*) [My mother buys our clothes and food with the money that my dad gives her]. Marisol then ended this lesson by emphasizing the importance of making wise choices of the consumption of products and services by saying, “*Y si me gasto todo el dinero en el cine…*” [And if I spend all my money at the movies…], prompting a student to respond by saying, “¡Bad choice, maestra!” Suggesting that the teacher was not a “wise consumer” and needed to make better choices so that she does not lose her clothes as well. Marisol, through the use of *dichos*, ended this dialogue with teaching the students a lesson about being a wise consumer and making good choices rather than bad choices, thus teaching a lesson through *dichos* to all her students.

In the previous classroom example, Marisol demonstrated how she listened keenly to what the students had to say about the *dichos* and how she used *dichos* to teach/learn a lesson about life or being a wise consumer. Also, Marisol often included humor in her teaching and was often called *Mami* by her students. At times Marisol could anticipate students’ responses
and would finish their sentences. Again, this was a characteristic that often reminded me of how I often communicate with my own children. Hence, *Marisol the Teaching Mother* example described in this section portrays many characteristics of a Latina teacher (Bartolomè, 2008) through the use of *palabras suaves, dichos* as a teaching and learning tool of moral lessons, and *consejos* as described in the previous section. This type of teacher as mother (Beauboeuf-Lafontant, 2008; Savage, 2001; Morris, 2004) has been described by African-American scholars in order to identify teachers’ dispositions as they teach their students. My analysis in this section presented how Marisol saw her students; she treated them as her own. In Marisol’s own words, “*Yo miro mis estudiantes como mis propios niños.*” [I see my students as I see my own children]. Marisol connected the students’ “funds of knowledge” (Moll et al., 1990, 1992) through the use of *dichos* as illustrated in the preceding section and *cuentos*, and *chistes*. Marisol viewed her students’ home literacy/language as cultural resources. Marisol was the only Latina in my study and brought a different perspective in light of the family values and responsibilities throughout classroom observations.

**Classroom examples of Marisol’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices.** In this section, I focus on Marisol’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices as a cultivator of students’ knowledge, skills, literate identity. In the following example, “*sembrando juntos*” [planting together], I present how Marisol utilized the students’ knowledge of Spanish literacy.

**Sembrando juntos [Planting together].** Academic writing in a first or second language can be a challenge for any student. Marisol provided many instructional tools such as graphic organizers and mediated structures that supported the students’ academic writing.
Marisol used “mapa semántico” [semantic maps] as an instructional tool to model the typical organization expected of the student as well as the details of a certain text type. Marisol as a cultivator provided many scaffolds so that the students could then take ownership of their learning. Marisol’s students did take ownership of their learning and shared their knowledge about the writing process with other teachers during a staff meeting, thus sembrado juntos [planting together] the seeds of writing. For example, she modeled in the following example how to organize thinking before writing by using a mapa semántico for a personal recount that included orientation (who, where, when, etc.), series of events, and personal comment. In addition, Marisol read aloud a variety of narrative stories to the students so that they could be familiar with the organization of a narrative text. Marisol began by recounting the events that took place before her daughter adopted their pet dog Ramoncita.

Marisol began the writing think aloud using the mapa semántico (Figure 4.1) tool on the white board located at the west end of the class. Marisol explained, “Primero la idea principal. Les voy a contar cómo llego Ramona a mi casa (Center circle).” [M: First the main idea. I will tell you about how Ramona arrived to our home (Center circle)].

![Figure 4.1 Narrativo](image)

Marisol continued her writing think aloud by asking the students the following questions:

\[M: \textit{Escojan un tema, … ¿Qué escribieron?}\]
As: Ir de vacaciones

M: ¿De qué más les gustaría escribir? Voy a empezar diciendo. ¿Quién es Ramona?

[M: Select a topic …What did you write?

Ss: Going to vacation

M: What else would you like to write about? I will begin by saying. Who is Ramona?] (Classroom Observation, March 3, 2010)

As Marisol continued with the writing think aloud, the students were also thinking of possible topics and examples and writing them in their writing journals. Marisol was answering the questions on the mapa semántico (Figure 4.1), moving clockwise and began with “Quién” and included the dog’s name and breed and wrote on the white board “Ramona es una perrita de la raza Boston Terrier” then talked and wrote about “cuándo” [when] and Marisol pointed out that “Ramona llegó a mi casa hace 2 años. Cuando llegó tenía menos de 2 años. Era bien chiquita.” [Ramona came to my house about 2 years ago. She was very little]. Marisol continued by mentioning “por qué” [why] her daughter decided to get a pet and said, “hija se graduó de la escuela y le regalaron dinero. Tenía $500.00 dólares.” [my daughter graduated from school and got money as a gift. She had $500.00 dollars]. The following example demonstrates the remainder of the writing think aloud activity with students’ input and Marisol having to clarify the writing task. The example shows Marisol using think aloud as an instructional tool to show her students the language and thought process as she wrote about “Ramoncita.”

M: ¿Por qué mi hija lo compró? Ella quería comprar un perro. Mi hija entró a internet y buscó perritas. Ella encontró un lugar donde criaba perros Boston Terrier. Ese lugar era en el estado Oklahoma. A Ramona la enviaron en avión en una cajita
para perros. Mi hija la tuvo que ir a recoger al aeropuerto y llegó a las 12:00 de la noche. Así fue como llegó a mi casa. Después que la escribí leo. ¡Siempre! Ahora quién quiere leer lo que escribí.

A12: [Student reads the entire text aloud.]

M: Ya les demostré fotos de Ramoncita, verdad. ¿Qué les gustaría escribir?

A11: De caballos

M: ¿Qué de los caballos, de qué?

As: Que comen

M: Tiene que ser un párrafo lo que van a escribir o más. Por ejemplo, puedo hablar de que los caballos...

As: Subir y montar los caballos

A8: Ir a Taos

M: Oh, okay otro tema pueden decir del paseo de Taos que hiciste, etc...

A3: De mi vida

M: ...¿Qué pasa en tu vida? Se me hace como mucho o muy grande el tema...

A7: Cuando fui a Cancún...

A2: Cuando fui a Oklahoma...

A10: Cuando fui a Kansas...

A11: Cuando fui a Colorado...

M: Lo que vamos a ser es esto primero utilizar el mapa u organizador. Lo primero es empezar a pensar de qué quieren escribir. Lo primero es esto hacer lo del centro y luego las otras preguntas quién, cuándo, por qué, cómo, dónde. Cuando terminen el mapa, quiero mirarla para ver cómo van. Solamente un párrafo hoy. Quiero mirar
cinco líneas. (She counts out loud 1, 2, 3, 4, y 5) Piensen, piensen que puedes escribir.

[M: Why did my daughter buy the dog? She wanted to buy a dog. My daughter went online and looked for dogs. She found a site where a Boston Terrier was being breed. That place was in the state of Oklahoma. Ramona was sent to us by plane in a little dog carrier. My daughter had to pick her up in the airport, and she got her at 12:00 midnight. This is how she got to our home. After I write, I will read it. Always! Now, who would like to read what I just wrote.?

S12: (Student reads the entire text aloud.)

M: I have showed you pictures of Ramoncita, right. What would you like to write about?

S11: about horses

M: What about the horses, of what?

Ss: what they eat

M: You have to write a paragraph or more. For example, you can write what about the horses…

Ss: How to ride a horse

S8: Going to Taos

M: Oh, okay another topic could be about you trip to Taos and what you did, etc…

S3: about my life

M: …What about your life? I think the topic is too much or too big…

S7: When I went to Cancun…

S2: When I went to Oklahoma…
S10: When I went to Kansas…
S11: When I went to Colorado…

M: Now we will do this, first use the map or organizer. First you need to think about what you want to write about. The first thing is to start here in the center and then answer the other questions: who, when, why, how, and where. When you are done with the map, I would like to see it so I can see how you are doing. Only one paragraph today. I want to see 5 lines, (Amanda counts out loud 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). Think, think about what you want to write about]. (Classroom Observation, March 3, 2010)

Students continued to sketch out their graphic organizer in order to write their paragraph. Marisol mentioned to the students that this should be practice since the class had already gone through this writing activity. Marisol continued to circulate the room to make sure they were doing what they were supposed to do for the writing task. Marisol then asked the class to pause and asked the students, “niños, bajan los lápices!” [kids put down your pencils!] It appeared that some students did not understand what she wanted them to do for this narrative writing, so she stopped everybody and clarified the writing task. Marisol clarified by reminding the students that each circle represented a sentence within a paragraph. Marisol underlined and color-coded within the paragraph she wrote (quién=red, cuándo=blue, por qué=purple, cómo=yellow, dónde=green) so that the students could see how she organized and wrote complete sentences from the captions or ideas she had written in the semantic map.

After the class observation, I asked Marisol if she could tell me more about “el mapa semántico” [semantic map]. I had noticed that Marisol used writing tools such as the mapa semántico and other graphic organizers so her students could write different writing genres.
These Spanish literacy activities that were being implemented and appeared to be effective since most students applied what they learned after the lesson was taught. However, I had questions about her rationale for doing this literacy activity. For that reason, I wanted to ask Marisol to further explain this literacy activity. Marisol was eager to share the use of “El mapa semántico” [semantic map] and how this led to a presentation with her students to the Vista del Sol staff about their writing activity. Marisol began by explaining the literacy activity she called el mapa semántico [semantic map]:

Marisol: El mapa semántico, que sé que Amanda lo usa, y es una buena manera de enseñar lectura y escritura. Básicamente les enseño la escritura pero comienzo con un read-aloud y luego me dan un resume usando este mapa semántico. El resume tiene que tener tres párrafos. El primer párrafo es sobre el personaje principal y secundario. Luego, el segundo párrafo el problema. El último es la solución del problema.

[Marisol: The semantic map, I know that Amanda uses this, is a good way of teaching reading and writing. Basically, I teach writing but I begin with a read-aloud and then they give me a summary using this semantic map. The summary has to have three paragraphs. The first paragraph is about the main and secondary character. Then, the second paragraph the problem. The last one is the solution of the problem].

(Classroom Observation, March 3, 2010)

Marisol mentioned that her students had done a great job in demonstrating this activity to all the third, fourth, and fifth grade staff during a professional development day. Marisol explained that she wanted a couple of students to be a part of this third-fifth grade teacher’s professional development and wanted the students to help her explain the activity. I
asked her, “¿Por qué es importante que los estudiantes sean parte de esta presentación?”

[Why is it important for you to have the students be a part of this presentation?] Marisol replied, “yo quiero que ellos puedan explicar la actividad y decirles a las maestras cómo les ayuda esta actividad para escribir y leer.” [I want them to explain the activity and tell the teachers how this activity helps them in writing and reading]. Marisol went on to say that two of her most quiet students volunteered to be a part of that presentation. Marisol then lifted her shoulders and said, “I am pleased that they wanted to participate in this sharing time with teachers.” Clearly, Marisol was proud of her students and sembrando juntos [planting together]. Presenting to teachers made it possible for the students to take the next step of teaching others about their learning.

Marisol’s explicit invitation for her students to use their own Spanish literate identity and knowledge provided the opportunity for these students to become the “expert other” (Vygotsky, 1978) within a community of learners. As a cultivator, Marisol provided her students with the space to grow through the use of instructional tools such as el mapa semántico in order to further develop Spanish literacy skills and knowledge that cultivated teaching/learning beyond the classroom context.

**Classroom examples of Tracy’s view of students.** This con cariño [with fondness] theme began to surface from the beginning of my classroom observations. For example, I vividly remember entering Tracy’s classroom and listening to her speak to the students in a tone that was calm and collected as she expressed her disappointment in their behavior during a school assembly. Since Tracy’s students were fifth graders, she expected that they listen intently, sit quietly and of course not to pass notes to each other. Although I had entered at the end of their classroom meeting (these meetings happened weekly so that the
teacher could check-in with the students needed), I can still hear her voice asking the students “What shall we do about this?” All I heard was silence and then a student said, “We need to show the rest of the school that we are fifth graders and act like fifth graders.” Tracy agreed and then closed the classroom meeting with a warm affirmation to the students “Ustedes saben que creo en todos y sé que a la próxima van a comportarse mejor.” [You know that I believe in all of you and I know that next time you will behave better]. Tracy’s insertion of “que creo en ustedes” [I believe in all of you] suggested that she was mindful towards her students and respected them enough to have weekly meetings so that the students could voice their opinions and thoughts.

Tracy believed in her students and had high expectations of the students academically and socially. Tracy struggled with how 5th graders should behave either in class or outside of the classroom since that year had been particularly challenging for her in regards to classroom management. Throughout the semester I was in her classroom, Tracy shared with me multiple incidents that happened in her classroom that led to several parent meetings with the principal about students’ behaviors in class and outside of class. Therefore, Tracy’s behavior norms during school wide assemblies were that the students model “good” behavior, which meant no talking and listening with attention. For the most part, Tracy’s students were able to conform to this norm; however, there were instances when one or two students had a different interpretation of “good” behavior. Tracy would remind them of their behavior and at times would accept the students’ way of being, communicating, and learning. However, Tracy would be the first one to admit that it was not easy for her to allow certain students to behave outside the norm she had set for the class environment. Tracy’s con cariño view (reciprocal relationship) was often being challenged in the classroom by her students.
and at times it was easier for Tracy to give than to take. In the following example, a student challenged her about the “conquistadores de España” as the class did a reading activity called pictorial input. The pictorial input is a Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) strategy that requires the teacher to draw the important scenes of a text or a thematic unit being studied. Tracy had started a unit about “Los conquistadores” [The Conquistadores], for example, Balboa and Cortes, and began the pictorial input with explaining the voyage from Spain to Bolivia, Cuba, and Mexico. As Tracy told the story of why and how the Spaniards came to the Americas, one student raised his hand and said “Pero Maestra los españoles eran crueles y no venían solos…” [But teacher the Spaniards were cruel and did not come alone…] Tracy responded, “sí es cierto no venían solos y en sus barcos trajeron muchos esclavos de África.” [Yes this is true they did not come alone and in their ships they brought many African slaves]. Tracy continued drawing and telling the students about the different routes that the Spaniards took while in the Americas. Adamantly, the same student who brought to light about the cruelty of the Spaniards described how cruel the Spaniards were to the slaves, “¡Yo sé que los españoles les cortaban los pies y no les daban comida como lo que leímos en ‘Amistad’ también sé que los mataban si no seguían sus órdenes!” [I know that the Spaniards would cut their feet off and did not feed them just like what we read about in ‘Amistad’ and I also know that they would kill them if they did not follow their orders!]” Tracy paused and acknowledged the student’s comment by saying, “buen punto y sí es como lo que leímos en ‘Amistad’ desafortunadamente unos españoles eran crueles.” [good point and it is like from what we read in ‘Amistad’ unfortunately some Spaniards were cruel]. Tracy ended the pictorial reading activity by asking the students to write about “los
conquistadores” and their voyage to the Americas and to make sure to use the pictorial input as a reference.

After the pictorial activity, I asked Tracy about the students’ comments and information about the Spaniards and slavery. Tracy mentioned that the class had read “El motín del Amistad: Una historia de libertad” [The Amistad Riot: A Story About Liberty] by Veronica Chambers, the text the student quoted during the discussion. And, Tracy believed that the student inquiries were probably related to the previous text he had read in class. I then asked Tracy if the topic the student brought up was uncomfortable for her to follow up on in class discussions. Tracy was very honest and said that it was uncomfortable for her to critically look at a topic because she was not sure how to respond, and it was an area “que yo tengo que mejorar.” [I need to improve upon].

Since Tracy was conscious of not knowing how to deepen a conversation or to look at text in a critical way in her classroom, she asked me to co-teach a class with her using a critical literacy approach. Tracy and I decided to co-teach a class, a topic that I expand upon in Chapter 5, and address some of the classroom tensions (bullying) that had happened throughout the semester I was in her classroom. Also, Tracy did not want to develop a “bad attitude” towards her students since the class had a great school year (except for several incidents that happened in the latter part of the spring semester), and she did not want to end “on a bad note” because of only several incidents overshadowing the rest of the year.

Tracy knew that in order to maintain a “sustained reciprocal relationship” she needed to learn how to carry on critical discussions in her classroom whether they were about slavery or bullying. Tracy’s “con cariño” view of her students was not always evident within the classroom context; however, often after I debriefed with Tracy about her Spanish literacy
instruction she expressed her teaching challenges, as the example above demonstrated. Tracy taught her Spanish literacy lessons within a joint effort and relationship approach so that all her students could learn and teach the topic at hand. Her reflections upon her teaching and the events that occurred in her classroom led her to be critical of herself, to want more for her students, and to consider a critical approach in the classroom that would allow for deeper conversations that named and dealt with some of the issues that were making caring difficult. Yet her commitment to con cariño did not waiver.

**Classroom examples of Tracy’s view of Spanish literacy instructional practices.**

The *Guiando la enseñanza* [Guiding learning] example was taken from classroom observations and best justify Tracy’s voice towards her Spanish literacy instructional practice. I illustrate how Tracy’s layout of the lecto-escritura (literacy) lesson that led the students through a process that guided them through various points of learning through the use of a Levels of Government mediated structure (Table 4.1). Then, having the student and teacher generate a text that Tracy called *el párrafo escrito por maestra y alumnus/as* [written paragraph of teacher/students] (Appendix Q). This text was used as a model so that students could then write their own individual piece of writing. In addition, Tracy had guided writing through the use of *el párrafo cerrado para unos estudiantes* [written cloze paragraph for students] (Appendix Q). The text was also used as a model; however, Tracy provided cloze sentences that provided a scaffold for students with emerging writing levels in Spanish. In the end, students then created their own text to be used as a resource while taking their end-of-the-lesson teacher-made exam (Appendix R).
Table 4.1 Government Levels Mediated Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Congreso</td>
<td>-President elegido por los ciudadanos</td>
<td>-Corte Suprema</td>
<td>-La constitución estableció la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Cámara de representantes (435)</td>
<td>-Departamentos del gobierno</td>
<td>-9 jueces elegidos por Presidente, confirmados por el</td>
<td>separación de poderes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Senado (100)</td>
<td>-Gabinete elegido por el Presidente</td>
<td>congreso</td>
<td>[-Capital (Washington, D.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Elegidos por los ciudadanos</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Por vida (jubilar)</td>
<td>-The constitution established the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Legislative Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Cortes federales</td>
<td>separation of power.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-House of Representatives (435)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poder Ejecutivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-President elegido por los</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ciudadanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Departamentos del gobierno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Gabinete elegido por el</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Executive Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-President elected by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Government departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-President’s cabinet]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Mexico [New Mexico]</td>
<td>Estado [State]</td>
<td>Poder Legislativo</td>
<td>Poder Ejecutivo</td>
<td>Poder Judicial</td>
<td>-Capital: Santa Fe, N.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Congreso</td>
<td>-Gobernador elegido por los</td>
<td>-Corte Suprema de N.M.</td>
<td>-Casa Redonda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Senado (70)</td>
<td>ciudadanos de N.M.</td>
<td>-5 jueces</td>
<td>ambos legislativos y ejecutivos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Cámara de representantes (42)</td>
<td>-Gabinete elegido por el gobierno</td>
<td>-Deciden si decisiones de las cortes menores deben vetarse o no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Elegidos por Nuevo Mexicanos</td>
<td>-Agencias del estado (Dept. de</td>
<td>-Jueces son elegidos</td>
<td>-Round House are only certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Legislative Branch</td>
<td>Educación Pública)</td>
<td></td>
<td>legislators and executors]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Senate (70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Chamber of representatives (42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-elected by New Mexicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Condado de Bernalillo [Bernalillo County]</td>
<td>Condado [County]</td>
<td>Poder Legislativo -Comisión del condado -5 comisionados -Elegidos por los ciudadanos del condado de Bernalillo -Hace las leyes locales [Legislative Branch -County commission -5 commissioners -Elected by the Bernalillo county residents -Creates the local laws]</td>
<td>Poder Ejecutivo -El alguacíl -Secretario o escribano del condado -Tesorero $ -Elegidos por la gente de Bernalillo [Executive Branch -The constable -County secretary -Treasurer $]</td>
<td>Poder Judicial -Corte del condado de Bernalillo -sistema de cortes del estado [Judicial Branch -Bernalillo court -State court systems]</td>
<td>Importante áreas rurales -La silla del condado de Bernalillo en Albuquerque [Important rural areas -Bernalillo county seat in Albuquerque]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiando la enseñanza [Guided learning]. Tracy did not stop at merely writing a text on the levels of government but utilized writing as a tool to apply knowledge about the concept of democracy and importance of the three levels of government in the United States. Tracy guided the students into understanding by carefully and skillfully leading them through the lesson. Flores (2008) calls these organizers “mediated structures” that “provide the bridge and the link to proficient academic and expository writing.” Table 4.1 presents the finished “tabla del proceso” [process table] that Tracy co-created with her class.

Tracy drew from the students’ knowledge of the local government and its characteristics, information they first read and learned from their English literacy block. Then, students used translanguaging (García & Kleifgen, 2010) skills and applied them to their Spanish writing. That is, during the class discussion of the government levels Tracy allowed students to speak in English or Spanish or both languages to express their ideas to their peers. However, when the students discussed them as a whole group, I noticed that many students expressed their ideas in Spanish. At the point of my observation, the federal and state governments were already filled in with the appropriate information gathered by teacher and student.

Below I note the students’ responses when Tracy asked, “¿Por qué es importante esta tabla?” [Why is this table important?] The students replied: “Esta en formato de lista y apuntes que nos va ayudar en nuestra escritura.” [It is in the format of a list and note taking so that it can help us for when we write]. She then explained how the information here was placed in an informal way “recuerdan que está en forma informal luego al formal.” [remember this is from the informal to the formal]. The students understood that this informal information from “La tabla” will then be taken to the formal writing, meaning the
production of an expository text. After the class filled in a row of “La tabla” and discussed the topic of “condado” [county] and cuidad [city], the class moved on to the writing piece of this activity. Tracy began by asking a student to read a paragraph that was co-created by teacher and student. Tracy often asked open-ended questions to her students in order to check for understanding such as “¿Por qué necesitamos un ejemplo, primero? [Why do we need an example, first?]” To which a student responded, “para tener una idea de cómo se escribe…” [to have an idea of how you write it…] After reading the text on the federal level that was used as a model, students then began to write their own paragraphs about the state and county levels of government.

I viewed Tracy as a guide because she made use of mediated structures and integrated social studies concepts and ideas while teaching Spanish literacy. The writing strategy used written text from previous lessons to provide a scaffold for all levels of Spanish writing. Tracy’s expectation was that students write a paragraph about each level of government in the United States. These paragraphs could then be used for the social studies teacher-made test (Appendix R). All students were to use their own writing text to inform their response for this test. Some students did not complete several paragraphs (county and city levels of government), so Tracy placed an X on those questions of the test that addressed these government levels. This indicated that the student was not responsible for this section of the test. However, Tracy did require that these students finish their paragraphs after the test. Tracy then included these paragraphs in her grading system. This differentiated instruction and assessment in the levels of reading and writing in her classroom. Tracy viewed her class as a whole and designed her teacher made test to meet the various levels by adapting who
will do what section according to completed assignments throughout these six weeks of
guided teaching and learning about the levels of government via literacy.

I asked Tracy if she could share with me an example of the teacher-made test and
how she monitors her students’ progress in Spanish literacy learning throughout the year.
Tracy responded and mentioned that one of the components of reading that her students were
missing was “critical thinking.” Tracy believed that teacher-made tests should be used as a
guide to better inform Spanish literacy instruction and curriculum.

Tracy: Yo solamente miré, por ejemplo, en lectura que es lo qué les falta. Y fue
critical thinking entonces me enfoco en esto durante mi instrucción. Yo quiero que
ello/as piensen en lo que leen y críticamente no solamente respondiendo preguntas
básicas de comprensión. Pero mi guía durante el año es mis pruebas para ver que
también están aprendiendo lo que hemos estudiado durante el año.

[Tracy: I only looked, for example, in reading what is it that is missing. This was
critical thinking so then I focused on this during my instruction. I want for them to
think about what they are reading and critically not only responding to basic
comprehension questions. But my guides during the year are my tests to see how well
they are learning what we have studied during the year]. (Classroom Observation,
February 26, 2010)

Tracy mentioned critical thinking as one of the Spanish literacy components that were
missing from the students’ literacy repertoires in Spanish and English. The critical thinking
topic had been addressed at a staff meeting by the instructional coach and a fifth grade
teacher. This topic was a school wide concern and most teachers wanted to integrate more
critical thinking skills during their literacy block. For this reason, Tracy and other upper
grade teachers began to construct teacher-made exams that included more critical thinking rather than just close-response types of comprehension questions. After some research, Tracy collaborated with other teachers and created a test that reflected a more holistic way of testing rather than just emphasizing comprehension.

Tracy’s self-identified metaphor of Teacher as Guide demonstrated the process of teaching and learning Spanish literacy within a dual language context. Tracy often mentioned that “Dual Language teachers have many challenges and one big challenge is how one adapts methods and activities to best meet the teaching of Spanish literacy.” The challenge of adapting English literacy methodology to Spanish has been a topic that Escamilla (2000) points out that many teacher preparation programs and professional development trainings ask teachers to adapt best practices in English reading to Spanish. Furthermore, Bartolomé (2000) explains how dual language teachers believe in teaching Spanish literacy but have the pressure of overstressing English literacy because of the burdens of testing. For Tracy, guiding the students through reading and writing in Spanish meant providing mediated structures as seen in Table 4.1 so that students created written texts that demonstrated academic writing. Tracy did not stop at merely writing a text on the levels of government but utilized their writing as a tool to apply their knowledge about the concept of democracy and importance of the three levels of government in the United States. Thus, Tracy guided the students into understanding by carefully and skillfully leading them through the lesson without just presenting the material.

**Summary**

The teachers’ views of students were critical in that their views, consciously or unconsciously, directed their actions, influenced their perspective and greatly affected the
Spanish literacy instructional practices enacted in their classrooms. Each of the teachers had a particular view, and the view manifested itself in the teachers’ interactions with students and parents was different. Thus, it can be argued that a teacher’s inward perspective, especially when reinforced by a positive school community oriented program like that of Vista del Sol elementary, can be observed and documented to have a marked impact on the teachers’ methods, interactions, and perspectives on teaching. By using case study as one of my methods, I was able to see them on a weekly basis throughout a course of five months and truly study their interactions, actions towards their students, and how the teachers’ expectations and understanding and uses of strategies influenced their Spanish literacy practices and their learning community. Since at the center of teaching/learning were the students, it was imperative for me to begin with the teachers’ views of the students first, and then move to the teachers’ views of Spanish literacy instructional practices. In the next chapter I will focus on the teachers’ enacted and expressed literacy views as they move toward more holistic literacy practices.
Chapter 5 – Facets of Dual Language Pedagogy

In this chapter, I present different facets of dual language pedagogy. One facet was the teachers’ literacy views that involved observing the teachers throughout a five month period; this allowed me, in part, to better understand what and how the teachers taught in the classroom. Another facet was the teachers’ challenges, as they taught in a dual language context as expressed during our critical dialogues and collaborations. The last facet I present is the teachers’ changing Spanish literacy views towards a more holistic literacy view through critical dialogues. All three facets were places to further examine the teachers’ literacy views, approaches, and strategies implemented in their classroom during Spanish literacy instructional practices. The results of this study indicate that all three teachers’ expressed literacy views were enacted during their Spanish literacy instructional practices at some level. Moreover, developing pedagogical views of literacy was important because this provided an insight into what and how dual language teachers taught Spanish literacy in grades three through five. Through these findings, I then organized a Spanish Pedagogy of Literacy matrix (Appendix O) that describes the teachers’ teaching phenomena within a dual language context (Chapter 3). This chapter offers a collective description of my findings, presenting the similar aspects of the teachers’ literacy views and challenges rather than the differences of each individual teacher. All three teachers had similar literacy views and challenges towards various facets of their Dual Language Pedagogy (DLP).

The following agricultural metaphor served as a framework for the purpose of describing the facets of Dual Language Pedagogy as the teachers enacted their literacy views, approaches, and strategies during their Spanish literacy instructional practices.
If we consider that the child’s mind contains the seeds of learning, like acorns, the child’s mind must be cultivated over its lifetime to bear its full potential harvest.

From within this metaphor, the role of the teacher is sower and tiller. The teacher’s role is critical, but just as important, the school’s soil must be fertile, and the school’s climate for learning temperate, for the seeds of learning embedded in the minds and hands of each child sprout and yield their bounty. The best seed fallen on barren soil will perish. Hence, the structure of the school and the institution of education are foregrounded within this metaphoric constellation. (Santa Ana, 2002, p. 310)

This metaphor offered me a vivid pedagogical vision in which to illustrate the teachers’ DLP. The findings to follow in each section represent vistas (means a scene or outlook), which I refer to as ‘views,’ that will in the end provide a holistic picture of the teachers’ Dual Language Pedagogy. I use the word vista or view, within the agricultural metaphor, because it suggests that we are viewing a landscape; in this case, the landscape is a potential, like the acorn, which may be realized in different ways as a function of the care, environment and other issues discussed below. The first section, Views Yielding a Half Harvest, encompasses the teachers’ expressed literacy views that were sowed and tilled into practice. The second section, Seeds Fallen on Fertile Soil Flourish, unearths two challenging issues (Rhythm of Teaching and First Language Literacy) that all three teachers expressed as being important to address in order to work towards more effective Dual Language Pedagogy as a school. In the third section, Developing a Whole Harvest, the teachers and students cultivate new fields of study with multicultural and critical literacy.
Views Yielding a Half Harvest

As a young child, my family and I traveled to many places in the southwest and northwest regions of the United States to cultivate the lands that yielded bountiful amounts of sugar beets, strawberries, and lettuce produce. We came across many fields that needed to be harvested. The view of completing this work was daunting to see fields that needed to be sowed and tilled. The sowing was easier in that we hoed around the sprouting seeds allowing them room to grow further. However, the tilling that we did was a different type of work. In order to cultivate a harvest, our job was to till the soil through hoeing the entangled weeds from around the sugar beet so that these plants could grow to their fullest potential. Similarly, to the agricultural metaphor created by Santa Ana, on a personal level this metaphor makes sense to me since I also believe that teaching and learning can be viewed as cultivating and harvesting students’ knowledge and experiences into the students’ literacy education. Consequently, using this agriculture metaphor as an analytical tool was a personal and academic decision. Academically, the teachers of this study had a cultivating spirit providing a space to further develop the students’ language and literacy so that they can grow to their fullest potential.

For each teacher involved in the study during critical dialogues, I asked that they identify the literacy view/s represented in their Spanish literacy instructional practices. By identifying their literacy view(s), I was then able to see the teachers’ views being nourished and developed in the classroom. Table 5.1 represent each teacher’s literacy views and was a fair depiction of what was expressed, enacted, or partially enacted in each teacher’s classroom.
Table 5.1 Teachers’ Literacy Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Views</th>
<th>Amanda</th>
<th>Marisol</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★★ = Represents the teachers’ expressed and enacted literacy views.
X = Represents the teachers’ not expressed or enacted literacy views.
➡️ = Represents the teachers’ expressed and partially enacted and further developing this literacy view.

This table represents an overall view of the teachers’ literacy views. That is, the teachers knew which literacy view they fostered most, thus, reflecting their teaching and learning vista (outlook). The following explanations from the teachers’ exchanges during critical dialogues provided their pedagogical rationale in what the teachers taught and how they familiarized themselves and the students to a certain view represented in their Spanish literacy practice.

**Amanda.** Las siguientes [functional and progressive literacy] son lo que yo hago más en mi salón. La lectura funcional es importante porque yo quiero darles la oportunidad de escoger qué es la profesión que van hacer por el resto de su vida. Es mi responsabilidad enseñarles las destrezas y herramienta para poder seguir
estudiando. Yo miro los estándares y enseño a ese nivel a todos y luego "I differentiate" para que todos puedan aprender la materia. Esto es muy importante para mí. Y claro lectura progresiva es importante tener la opinión de los estudiantes para incluir su voz. Entonces pensé eso no tomó en cuenta de lo que los estudiantes realmente están pensando. Por ejemplo, para incluir su voz yo les doy tiempo para pensar en su respuesta o pensamiento y luego todos contribuyen su voz.

**Marisol.** Lectura progresiva es algo importante para mí también porque incluyendo la voz del estudiante es necesario siempre. Y la tercera (lectura funcional) es algo importante porque uno tiene que enseñar las destrezas del idioma claro en una manera inclusiva pero se tiene que enseñar para que los estudiantes puedan leer y escribir en una manera académica.

**Tracy.** Yo dijería que...[inaudible] ...pues, enseño lectura funcional, en cierta manera, pero también trato de incorporar... por cierto las perspectivas culturales y progresivas.

**[Amanda.** And then the next (functional and progressive literacy) are the ones that I do most of in my classroom. The functional literacy is important because I want to give them the opportunity to choose the profession they want to do for the rest of their life. It is my responsibility to teach them the skills and tools to continue studying. I see the standards and I teach at that level to all and then “I differentiate” so that all can learn the content. This is very important for me. And, of course, progressive literacy is important to have the students’ opinion in order to include their voice. For example, to include their voice, I give them time to think about their responses or thoughts. Then they all contribute their voice.
Marisol. Progressive literacy is something important for me because including the voice of the student is always necessary. The third one (functional literacy) is something important because one has to teach the skills of the language, of course, in an inclusive manner, but it has to be taught so that the students can read and write in an academic manner.

Tracy. I would say…[inaudible]…well, I teach functional literacy, in a certain way, but I also try to incorporate…for sure the cultural and progressive]. (Critical Dialogue, February 17, 2010)

The teachers provided access to the literacy curriculum through sociocultural approaches (Carrasazo et al., 1981; Cazden, 1988; Flores, 1990; Gibbons, 2009; Meyer, 2000; Moll, 1992; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Valdés et. al., 2011; Vygtosky, 1978). These sociocultural approaches presented the students with opportunities to learn the school-related language and skills needed to become avid readers and to learn the subject-specific literacy in grades third through fifth. Specifically, I will describe the strategies used by the teachers. I define strategy as how information was sought and how concepts attained were used as part of a sense-making process by the students and teacher. These teaching strategies were designed through an organic approach. That is, the students learned through co-generative and student-centered approaches through oral and written mediated structures (Coleman & Goldenberg, 2012; Flores, 2008), language and literacy scaffolding (Gibbons, 2009), and unpacking cognitive, culture, language, and learning loads for meaningful literacy instruction (Escamilla, 2008; Meyer, 2000). This organic approach is essential in order to better meet the educational opportunities of students in Spanish reading comprehension described as the understanding and oral production of the text.
The literacy views expressed and implemented by the teachers in their classrooms cultivated the student’s embedded seeds of everyday and school related knowledge, literacy understanding, oral communication, and text interaction. The following classroom examples will illustrate their literacy harvest. That is, “what” the teachers taught (functional and progressive literacy) and “how” they approached their Spanish literacy practice through certain sowing and tilling strategies that integrated the teachers’ literacy views. Although this chapter is about critical dialogues and collaborations, I have added classroom examples to describe how the teachers enacted their expressed literacy views shared during our dialogues and collaborations.

**Functional literacy: Sowing the seeds of oral production.** A functional literacy view teaches students certain skills that will enable them to become part of the workforce and society with the specified literacy skills needed to operate in this societal context (August & Shanahan, 2006). The teachers from this study transformed this definition to include skills in meaningful ways. For example, the use of oral production “skills” prepared students for structured interactions with other peers that were rich verbal exchanges, rather than completing a task (Coleman & Goldenberg, 2012). Also, the analysis showed more of a cultivating (sociocultural) approach to teaching and learning in that the teachers drew from the students’ Funds of Knowledge (Moll, et. al., 1990; Moll, 1992; Vygotsky, 1978) rather than just literacy skills. The teachers integrated sowing and tilling of skills with that of the students’ learning, cultural, and language experiences.

**Destrezas interactivas [Interactive skills].** Amanda expressed during a critical dialogue that she wanted to give her students “la oportunidad” [the opportunity] to choose their profession. Moreover, Amanda felt that “es nuestra responsabilidad enseñarles a
escribir bien para que puedan ir a la universidad pero tengo que darles los estudios para que tengan esta oportunidad.” [It is our responsibility to teach them how to write well so that they can go to the university, but I have to give them these teachings so that they can have an opportunity]. Amanda was very concerned about the quantity and quality of the students’ reading and writing experiences. Amanda’s emphasis on standards derived from her belief that if she taught everything they needed to learn in third grade, then the students will be ready to build upon their knowledge and literacy. Amanda’s teaching metaphor was Teacher as Architect because she used the standards as an emerging blueprint, as a starting point of teaching/learning. Then, Amanda built a structure via her lesson plans in order to give access to the Spanish literacy and content area curriculum. For instance, a strategy that Amanda implemented in her classroom that drew from a functional view was “destrezas interactivas.” [interactive skills]. With this strategy, Amanda structured student and teacher talk through everyday and school-related topics. In the example to follow, Amanda related the structured verbal exchanges to the study of prefixes utilizing vocabulary from science (Geography) previously introduced in the students’ content-area.

Amanda (A): ¿Qué significan estas palabras? Hay una parte que es clave...

Amanda has these written on the front area of the classroom the prefix and words:

**Geo** geografía

geologista

geométrico

Alumno (A) 20: Lo que pasa antes

A16: Algo del mundo

A: Si hace mucho calor
Amanda places her arms over her head and forms a circle and then asked the students the following: ¿Qué estoy formando?

As: ¡El mundo, La Tierra!

As: Geo es el estudio de la tierra

[Amanda (A): What do these words mean? There is a part of it that is a clue…

Amanda has these written on the front area of the classroom the prefix and words:

**Geo** geography

  geologist

  geometrical

Student (S) 20: What happens before?

S16: Something about the world

A: If it is very hot…

Students (Ss): Geo is is…

S2: What? …

Amanda places her arms over her head and forms a circle and then asked the students the following: What am I forming?

Ss: The world, the earth!

Ss: Geo is the study of the earth] (Classroom Observation, March 22, 2010)

Amanda used *destrezas interactivas* [interactive skills] to do word studies of certain vocabulary before reading the text, thus, cultivating the students’ “seeds” of knowledge and concepts through oral production to lightening the cognitive and language load (Meyer,
that subject-specific literacy (Gibbons, 2009) entails. Amanda’s first statement: “¿Qué significan estas palabras?” [What do these words mean?] This was an open-ended question that provides continuity between the words studied to the final meaning of it. The strategy was interactive in that Amanda involved the students in figuring out what the different parts of the word meant, beginning with the prefix of the word. The student’s responses were what comes before and something about the world, which were accurate replies. Further, Amanda then prompted the class by modeling a clue in which all students then knew it was about the earth or world. The strategy applied by Amanda was a joint effort by teacher and student in trying to learn a new prefix that could potentially generate background/new knowledge and skills when reading their science text. Amanda engaged the students in communicating what they thought the prefix meant drawing from their reservoir of knowledge (Commins, 2012). Yet, at the end Amanda provided a physical clue so that all students understood the prefix.

There are several implications for functional literacy learning in that the teacher provided vocabulary that emphasized the dissecting of the word beginning with the prefix “geo”. By writing the words that have geo as a prefix, this gives the student’s tools to further nurture their reading or writing across content areas. In addition, at the end of the lesson the students figured out the meaning of the prefix geo. Finally, the students were being led by the teacher to generate responses and had all students verbally participating either collectively or individually. Amanda embedded some kinesthetic motions to indicate that the prefix had something to do with the world (placed her arms over her head and forms a circle), then allowed the students to make a final decision of what the meaning of the prefix geo meant as the students called out in unison “es el estudio de la tierra.” [It is the study of the earth].
Thus, in this brief interchange consisting of a series of nine exchanges between the teacher and student, I found that through the use of the interactive skills strategy, Amanda allowed the students to learn the parts of the words within a student generated approach. At a first glance, it may seem like a functional literacy approach since the focus was more on the part to whole of literacy. Yet, including the student’s knowledge intersects with progressive literacy at the same time. Amanda demonstrated a more holistic approach to teaching and learning of literacy in her classroom by integrating both functional and progressive approaches. Although I have separated these literacy views to provide an example of each, all three teachers employed functional and progressive concurrently as was seen in the previous example and the ones to follow.

**Destrezas del idioma [Language skills].** During a critical dialogue Marisol expressed and equated functional literacy with academic literacy. The connection Marisol made between functional and academic was both emphasized “destrezas del idioma” [language skills] (writing, reading, speaking, listening) and needed to advance through the educational trajectory (K-18). Marisol believed that if students learned these language skills, they could become better writers and readers, thus being better prepared to meet the academic challenges throughout their schooling experience. Marisol expressed concern in regards to some of her students not advancing in “lecto-escritura” [literacy] in Spanish. Hence, Marisol wanted to always introduce specific writing skills, vocabulary usage, and reading strategies in order to further cultivate her student’s Spanish literacy resources. The following example demonstrated how Marisol created a space to learn new vocabulary through structured classroom talk that provided further understanding of the literature selected: *El niño que buscaba ayer* [The Kid Who Looked for Yesterday] by Claribel Algeria.
(1996). Marisol began with *el Diccionario académico de lenguaje y estudio* (DALE) [The Academic Dictionary for Language and Study], a Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) strategy called Cognitive Content Dictionary (CCD) adapted by Marisol. DALE emphasized the oral responses to specific vocabulary needed before/during/after reading a text that provided lesser language, learning, and culture loads to better support their literacy growth.

As I arrived, the students were talking about the last week of school activities, such as field trips typically done only after New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) testing. Marisol reminded them about these forthcoming activities. Then, she had them write in certain information on to the field trip permission slip. Students put away permission slips and were then ready to move on to reading and writing. The students in the following example were reading along with the audio recording of the story and pointing out any words, phrases, or expressions that they wanted to know more about from the teacher. Marisol provided guidance through talk, illustrations and movement to promote further understanding of the language being used in the text.

*Alumno 1 (A1):* La palabra es arroyuelo.

*Marisol (M):* Eso es como un arroyo. Es pandito...

*A15:* Cenit

*M:* Muy bien

*A3:* El sol estaba en el cenit. (Another student then read the word within the context that it was used in this story)

*M:* Cenit es cuando el sol está a las 12 del día la posición del sol. El sol sale al este y termina al oeste o el sol sale en el oriente y termina en el occidente. Aquí usan mucho
esto (este u oeste) en los Estados Unidos. En Colombia escuchamos más oriente y occidente. El cenit es la hora que el sol está en la posición al medio día. También se puede escribir diferente como Zenit. (Marisol then reads the definition found in the glossary of the reading basal). Cenit es el punto del hemisferio celeste situado al vertical de la tierra.

[M: Remember I am not saying lines but paragraphs.
S1: The word is stream.
M: This is like a stream. It is curved…
S15: Zenith
M: Very good
S3: The sun was in the zenith position. (Another student then read the word within the context that it was used in this story)
M: Zenith is when the position of the sun is at 12 o’clock. The sun comes out to the east and ends to the west or the sun comes out to the orient and ends at the occidental. Here east and west are used a lot in the United States. In other places we use orient and occidental. The zenith is the position of the sun at mid-day. The spelling of this word can also be Zenit.] (Marisol then reads the definition found in the glossary of the reading basal). Zenith is the point of the hemispheric space situated vertically to the Earth]. (Classroom Observation, April 6, 2010)

Marisol explained the differences between the word usage of the words East and West in the United States and Colombia. Marisol told the students that in the United States, Spanish speakers used oeste and este as opposed to Colombia, where the terminology was different. The words most commonly used there were occidente y oriente. Marisol drew the following
sketch (Figure 5.1) to show the students the meaning. The first image (*oeste u occidente*) represented the sunset (the line depicts the sun going down) and the second image (*este u oriente*) represented the sunrise.

![Figure 5.1 Sunset and Sunrise Sketch](image)

**Figure 5.1 Sunset and Sunrise Sketch**

_A15: Maestra la palabra vaho qué quiere decir..._

*M: Okay, como el niño tenía color salió un vapor o un vaho. Vamos a ver que ponemos a la definición de cenit y vaho._

_A20: El sol está vertical en el cielo._

_A14 & A15: Lo que usted dijo._

*M: ¿Qué dijo?_

_A14: El aliento de su boca._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palabra</th>
<th>Definición</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cenit</td>
<td>Cuando el sol está vertical en el cielo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaho</td>
<td>El aliento que sale de tu boca.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M: ¿Cómo podemos hacer cenit con el cuerpo?_

_As: Some students suggest placing their hand over their head then making a fist to represent the sun._

*M: Sí que bien así y vaho?_

_As: In unison the students begin to breathe loudly through their mouth._
M: Allí vamos a terminar de leer por hoy.

[S15: Teacher the word vapors what does that mean…]

M: Okay, since the boy was hot and let out some vapor. Let’s see what definition we can write for zenith and vapor.

S14 & s15: what you said

M: What did I say?

S14: The breath from his mouth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zenith</td>
<td>When the sun is vertically positioned in space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapor</td>
<td>The breath that comes out from your mouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M: How can we motion zenith with our body?

Ss: Some students suggest placing their hand over their head then making a fist to represent the sun.

M: Yes well done and vapor?

Ss: In unison the students begin to breathe loudly through their mouth.

M: This is where we will end for today]. (Classroom Observation, April 6, 2010)

The teaching strategies and approaches of Marisol were similar in a number of ways with that of Amanda’s. With respect to teaching literacy skills, both began their literacy lesson by recognizing related/new vocabulary through structured student talk. For example, Amanda began her destrezas interactivas classroom example with introducing a prefix then having students generate their own words associated to the prefix with plenty of interaction and guidance. Marisol taught the new vocabulary within context of a reading selection. She also began with vocabulary that was student generated. The lines in the beginning of this
example, therefore, provided a definition for the students. Both Marisol and Amanda
couraged all the students to engage in verbal exchanges in pairs or small groups throughout
the literacy activity. They worked to include this social element because it was consistent
with their views, and, further, was evidence that they actually did what they had reported to
me that they would do.

Marisol expressed and expected that “los estudiantes tienen que aprender cómo
escribir cartas, redacciones, narrativos y otros géneros para poder adquirir el español
académico.” [the students need to learn how to write letters, essays, narratives, and other
genres so to acquire academic Spanish]. Marisol taught writing through the strategy “el mapa
semántico” [semantic map] in which she began with a read aloud of “El Niño Que Buscaba
Ayer” by Claribel Alegria (1996) with the embedded structures of the genre or text type
being taught and learned in class. Marisol then drew (on chart paper in front of class) the
layout of the story to make explicit the narrative structures. She asked the students to name
the setting and then drew (with pictures and labels) the setting of the story. Marisol did the
same with the main characters; after reading the text, she asked students to name the
characters and then she drew them on to chart paper in front of the class, and so forth. This
plática [conversation] about the text went on until she covered the different components of a
narrative genre. This strategy provided all the students with a visual schema which then
provided a support for when they wrote their own narrative text. Marisol often read each
literature selection aloud twice. The first reading was to build background using the DALE
vocabulary strategy mentioned in the classroom example above. The second reading was
connected to writing.
In summary, the DALE and *el mapa semántico* strategies used by Marisol were interconnected in order to frontload the learning of specific language (vocabulary) and cultural (differences of the use of words) loads that the story entailed (Meyer, 2000; Gibbons, 2009). The classroom example demonstrated how the students related their knowledge to the new vocabulary while reading, and then transferred the language and ideas learned to the students’ writing through the use of *el mapa semántico*, a sense making process (Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). In sum, the sense making process involved students generating meaning for words that they did not understand. Further, students reviewed the vocabulary using a chart that had vocabulary/phrases with definitions. Next, the class attached a movement to reinforce the meaning of the word. Lastly, after reading this selected text the students co-generated a semantic map with the teacher that depicted the narrative elements of the *El Niño que Buscaba Ayer* [The Kid That Kept Looking for Yesterday] and used that map to then write their own version of this story.

**Charla del lenguaje académico [Academic language talk].** Tracy expressed and enacted functional literacy in her classroom. In Tracy’s own words, “…enseño lectura funcional…” For Tracy it was important for her students to learn the academic language needed across the content-areas (social studies and science). Tracy and Amanda taught much literacy through integrated thematic instruction due to time constraints. Both teachers had little time to teach social studies and science. In order to provide the students with the opportunity to learn about these content-areas, they both intertwined academic language and curriculum content. The classroom example to follow demonstrates teacher and students talking about academic language that included key language of the content subject (social studies) and text structures that expressed cause and effect.
Tracy began with introducing the cause and effect concept with an example followed by the student’s own responses and examples of how they made sense of this concept through teacher and student talk.

*Tracy (T): Primero les voy a explicar causa/efecto. Por ejemplo, No desayuné esta mañana y ¿Qué piensan que me va pasar si no comí por la mañana? ¿En otras palabras que es el resultado? O qué va ser el efecto...?*

*Alumno/a 16 (A16): Te puede dar hambre durante el día*

*T: Sí, el efecto es que me va dar hambre. Ahora la causa fue que no comí por la mañana. Preguntas. Bueno ahora van a pensar en efectos en grupos. Por ejemplo, les voy a dar causas como ‘No hice mi tarea o No paré cuando había una luz roja.’*

[Tracy (T): First I will explain to you cause/effect. For example, I did not eat this morning and what do you think will happen to me if I did not eat this morning? In other words what is the result? Or what effect will this have on me…

Student 16 (S16): You could get hungry throughout the day

T: Yes, the effect is that I will get hungry. Now the cause of this is that I did not eat in the morning. Questions. Okay now you are going to think of effects in groups. For example, I will give you causes like ‘I did not do my homework or I did not stop when there was a red light.’] (Classroom Observation, April 21, 2010)

Although it seemed as if Tracy only provided one cause and effect example, the students understood because on the previous day Tracy’s teaching partner introduced this concept during their content area (social studies) reading time. Tracy knew that she could rely on the students using their cross-linguistic transfer (Cummins, 1981) skills to connect concepts and skills since many of the social studies vocabulary were cognates (August, 2009; Freeman &
and used the preview/review (Freeman & Freeman, 1993) strategy to make connections of the text. Students promptly began to talk within their small group. The students seemed to enjoy writing about cause and effect because as the teacher walked around the room a student mentioned to her "We are ready to give our example!" Tracy began with “¡Bueno, listos! Vamos a comenzar voy a leer la causa y un grupo responde sobre el efecto. Y les doy un minuto para responder.” [Great, we are ready! Let’s get started I will read the cause and a group will give me a response to the effect. I will give you a minute to respond].

\[ T: Si te pasas una luz roja, ¿Qué pasa? (teacher points to a group) \]

Grupo 5 responded: Pueden mandar a la cárcel

Grupo 3 responded: Le pueden dar un tíquete.

T: Una multa.

Group 2 responded: Puede chocar y dar un tíquete

[T: If you run a red light, what happens? (Teacher points to a group)

Group 5 responded: They can send you to jail.

Group 3 responded: They can give you a ticket.

T: A fine

Group 2 responded: You can crash then get a ticket]. (Classroom Observation, April 21, 2010)

Tracy then wrote a modified version of the student’s response on to a T-chart white paper placed in front of the class (Figure 5.2). Tracy encouraged certain words during her teaching. For example, a group mentioned ‘dar un tíquete’ [give a ticket] and Tracy responded and instead used more precise word in “\textit{una multa}.” [a fine].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causa</th>
<th>Efecto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si pasas una luz roja</td>
<td>Puede chocar y la policía le puede dar una multa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accidente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.2 Cause and Effect T-graph**

Tracy continued this discussion with her class and some groups came up with their own cause such as Group 5 said “Lola fue a la escuela sin la tarea.” [Lola went to school without her homework]. To which some students responded “la directora la puede regañar y llamar a la mamá.” [The principal will get mad at her and call her mother]. One of the students from this group voiced his opinion about homework to the teacher.

*A22: No puede ser eso.*

*T: ¿Por qué?*

*A22: No puede ser eso.*

*T: ¿Por qué?*

*A22: No creo que sea necesario por algo como tarea.*

*T: No crees que eso sea tan grave, ¡que interesante...!*  

*A22: ¡Sí eso es lo que creo!*

[S22: It can’t be that.]

*T: Why?*

*S22: It can’t be that.*

*T: Why?*

*S22: I do not think it is necessary for something like homework.*

*T: You do not think this is important, how interesting…!*
The class concluded the *charla de lenguaje académico* [academic language talk] lesson on cause and effect with the students’ own examples about homework. Although Tracy did not entirely agree with the student questioning the importance of homework, she insisted on asking him why. The student continued to question the significance of homework. Nevertheless, by providing explicit instruction and concrete examples as “driving through a red light” or “homework,” the students appeared to understand the cause and effect concept related to the social studies texts being read. Tracy and her students learned about the cause and effect concept as a preview/review strategy used with a non-fiction text read in social studies during their literacy learning. Guiding students through a *charla de lenguaje académico* [academic language talk] was important to Tracy because it further developed the students’ understanding of the cause and effect concept through explicit and meaningful oral production (Branum-Martin, Foorman, Francis, & Mehta, 2010; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2012; Flores-Dueñas, 1997). This process helped to lighten the language and cognitive loads content-area reading demands of the students (Meyer, 2000; Gibbons, 2009).

The two common themes across all three teachers’ functional literacy approaches were the following. First, the teachers generated meaningful classroom communication yielding a better understanding of the specified literacy and language skills being taught across the content-areas. Second, by frontloading the concepts, ideas, and vocabulary through oral production before the students delved in to the text, the seeds of knowledge were sowed and the skills needed to cultivate a fertile soil for the literacy understanding followed.
Progressive literacy: Nourishing the ground through literacy understanding.

Progressive literacy is student-centered and allows discourse which respects the students’ voices and cultures through the use of a variety of texts (Edelsky, Altwerger & Flores, 1991; Freeman & Freeman, 1997; Goodman, Goodman & Flores, 1979; Macedo, 1991; Meyer & Manning, 2007; Shannon, 1989, 1991). In addition, a progressive literacy approach allows participants to co-construct meaning through intellectual and emotional involvement. In the following examples, the teachers demonstrated how students’ dialectical and sense making processes cultivated an enhanced understanding between readers, text, and the context.

Lecto-escritura integrada [Integrated literacy]. Amanda expressed during our critical dialogue that the importance of progressive literacy was to “tener la opinión de los estudiantes para incluir su voz” [have the opinion of the students in order to include their voice]. Including the students’ individual and collective “voice” while teaching was something Amanda encouraged in her classroom by providing students with the physical, social, and cultural environment to better understand the learning and teaching context. The following example demonstrated how Amanda integrated the social studies content-area with literacy. Amanda planned her lessons of the civics and government integrated thematic unit the class studied for six weeks utilizing the concept map planning tool and strategy (Appendix H). This tool allowed her to plan lessons by drawing and labeling main ideas and concepts. On a day that I observed, Amanda began her instruction with the use of technology to introduce the students to the new topic through a virtual tour of Washington, D.C. (showing various pictures of significant sites from the nation’s capital). She was providing the students with some background knowledge of the capital and its monuments. Amanda then discussed the 13 colonies through the use of a concept map she sketched and labeled
with the students. Amanda ended the instruction by connecting New Mexico government and history through the use of student booklets that had various New Mexican social studies topics. I begin the following example with the cyber walk (using the internet she walks the students through various sites that show the capital and its monuments and buildings) of the nation’s capital to encourage interest. The students hover around her desk top computer with some kneeling down so that other students could see.

*Amanda (A):* ¿Qué es el nombre de este presidente?


*A:* Este monumento es de George Washington.

[Amanda (A): What is the name of this president?

Student 1 (S1): It is George Washington.

A: This monument is of George Washington]. (Classroom Observation, May 4, 2010)

Amanda proceeds to point out the nation’s capital and explains to the students that this is where congress meets to make decisions for our nation. As Amanda was explaining this, I saw a student take out a coin from his pocket. This student then showed the coin to several students and whispered, “la peseta tiene la imagen del president George Washington.” [the quarter has the image of the president George Washington]. Amanda noticed the student showing his quarter to others and asked him to share with the rest of the class the image of George Washington on the quarter. In this example Amanda provided a physical and social environment to foster understanding and application about the topic at hand. Thus, cultivating the seeds of knowledge, language and interest the students brought forth. Amanda then continued with her cyber walk of the nation’s capital.

*A:* ¿Quién es él?
Alumnos (As): Abraham Lincoln

As: El libero los esclavos.

A: Sí un presidente muy sabio e importante.

A: Los que están enfrente en sus rodillas por favor no se muevan mucho para dejar a los otros alumnos mirar la computadora. Ahora, quiero mostrar la pared de Vietnam.

Para honrar los soldados de esa guerra criamos una pared con todos los nombres de los que murieron en Vietnam que se llevó a cabo en 1968-1974. Las familias de estos soldados/as van a esta pared y usan un lápiz y papel para trazar el nombre de esa persona como un recuerdo de su sacrificio para nuestra nación.

[A: Who is he?

Students (Ss): Abraham Lincoln

Ss: He liberated the slaves.

A: Yes a president who was wise and important.

A: The students that are in front sitting on their knees please do not move in order to let the other students see the computer. Now, I want to show you the Vietnam Wall. To honor the soldiers of that war we created a wall with all the names of the people who died in Vietnam that took place in 1968-1974. The families of these soldiers go to this wall and use a pencil and paper in order to trace the name of that person as a remembrance of their sacrifice for our nation]. (Classroom Observation, May 4, 2010)

After 15 minutes or so of viewing short clips and pictures of the nation’s capital and some of the New Mexican capital, Amanda then directs the students to their desk. Amanda reminds the students that in May the class will travel to Santa Fe, New Mexico to visit the state’s capital. Amanda then gave the students a N.M. booklet that had various New Mexican social
studies reading topics (e.g. state government and Pueblo Revolt). As the students return to their seats, the teacher sang the 50 states in alphabetical order with their appropriate capital; soon all the students sang loudly. The adjacent teacher opened her door and yelled “I love it when you sing the states and capitals!” After acknowledging the teacher’s remark, Amanda then reviewed the map of the United States with the 13 colonies sketched in and labeled providing information of the historical past of the United States as the following example will demonstrate. Although Amanda was teaching about the New Mexico government and history, she also included some knowledge and facts about the federal level of the United States and history in order to preview some of the knowledge expected in fifth-grade. Since Amanda had a third-and fourth-grade combination class, she wanted to preview information on this topic better preparing her fourth-graders for fifth-grade content-area expectations.

A: En nuestro repaso el otro día hablamos de los fundadores de la nueva nación, quien fueron ellos?

As: Francés y Europa

A: Aquí está E.U. Habían 13 colonias –Que fue Inglaterra (Amanda showed a concept map of the 13 colonies so that the students could see exactly where they were on the United States map). Pero Estados Unidos está muy lejos de donde estaba el rey de Britaña. Luego muchos problemas pasaron, por ejemplo, el rey quería que la gente habitando las 13 colonias pagara ingresos y muchas reglas estrictas luego comenzó la revolución.

A8: Estaba la gente muy furiosa e incómoda

A: ¡Sí claro! Es por eso que comenzó la guerra y los Estados Unidos peleó con Inglaterra y los Estados Unidos ganaron su libertad. Y ahora hablamos inglés aquí.
A3: Sí hablamos inglés porque nuestros antepasados hablaron inglés y claro español también.

A: Buen punto inglés por Inglaterra y español por España

[A: In our review the other day we spoke of the founding fathers of our nation, who were they?

Ss: French and Europe

A: Here is the U.S. There were 13 colonies—What was England? (Amanda showed a map of the 13 colonies so that the students could see exactly where they were on the United States map). But United States was very far from where the king of England was. Then a lot of problems happened, for example, the king wanted all the inhabitants of the 13 colonies to pay taxes and many strict laws. It was because of this that a revolution started.

S8: The people were very furious and uncomfortable.

A: Yes of course! This is why the war started and the United States fought with England and the United States won their liberty. And now we speak English here.

S3: If we speak English, why do our ancestors speak English and of course Spanish too?

A: Good point English from England and Spanish from Spain]. (Classroom Observation, May 4, 2010)

These oral exchanges demonstrated how Amanda validated students’ voices, recognizing the student’s response where he mentions that our founders were from England and Spain, noting that both have influenced the United States and in particular New Mexico. An important point was made by the student and was allowed and acknowledged by the teacher. Amanda
supported the cultural knowledge the student knew about the founders of our country. The student’s literacy understanding of “founders” as was told in Amanda’s narrative did not match his knowledge. Therefore, the student felt compelled to add España [Spain]; thus, he was inclusive of the many cultural and linguistic groups such as Native Americans that influenced the formation of New Mexico, just as one of the N.M. student booklet readings indicated. Amanda concluded the day by giving the students a separate U.S. preamble handout and having them read together, the U.S. Constitution’s preamble and paraphrasing main parts using cloze sentences. The students were encouraged to read other student’s written responses in the U.S. preamble handout in order to share their ideas about their understanding about the preamble.

This integrated strategy of teaching and learning utilized social studies standards (civic and government) from third and fourth grade levels since Amanda taught a combination class. The concept map (a sketch that illustrated and labeled the main concepts and ideas being taught about the unit) was a frontloading strategy that developed the students’ understanding of the text and the context (Meyer, 2000; Gibbons, 2009). Providing access to cultural, cognitive, and language knowledge about the studied topic supported the student’s literacy learning. In addition, this type of integrated literacy teaching and learning via cyber walks, chants, and shared reading and writing with the teacher the “expert other” (Vygotsky, 1978), cultivated student-centered literacy practices (Flores, 1990; Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991). Instead of merely just a “transfer of knowledge” (Freire, 1970) about the U.S. government, Amanda brought relevance and responsiveness to her students’ understanding through meaningful and student-centered literacy instruction.
At the center of Amanda’s literacy teaching and learning were her students. During a critical dialogue about testing, Amanda mentioned that “I have to teach whole group today with lots of pair/group activities. I have to because today is the only day I can teach my students. The rest of the week is New Mexico Standard Based Assessment (NMSBA).” Amanda felt that she had to adapt the class delivery since time was “precious.” In Amanda’s own words, “Instead of doing 20 minutes of small group reading time, I decided to frontload the information and work together as opposed to small groups (4-5 students). I had to because tomorrow we are testing and I need to teach.” Amanda was torn between the amount of testing and lack of teaching, a topic that I will expand on in the latter part of this chapter. However, she never lost focus of the student’s literacy educational needs. Rather, Amanda adapted her literacy teaching and made the most of the “one” day she had of teaching during the four weeks of NMSBA testing.

**Nuestra voz [Our voice].** Marisol shared during a critical dialogue that progressive literacy was “*incluyendo la voz del estudiante es necesario siempre.*” [including the students’ voice [and] is always necessary]. Marisol believed that through progressive literacy students can voice their opinion and think about the topic at hand in order to question and not simply state what others in the class have shared out. The following example portrays how Marisol’s progressive literacy outlook promoted an expectation of oral and written language for genuine purposes through the use of Literature Circles (Daniels, 2002). In this particular Literature Circles (LC) group discussion, the students first read for 20 minutes and then talked about the book Pink y Say by Patricia Polacco (1994). The LC activity took 45 minutes to an hour for the entire literacy cycle (read and discuss book). This day I joined one of the LC group’s conversation.
Alumno/a 1(A1): Mejor parte es Pink le dijo a Say que lo toque porque el tocó a Abraham Lincoln.

Susana (S): ¿Por qué?

A1: Porque Abraham Lincoln era importante y el presidente.

S: Es como Obama ahorita, verdad. Él es presidente y popular...

A1: Pues, todo depende.

S: Sí, cierto depende si crees en lo que él hace con su poder o lo que representa.

A2: Si, pero Abraham Lincoln todos lo querían especialmente la gente de color.

[Student 1 (S1): The best part was when Pink told Say to touch him since he touched Abraham Lincoln.

Susana (S): Why?

S1: Because Abraham Lincoln was important and the president.

S: Like Obama right now, right. The president and popular…

S1: Well, it all depends.

S: Yes, it depends if you believe in what he does with his power or what he represents.

S2: Yes, but Abraham Lincoln everybody liked him, especially the people of color.

(Classroom Observation, April 21, 2010)

We continued our discussion about Pink saving Say after getting wounded from battle and then abandoning his unit. Pink and his family took Say in and nursed him back to health.

A3: A mí me gustó esta historia porque Pink rescató a Say y le ayudó bastante.

S: ¿Piensas que Say hubiera hecho lo mismo para Pink? Es decir rescatarlo y ayudarle siendo que él era un esclavo.
A1: No creo porque es por eso que tenían la guerra civil unos querían esclavos y otros no. Y donde Pink estaba en Georgia no podían ayudarles a los esclavos.

[S3: I like this story because Pink and his family rescued Say and helped him out a lot.

S: Do you think Say would have done the same thing for Pink? To rescue and help him out knowing that he was a slave.

S1: I do not think so since this was one of the reasons they had the Civil War; some wanted slaves and others did not. And, where Pink was in Georgia you could not help out slaves]. (Classroom Observation, April 21, 2010)

The students’ conclusion to my question varied and some replied, “Say no podía rescatar a Pink porque tenía miedo que lo arrestaran por ayudar a un esclavo” [Say could not save Pink because he would be afraid to get caught helping a slave]. Yet others said that, “Say lo hubiera ayudado porque él peleaba por el norte.” [Say would help him out since he was fighting for the North]. After this LC conversation, Marisol mentioned to the students that Pink and Say (1994) was one of her favorite stories because it showed true friendship between two boys who came from very different backgrounds. Although Marisol was not part of the LC conversation, she sowed and tilled progressive literacy in her daily instruction that supported an authentic social context for literacy learning. For example, some authentic responses from students were, first one student questioned President Obama’s popularity and then second another student implied that if one lived in the south helping a slave is not seen as positive. The discourse allowed during literature circles further developed the students’ literacy development both in a purposeful manner because they were given time to read a text and in a comprehensible manner because they were given time to make meaning of the text.
Marisol expressed and practiced progressive literacy in her classroom through the use of *dichos* (as demonstrated in Chapter 4), literature circles, and “*plática*” throughout the study.

**Cuéntame algo [Tell me a story].** Tracy expressed during a critical dialogue that she tried to “*incorporar… por cierto las perspectivas culturales y progresivas.*” [incorporate… for sure the cultural and progressive perspectives]. Tracy’s cultivating spirit yielded a rich linguistic and culture harvest through the use of a student-centered story that generated a sociocultural connection from her students. Further, Tracy created a translanguaging (García, 2010) vision and space in which reading, writing, listening, and speaking overlapped as mutually informative processes. Tracy relied on the students’ multiple languages to generate discussions about texts and also understandings of languages and cultures. Tracy’s motivation for such discussions about texts (whether written by the students or others) was to provide a space for all students to read and subsequently write interesting pieces that drew upon their linguistic and cultural experiences. The following example shows the students involved in reading like writers as they made sense of an author’s choice of words, enlightened by their multilingual lives. This example of a literacy activity took the students through a study of the language and cultural elements presented in the story of *Lluvia de Plata* [Silver Rain] by Sara Poot Herrera (2001). Tracy explained that “*Lluvia de plata fue una de las lecturas más interesantes para mis alumnos/as porque muchos de ellos son de Chihuahua.*” [Lluvia de Plata was one of the most interesting readings for my students because many of them are from Chihuahua]. This reflects Tracy’s dedication to the use of languages and texts that resonate with her students as a point of origin for studying and writing other texts.
Tracy began literature study this day by collaboratively reviewing with the class their reading of *Lluvia de Plata*, a story about Mariana, a young lady who visits the *Tarahumara* region in Chihuahua, Mexico and experiences a cultural and language transformation. The strategy Tracy utilized was *Cuéntame algo* [Tell me a story], which began with a review of the setting of the story. Tracy created an illustrated backdrop (on a long, wide strip of paper) of *la Barranca del Cobre* [Copper Canyon] with the moon overlooking *la sierra Tarahumara* [the *Tarahumara* mountains] inspired by several scenes from the text. Tracy and the students relived the story with picture cards and text of the main events that the students generated the previous day. The students placed the illustrations and text onto the illustrated backdrop.

Tracy’s purposes for reviewing the story with this strategy were to encourage peer interaction and deeper understanding about the text, study the use of language, and consider literary elements they would use in their own writing: characters, setting, time, etc. As Tracy read aloud sections of *Lluvia de Plata*, the students listened actively and often raised their hands or boisterously questioned or commented about the story. The example shows an exchange between Tracy and several students related to a certain scene in the story in which the students find a phonetic cognate expression, *si te cansas* [if you get tired], and discuss the meaning. Typically a cognate is a word that is easily identified between languages because the words are similar in look, sound, and meaning; examples include (Spanish words are in italics): *electricidad*/electricity, *ciencia*/science, and *planta*/plant. In the translanguage context of her classroom, Tracy’s students discovered phonetic cognates, words with similar pronunciation (sounding quite alike) between Spanish and English, but with different spellings. The students were able to relate to these expressions both linguistically and culturally.
Tracy began her literature circles this day by previewing the reading selection *Lluvia de Plata* [Rain of Silver]. The strategy Tracy utilized was *Cuéntame algo* in which she reenacted the story through pictures, student interaction, and some drama. As explained above, Tracy read the text using pictures from the reading text while the students listened actively by placing word and phrase cards on to the an illustrated backdrop of *La Barranca del Cobre* [Copper Canyon] with the moon overlooking la sierra *Tarahumara* [Tarahumara mountains] (copied from one of the scenes from the text) as Tracy read. Also, the students asked questions and commented as she read along. As a student placed his word card on to the backdrop, the student shared the following:

*Esta parte que lee me gusta porque los trabajadores que construyeron el ferrocarril le llamaban al tren que venía de Kansas a Chihuahua ‘Si te cansas.’ Yo creo que no sabían cómo decir Kansas entonces para recordar cómo decirlo solamente mencionaban ‘si te cansas’. [Todos comenzaron a reírse.]*

*Tracy: ¿Por qué encuentran esto chistoso?*

*Alumno: En mi casa nosotros usamos este tipo de palabras…*

*Otros Alumnos: Sí es cierto he oído algo así también en mi casa…*

*Tracy: ¡Muy interesante!*

[This part that I read I liked because the workers that built the railroad would call the train coming from Kansas to Chihuahua ‘If you get tired’. I think they did not know how to say Kansas so then in order to remember how to say it they would mention ‘if you get tired’ [Everybody begins to laugh].

Student: In my house we use these kinds of words…

Other students: Yes this is true I have heard something like this at home too.
Tracy: Very interesting!] (Classroom Observation, May 3, 2010)

This example demonstrated how the language used in the story by the railroad workers had cultural and linguistic connections with the students. Tracy asked the class why they found this funny. The sense-making process of translanguaging was well articulated by one student in Tracy’s classroom when he explained how the railroad workers adapted the word Kansas [/kǽnzəs/] to a Spanish word that was similar in pronunciation, cansas [/kanzás/]. Several students responded that using one language to remember the sounds of words in the other is something they heard at home. The Spanish word gel [pronounced ‘hel’ in Spanish, means gel, like hair gel] is used to remember how to pronounce the word ‘help.’ The Spanish word flor [flower] is used to help recall the pronunciation of the English word ‘floor.’ Many Spanish chistes [jokes] use these phonetic cognate words/expressions to connect Spanish and English words in a humorous way. The play-on-word jokes or chistes that emerge from these phonetic cognates are entertaining; however, to find a word that creates a chiste takes much linguistic and cultural knowledge—across languages and cultures. The students found the translanguage moment amusing, yet the humorous moment reflected the complexity of their understanding of language use across contexts and languages. Further, that complexity was invited into Tracy’s classroom as a strength and asset upon which her students could draw. A cautionary note to translanguaging in the classroom is that as bilingual educators we must not privilege one language variety over another. Rather, teachers need to use translanguaging as one of the language varietites available to students and use as a resource.

After this literacy activity, I asked Tracy if she had planned for this interesting language connection. Tracy replied, “no es algo que yo planea pero seleccioné el cuento
Lluvia de Plata porque sabía que muchos de los estudiantes son de Chihuahua e iban a tener una conexión.” [it is not something I planned but I selected Lluvia de plata because I knew that many of my students were from Chihuahua and they could make a connection]. This translanguaging strategy that Tracy’s students came upon was due to her willingness to create a language space where students could hear and see themselves in the text and feel safe enough to experiment with, take risks in, be tentative about, and explore languages.

In addition, Tracy created a “student friendly version” for doing literature circles (LCs) (Appendix S). This guide provided directions and questions to prompt students’ thinking and comprehension of the text. The questions in this LCs student friendly guide were used as a language mediation tool (Flores, 2008; Gibbons, 2009) in that it supported students needing the language of questioning, inquiring, summarizing, etc. in Spanish. I saw firsthand how the students used this language tool created by Tracy as they read texts and then wrote in their LC journals everything from questions to thoughts. Also, as the students discussed different aspects of the text, I could see them looking at their notes to clarify or expand on a given topic being discussed. Tracy attributed the need to use or not use this tool to the various levels of Spanish language development and the Spanish reading levels that her students brought in to her fifth grade classroom.

The teachers practiced functional and progressive literacy by integrating oral production and literacy understanding in student-centered spaces. These literacy spaces provided opportunities for student’s minds to be cultivated by drawing from their knowledge and experiences in various educational contexts (spontaneous and structured settings) as a regular part of their literacy understanding. The teacher’s role as sower and tiller was seen in Amanda’s structured destrezas interactivas, which supported student’s interactive oral
production of science terms before reading. Marisol created a student-centered space through Literature Circles in order to hear the student’s authentic voice about the text. Tracy created a translanguaging space in which student’s literate identity was expressed and nurtured during her Spanish literacy time. The literacy views expressed and performed by the teachers cultivated an agricultural vista yielding a half harvest. This half harvest portrayed in this section only represented the literacy views the teachers expressed and enacted. However, the teachers continued in their journey of developing their Spanish literacy instructional practices by examining the literacy views (critical and multicultural) they were excluding in their class yet leaned towards developing a whole harvest of literacy pedagogy. The next section unearths the teachers’ challenges and how they described and dealt with these dilemmas.

**Seeds Fallen on Fertile Soil Flourish**

Vista del Sol (VS) has been recognized as an effective dual language school by the school district and state education department standards. In 2009, VS was recognized by the state as an outstanding dual language school serving a diverse group of language learners (e.g. native Spanish speakers, heritage language learners, and native English speakers). Moreover, the school met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as measured by the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) and Spanish test since the enactment of No Child Left Behind in 2002. In fact, during the 2010-2011 school year, Vista del Sol was recognized as an A school according to the new A-F grading system implemented by the New Mexico Public Education Department. The principal, teachers, students, parents, and community leaders were grateful and proud of their academic success and recognition. Regardless of such measures of status, at the top of their list is the well-being of the students, as stated in the schools’ mission statement: “…the students will have a learning environment
which students can be successful academically, emotionally, and socially.” Naturally being successful in academics was important to VS, but just as critical were the student’s emotional and social interests. Vista del Sol’s mission cultivated the teacher’s role through various professional opportunities, but just as important, was nurturing the school’s soil by encouraging a climate for equitable teaching practices to take precedent (Santa Ana, 2002).

Following the agricultural constellation framework of this chapter, I provide evidence of the Seeds Fallen in Fertile Soil Flourish theme with the following description. That is, regardless of the “days of draught” or challenges such as testing when the teachers’ rhythm of teaching was disrupted, the teachers kept the students at the center of their literacy instruction. In spite of challenges, the teachers and students grew mainly due to the fertile soil that had been sowed and tilled throughout the years by administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community at Vista del Sol. In what follows, I describe the teachers’ collective challenges: Accountability and First Language Literacy (FLL) as described during critical dialogues and other teacher collaborations. These findings explain how the Vista del Sol teachers and students were able to flourish in spite of the intemperate climate that testing and other uncertainties provoked.

**Accountability.** The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) testing window spanned from the end of March through the end of April of 2010. During the testing window, we had a critical dialogue (CD) that related to the teachers’ views towards the NMSBA. The major emergent topics were as follows:

1. Accountability at the state level does not take into account their students’ knowledge/experiences and language skills;
2. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) places much stress on teachers and students,

and

3. Addressing item bias questions on the NMSBA. (Critical Dialogue, March 10, 2010)

Since the enactment of the 2002 act of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), many schools have changed their literacy instructional practices to better match assessment demands made by the NCLB educational act. For example, during the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) testing window March 29, 2010 through April 23, 2010 (the last week was used to make-up any testing missed by students), the teachers were required to teach on Mondays and test the remainder of the week. Although some teachers were able to teach after testing, many students were too “tired” to focus on any literacy lesson. The teachers in my study were not immune to this educational scenario brought forth by NCLB through testing. This section describes the emergent topics brought forth from the critical dialogue about views towards NMSBA and how rhythm of teaching was disrupted from the multiple testing windows during the spring semester I collected data at Vista del Sol in 2010.

**Views towards New Mexico Standards Based Assessment.** As I arrived to our third critical dialogue in March 31, 2010, I knew that the teachers had started testing for the NMSBA. I modified the questions I had written for our CD to more relevant ones about views on testing. In this CD Marisol was not in attendance due to personal reasons. I began our dialogue with the question: “¿Los exámenes de esta semana cómo van? Y más importante, cómo creen que sus estudiantes están haciendo con sus emociones, físicamente y académicamente durante este tiempo tan tenso?” [The testing for the week how is this going? And more importantly, how do you think your students are doing with emotions, physically,
and academically during this time?] Amanda mentioned that her students were doing well but, that the testing was “largo y se cansan.” [long and they get tired]. Amanda went on to say that she had high expectations of her students and she knew that they could do well on the test and most could meet proficiency. The 2009-2010 accountability expectation set for New Mexico was that all students should be able to score at 67% in order to be proficient in language arts and mathematics. Tracy disagreed with Amanda and commented the following:

Tracy (T): Sí pero yo no estoy de acuerdo que nuestros estudiantes realmente no están evaluados correctamente por sus habilidades de escribir, lectura, etc. Porque por ejemplo hoy estaban leyendo sobre una clase de perro que ellos no reconocían y otras cosas que automáticamente van a estar en desventaja porque no tienen ese conocimiento “Prior knowledge” del contexto. Entonces contestan las preguntas lo mejor que pueden y eso es lo que hacen.

[Tracy (T): Yes but I am not in agreement that our students are being evaluated correctly through their writing and reading, etc. For example, today they were reading about different breeds of dogs that they did not recognize and other things that they automatically are at a disadvantaged because they do not have that prior knowledge of the context. Then they answer the questions the best they can and that is what they do]. (Critical Dialogue, March 31, 2010)

Tracy argued that her students were at a disadvantaged because of the lack of “prior knowledge” needed for them to contextualize or make sense of the text and context in which the questions from the test were being solicited. Amanda agreed with Tracy’s argument; however, Amanda mentioned that much has to do with exposure and gave the example:
Amanda (A): ...muchos de mis estudiantes no viajan o van a museos...pero los estudiantes que tienen experiencias de viajar e ir a diferentes lugares ellos tienen más conocimiento de más cosas que cuentan en estos exámenes. Yo lo noto en mi aula...las pruebas no lo toman en cuenta el conocimiento de nuestros estudiantes y para nosotros parece que no somos buenas maestras.

[Amanda (A): ...many of my students do not travel or go to museums...but the students that have experience traveling and going different places they have more knowledge of many more things that count on these tests. I notice this in my class...the tests do not take this into account our students’ knowledge, and it appears as if we are not good teachers]. (Critical Dialogue, March 31, 2010)

Amanda’s statement of “muchos de mis estudiantes no viajan o van a museos…” [...] I found interesting since it has been a question I often wondered when I taught fourth grade as well. This brought to the surface the issue of what and whose knowledge counts in standardized tests: the standard “mainstream” knowledge or the students’ “funds of knowledge?” Unfortunately, I would have to say the White middle-class mainstream knowledge is what counts.

Nevertheless, Amanda and Tracy never lowered their teaching and learning expectations of their students and believed that “un balance” [a balance] was necessary for their students to learn the upper grade knowledge and skills necessary to advance to middle school and beyond. Amanda and Tracy often retaught certain literacy and math skills to their students and did not move ahead because of the recommendations of the pacing guide. Instead, Amanda believed that “…si no aprenden algo no pueden seguir adelante; es injusto…” [if they do not learn something they cannot move ahead; it is an injustice]. My last
question during this CD was how they used the NMSBA scores to guide their teaching throughout the year. Amanda and Tracy remind me that it is about “balance” and they take into account the NMSBA trends with other formative tests such as quarterly reading tests (Developmental Reading Assessment and Evaluación del Desarrollo de la Lectura) (Pearson, 2010) and teacher made exams as well. In the following example, Tracy and Amanda explain how they used their literacy data.

Tracy (T): Yo solamente miré, por ejemplo, en lectura que es lo qué les faltó. Y fue critical thinking entonces me enfoco en esto durante mi instrucción. Yo quiero que ello/as piensen en lo que leen y críticamente no solamente respondiendo preguntas básicas de comprensión. Pero mi guía durante el año son mis pruebas para ver que tan bien están aprendiendo lo qué hemos estudiado durante el año.

Amanda (A): Igual yo miro las NMSBA...y lo que necesitan y luego me enfoco en mis pruebas y las del distrito para ver que normas necesito que enseñar.

[Tracy (T): I only looked at the, for example, what was it that they were lacking. And that was critical thinking and so I focused on this during my instruction. I want them to be able to think about what they are reading and critically not just responding to basic comprehension questions. But the guide throughout the school year was my teacher made tests to see how well they learned what we studied this year.

Amanda (A): The same I see the NMSBA… and what I need and then I focus in my own teacher made tests and the district ones to see which standards I need to teach].

(Critical Dialogue, March 31, 2010)
As explained by Tracy and Amanda, “teacher-made tests” were used to better guide their teaching and learning throughout the school year. We then moved to a more personal note on how they felt when they saw these NMSBA results.

Amanda (A): …realmente yo lloro cuando miro las marcas de mis alumnos/as porque no indica lo que ellos/as saben. Yo digo mis estudiantes saben bastante y estos resultados no indican esto para nada. Y el distrito ha de creer que nosotros nomás estamos sentadas con nuestras manos dobladas. Y en realidad eso no es la verdad. Me siento como que no soy una buena maestra. It is a lot of stress!

Tracy (T): El año pasado que mis estudiantes no hicieron bien yo me sentí muy mal. También lloré porque mi nombre estaba publicado para todos que miran como mis estudiantes salieron en estos exámenes NMSBA. Podrían ir en el internet y mirar los resultados de todos los maestros/as eran recursos públicos. Yes it is a lot of stress!

[Amanda (A): …in reality I cry when I see my students’ test scores because it does not represent what they know. I say my students know a lot and these results do not indicate this at all. And the district must think that we are sitting around with our arms folded. In reality this is not true. I feel as if I am not a good teacher. It is a lot of stress!

Tract (T): Last year when my students did not do well I felt very bad. I also cried because my name was publicized so that all can see how my students did on the NMSBA tests. They could go to the internet and see everybody’s results of all the teachers these are public resources. Yes it is a lot of stress!] (Critical Dialogue, March 31, 2010)
The reality of testing can be very threatening and stressful to teachers in the classroom.
Amanda and Tracy mentioned that they both “cried” when they saw the results posted on the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMSBA) website. Amanda cried because she thought that district administrators probably thought that “nomás estamos sentadas con nuestras manos dobladas” [we are just sitting down with our arms folded] and assuming she was not a good teacher. Tracy mentioned “…miren cómo mis estudiantes salieron en estos exámenes NMSBA.” [to see how her students faired in the NMSBA tests]. This suggests that posting NMSBA results in the NMPED website only represented one side of the story and did not depict a fair picture of Tracy’s teaching and her students’ learning that school year. I mentioned to Tracy and Amanda to remember that they know what their students can do because of so many factors, such as language, prior knowledge, and experience; they know that some of their students will perform well and others may not. They plan to keep teaching to their high expectations so that in the future the students will have academic success.

Rhythm of teaching. The rhythm of teaching dilemma first appeared at a teacher collaboration meeting with Marisol and Amanda in the spring semester (January 20, 2010). Amanda mentioned that since testing began her “rhythm of teaching” was not in sync anymore. I was intrigued with her response, so I followed up with Amanda. She indicated that her regular pace of teaching, which, for the most part, took part in the fall semester, was interrupted in the spring semester because of all the testing. Amanda said that once the spring semester comes, teaching comes “to a halt,” implying that she cannot continue her teaching instruction as it was in the beginning months of school. The regular pace implemented in the fall semester came to a halt in the spring, causing Amanda’s pace of teaching to become more irregular.
Amanda’s comment about the rhythm of teaching and being present to view how the teacher’s “rhythm” became irregular prompted me to further analyze the data and bring to light the quantity of testing. This month-long testing marathon disrupted the rhythm of the teachers’ lessons. The instruction came to a halt when spring assessments brought forth an intemperate climate in which to teach in. As a way of demonstrating the disruption of rhythm, I created the rhythm of teaching chart (Appendix T) as a visual representation of how the different mandated assessments altered the teachers’ natural pace of instruction by breaking their stride creating an irregular and unnatural pace for learning and teaching.

This chart represents a summary of Vista del Sol’s spring semester (January 2010 through May 28, 2010) assessment schedule for all third through fifth grade teachers and students at Vista del Sol. The Y axis represents the rhythm of teaching; the X axis represents the amount of testing throughout the spring semester of 2010.

The Y axis suggests the pace of the teacher’s instruction before and after testing. In the pre-testing phase, January 4 through January 22, 2010, the teacher’s instruction was at about 100 percent of their natural instructional pace. During the testing phase, the teachers reached an unnatural pace dipping as low as 10 percent in late April. In this context natural instructional pace meant the teachers reorganized, facilitated, guided and monitored their literacy practices based on how well students developed their literacy/biliteracy acquisition. For example, in January, Tracy and Marisol reorganized their literacy instruction to reflect a more progressive literacy view by including Literature Circles as described in the previous section (Nuestra voz and Cuéntame algo) in order to include more student-centered practices. An unnatural pace for teachers created an irregular pace that caused students and teachers “stress” and tiredness in excess. This stress was mainly due to the lack of instruction and the
increase of testing. Moreover, the teachers re-taught literacy lessons to refresh student’s memory of past learning since there were prolonged periods of no Spanish/English literacy instruction. During the testing phase, one can visually see the erratic pace the teachers have to keep up with while testing. In sum, a natural pace for the teachers was a space that was reflective and responsive, providing students with ample educational opportunities to read and write in both languages, while the unnatural pace created the opposite effect in unreflective and irresponsible literacy learning and teaching. This natural versus unnatural flow and rhythm is consistent with the agricultural metaphor. When the climate shifts in irregular ways (tornadoes, floods, droughts), the growth is significantly and negatively influenced.

The X axis of the graph represents the time allocation for each assessment taken by students in the spring semester (January 25, 2010 through May 28, 2010). In January and February 2010 for four weeks in total, the school assessed English language learners (ELLs) using ACCESS, a language proficiency test. As the graph indicates, about three-fourths of the students were ELLs from grades third through fifth and were required to take this test. For two weeks in March 2010, all second through fifth grade students took the District Benchmark Assessment (DBA) for mathematics and reading. In addition, all students (except Kindergartners that take DIBELS) were tested in English and Spanish reading with the Pearson DRA and EDL assessments. At the end of March and through mid-April, the four week testing window for NMSBA and SUPERA (Spanish standardized-based assessment) was endured by all third, fourth, and fifth graders. The SUPERA was only given to students who performed best in Spanish as determined by their Spanish Language Assessment Scale (S-LAS) language test and teacher recommendation. In past years, VS assessed all their third
through fifth grade students in Spanish and English. Due to the amount of mandated testing, the administration decided to have students only take one achievement test either in English or Spanish. At the end of the X axis was the last cycle of testing for the DBA, DRA, and EDL mathematics and reading tests, lasting two weeks in May 2010. In total, the testing marathon lasted 12 weeks, granted some students did not have to take all of the indicated tests. Even so, most students had to endure a minimum of eight weeks of testing that took precious time from students’ learning and teachers’ teaching.

The teachers and students at Vista del Sol endured this testing marathon with great resilience. The students had 8-12 weeks of testing, yet all the examples that I have described in this dissertation flourished in the midst of all this testing, albeit during tiny windows of opportunity. The teachers often told me, “I wish you were here for the fall semester…that’s when we are all fresh…” The soil might have not been as moist during this time of the year. I would say it was becoming dry; however, the climate that the school generated was always “fresh.” In turn, refreshing the soil and keeping it fertile so that, as best they could, they could create a climate in which students could flourish.

First Language Literacy. Traditionally, Vista del Sol Elementary has implemented a 90/10 dual language immersion program in kindergarten followed by a 50/50 model in first through fifth grade. The theory of simultaneous literacy in English and Spanish was practiced with some success; however, a trend that became apparent could not be ignored. The administration decided to look at the Developmental Reading Assessment 2 (DRA2) and Evaluación del desarrollo de la lectura 2 (EDL2) fall data of 2006, and noticed that some of the students at VS were not progressing in reading either in home or new language (Valenzuela, Alvarado, & Ibarra Johnson, 2008). This began a conversation at VS on what
the school felt were the contributing factors in the students’ lack of reading growth in both Spanish and English. The school’s plan of action after analyzing reading scores and dual language research was for kindergarteners to focus on First Language Literacy (FLL) by teaching the second language through oral language development (e.g. develop oracy through content) and early literacy skills in student’s first language (e.g. phonemic awareness and phonic skills) (Valenzuela, Alvarado, & Ibarra Johnson, 2008).

During a Hacia el Avance de Lenguaje Dual (HALD) [Towards the Advancement of Dual Language] collaboration I attended in May 2010, in which Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy attended monthly as part of their professional development opportunities at Vista del Sol, the teachers expressed to the group their concerns and challenges about the first language literacy initiative the school had started two years prior to my study. Marisol commented, “Muchos estudiantes hacen bien en español e inglés no tan bien. Bueno, unos hacen mejor en español que el inglés.” [Many students will do well in Spanish and in English not so well. Well, some do better in Spanish than in English]. Marisol wanted her students to be at grade level in reading in both English and Spanish. These high expectations were part of the school’s goal as well. In Marisol’s and Amanda’s DRA2/EDL2 data, their scores reflected a third grade level score in either Spanish or English but not in both. Marisol questioned the effectiveness of this FLL initiative. I reminded her that according to their school literacy data, their preliminary DRA2/EDL2 findings at the end of the school year 2007/08 showed that among struggling readers, the emphasis on reading in their first language increased their scores significantly. For example, the school had students in second grade that began the year reading at an EDL2/DRA2 level. For some students the reading levels improved from a few
points to as much as 22 points in EDL2 and 20 points in the DRA2 for others (Valenzuela, Alvarado, & Ibarra Johnson, 2008).

Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy knew that their principal supported first language literacy, and they wanted to better understand at the upper grades how first language literacy would affect their students’ reading scores. The following research questions were action steps that the teachers at Vista del Sol were collecting data on:

*How do we determine first language proficiency?*

*Which language assessment tool should we use to determine language proficiency?*

*When do we introduce formal literacy instruction in the second language?*

*How do we adjust schedules to provide more time for first language literacy?*

*How do we maintain a 50/50 model in a team-teaching situation while implementing first language literacy?*

After the teachers gathered data (based on the questions above) in the 2009/10 school year, many presented during their monthly professional development. For example, in a teacher collaboration I attended, several teachers shared how they adjusted their schedules to provide more time for first language literacy in grades K-2.

If dual language educators stopped to consider the context, many of the teachers might simply assume that the most successful DL programs are those that teach literacy simultaneously. However, research shows (Garcia et al, 2008; Hornberger, 2009; NDLC, 2009; Reyes & Halcón, 2001; Romaine, 1989; Valdés, 1994) that we still do not have adequate understanding and data that supports simultaneous literacy to be the most effective literacy approach.
Developing a Whole Harvest

Cultivating a whole harvest can be daunting; many hours are spent sowing and tilling the soil so that fruit seed can grow to its fullest potential. The teachers’ enacted literacy practices were functional and progressive literacy views. These literacy fields only yielded a rich half harvest. While the fruit of their labor fostered student-centered and interactive literacy strategies, the teachers’ offerings lacked a more “holistic” literacy harvest. However, the teachers examined their literacy practices during the critical dialogues and teacher collaborations; as a result, the fruition of multicultural and critical literacy views as generative themes were awakened.

Towards a multicultural perspective. In recent discussions of cultural literacy, a controversial issue has been whether cultural literacy is the same as multicultural literacy. On the one hand, some (Banks, 1993; Sleeter & Grant, 1987) argue that cultural literacy is “Eurocentric.” From this perspective, it seems as if cultural literacy was focused on White middle class cultural values. On the other hand, others argue that cultural literacy is inclusive of other ethnic groups. In the words of Hirsch author of the book *What Your Second Grader Needs to Know* one of the view’s main proponents, “this book includes myths, stories, and poems from around the world” (Introduction, 1991). According to this view, cultural literacy does represent cultures from “around the world.” In sum, then, the issue is whether cultural literacy represents one cultural literacy view or multicultural literacy views. In the same way, the teachers in my study discussed at length the relevancy and meaning of cultural literacy view whether it drew from a monoculture or multicultural view. In the following example, I begin by clarifying the definition of cultural literacy since the teachers were unclear between cultural literacy and multicultural literacy. The explanation led to a
discussion and a better understanding of this literacy view to the extent that Marisol, Amanda, Tracy believed that a multicultural literacy view needed to be added to the list of literacy views I had presented to them. After a brief check-in with the group, I asked the first question: “¿Qué ideología (vista) de lectoescritura consideras ser como expresas tu enseñanza de instrucción de lectoescritura en español? Por favor explica.” [What would you consider to be your expressed literacy ideologies (views) for Spanish reading instructional practices? Please explain]. Marisol turned to me and asked if I could clarify the first literacy ideology (Cultural Literacy).

Marisol (M): Por favor, explica el significado de cultural literacy...

Susana (S): La ideología [vista] cultural en esta pregunta significa la cultura anglosajona, en mi opinión. Por ejemplo, E.D. Hirsch escribe libros para cada nivel escolar con ideas de literatura y currículo que se debe leer para ser un lector bien informado de la literatura que encontramos en la academia. El trata de incluir leyendas y cuentos del mundo alrededor pero tiene un enfoque más "Eurocentric," entonces no es muy inclusivo. Como leyendo Shakespeare y aprendiendo de todas sus obras que es interesante lectura, pero en realidad cuando yo leo eso para mí no tenía sentido y no entendía casi nada de lo que él estaba escribiendo. Como adulto en la universidad entonces pude entender más lo que Shakespeare representaba.

[Marisol (M): Please explain the meaning of cultural literacy…

Susana (S): The cultural ideology in this question represents the Anglo Saxon culture, in my opinion. For example, E.D. Hirsch has written books for each grade level with ideas of literature and curriculum to read in order to be a well-informed reader of the literature we find in the academy. He tried to include legends and stories from around
the world but the focus draws more on the ‘Eurocentric’; therefore, it is not too inclusive. Like reading Shakespeare and learning all about his work although it is interesting readings, but in reality when I read this for me it did not make any sense and I did not understand for the most part anything that he was writing about. As an adult at the university, I was able to better understand what Shakespeare represented]. (Critical Dialogue, April 20, 2010)

In this example, I gave my explanation of what cultural literacy represented to me in order to give them a better understanding of this view. I mentioned that this literacy view centered in a “Eurocentric” lens. I gave the example of Hirsch (1991) series of texts that he had created emphasizing a white middle-class mainstream culture (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). After I explained cultural literacy, the teachers agreed that the definition was limited and would have been better if multicultural was included instead of cultural literacy. In Amanda’s own words:

_Hace un año cuando estábamos mirando programas de lectura en español y un enfoque que yo, Tracy y Marisol teníamos era que los textos fueran multicultural para que nuestros alumnos puedan conocer su cultura y la de otros. So, no entiendo muy bien por qué cultural literacy está definida en esta manera para mí es más incluyendo la cultura en la escritura y lectura._

[About a year ago we were looking at reading programs in Spanish and a focus that I, Tracy, and Marisol had was that the texts were multicultural so that our students could recognize their culture and that of others. So, I do not understand why cultural literacy is defined in this manner. For me it is more to include the culture in reading and writing]. (Critical Dialogue, April 20, 2010)
Amanda recognized the importance of multiculturalism and did not understand why any emphasis should be given to cultural literacy. Amanda concluded the following about her understanding of cultural literacy view: “por eso para mí es importante enseñar en una manera multicultural y es lo que pensaba que la primera perspectiva indicaba pero ahora entiendo qué es lo que significa.” [This is why it is important for me to teach in a multicultural manner and that is what I thought the first perspective indicated but now I know the significance of it]. Amanda advocated for multicultural texts, at district level, by selecting a reading basal and other texts that had multiple cultures represented. I never observed Amanda using multicultural texts; her additive approach (Banks, 1993; Sleeter & Grants, 1987) towards multicultural literacy focused on adding lessons and units drawing on the multiple perspectives and experiences of the students. For example, when she taught New Mexican History, she let each student “escogan un neomexicano famoso” [select a famous New Mexican] which allowed a representation of various people groups from the Spaniards to various Native American tribes. Also, each student had to create a pie graph that represented the racial make-up of New Mexico and engage in a discussion of what that information meant to them.

Marisol agreed with Amanda’s response in that cultural literacy was narrow and multicultural should also be valued as a literacy view. Marisol gave reasons for including multicultural:

Estoy de acuerdo que esta definición de lectura cultural es un poco limitada. Yo pensé lo mismo que es sobre multicultural y no solamente la cultura anglosajona pero todas las otras que uno tiene que saber. Si nomas nos enfocamos en una entonces no aprenden de otros.
[I agree that the definition for cultural literacy is limited. I thought the same that it was about multicultural literacy and not just the Anglo Saxon culture but also including many others that one needs to learn about. If we only focus on one then you will not learn about others]. (Critical Dialogue, April 20, 2010)

Marisol’s own words were, “es sobre multicultural y no solamente la cultura anglosajona.” [it is about multicultural and not just the Anglo-Saxon]. This statement represented her multicultural literacy view. Marisol later mentioned, “Entonces más multicultural, yo pienso más en culturally relevant pedagogy de todos los estudiantes.” [So then more multicultural, and I think more of a culturally relevant pedagogy of all the students]. For Marisol, it was important to include the “culturally relevant” texts during her literacy teaching so that throughout the year all students see themselves in the literacy curriculum. In contrast to Amanda, Marisol views multicultural literacy through a culturally relevant lens, thus moving towards a more transformational approach to multiculturalism (Banks, 1993; Sleeter & Grants, 1987). For instance, during Marisol’s literature circles, she selected texts that came from different points of view from perspectives of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds as was demonstrated in the Nuestra Voz example. In addition, Marisol and her partner teacher selected the following texts for their literature circles: Going Home by Eve Bunting (1996); Sister Anne’s Hands by Marybeth Lorbiecki; Parrot in the Oven: Mi Vida by Victor Martinez (1998); So Far From Sea by Eve Bunting (1998); and Tomás and the library lady/Tomás y la señora de la biblioteca by Pat Mora (1997), to name a few. Moreover, Marisol and her partner teacher decided to use various book titles during literature circles that were selected according to the students’ reading levels. They believed different book titles allowed all students to participate in literature circles.
Tracy expressed the following about her understanding of cultural literacy: “this literacy draws from a Eurocentric lens rather than a multicultural perspective.” Furthermore, Tracy stated, “Pues para mí... ah; tomar en cuenta las culturas de los estudiantes que [inaudible] tienen, ¡Qué no!” [Well for me...ah; take into account the student’s culture that they bring, of course!] Multiculturalism was an important instructional literacy practice in her class since she recognized that “tomar en cuenta” [taking into account] students’ cultures was important, “of course!” Tracy applied multicultural literacy through a transformational approach (Banks, 1993; Sleeter & Grants, 1987), similar to Marisol, by implementing literature circles using the core reading basal from McGraw Hill-Lectura [reading] (2001) and other texts. Literature Circles as the only independent reading structure throughout the school day opened a space for students to learn from one another linguistically and culturally. This transformative approach towards multicultural literacy was enacted in the Cuéntame algo example wherein Tracy created a vision and space for students to learn various cultural and linguistic perspectives.

At the center of our critical dialogues, we placed Cadiero-Kaplan’s four ideologies in order to deconstruct, construct, and reconstruct (Freire, 1985, 1994; Bartolomé, 2008) the Spanish literacy practices represented in the textbooks and curriculums and generate new perspectives to use in their classrooms. The teachers did not express or enact cultural literacy in their classroom. Rather, they expressed a more multicultural approach to the teaching and learning of Spanish literacy. All three teachers expressed that they practiced some level of multicultural literacy, which informed my research by adding one more literacy views in order to represent their Spanish literacy instructional practices (as noted on Table 5.1).
Although providing multicultural texts to students does not necessarily mean enacting a multicultural view, Tracy, Marisol, and Amanda critically and consciously selected texts from their reading basal, school library, and purchased chapter books through a multicultural lens and approach. The lens they applied was selecting books culturally relevant to their students. The teachers’ multicultural literacy approaches were implemented through additive and transformational approaches. As the teachers continued to develop a consciousness of their literacy practice, they began moving towards a more critical action approach and generated a more “holistic” literacy orchard.

**Critical learners.** The findings in this section challenge many popular reading program claims that critical learning is taking place throughout their reading curriculum and step-locked lesson plans. A number of critical thinking teaching and learning pedagogies have suggested that by using the *Bloom’s Taxonomy* line of questioning students can do critical literacy. By focusing on just *Bloom’s Taxonomy*, one will easily overlook how students are involved in reading the world and the word (Freire & Macedo, 1987) by deconstructing texts and discourses both inside and outside the classroom (Shor, 1999; Luke & Freebody, 1999) through critical literacy. This was a dilemma that many of the teachers at Vista del Sol dealt with when discussing how all students could become critical learners. The following example illustrates how Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy responded to students’ input about their (teacher’s) literacy practices.

In several upper grade teacher collaboration sessions I attended with the teachers in my study, the discussion throughout the meeting was often the need for critical thinking (using Bloom’s Taxonomy approach) in their classrooms. The teachers observed that their students were lacking this type of literacy learning from teacher-made test and standardized
based assessment data. Tracy shared with me how she and another upper grade teacher asked their students, “What do you think about our literacy block?” and used a Plus/Delta chart to help generate students input about this topic. Tracy shared the students’ input (Table 5.2) since it was an artifact (plus/delta chart) that Tracy and her colleagues used to better understand the students’ struggles during their literacy block. A plus/delta chart lists things that students liked or worked well (plus) and things they’d like changed (using the mathematical symbol delta, which refers to change).

**Table 5.2 Plus/Delta Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn strategies</td>
<td>No popcorn reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One more RACE letter</td>
<td>No recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve our fluency</td>
<td>Do not teach us how to use reading strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD Chart</td>
<td>The stories/different books for different people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing prompts</td>
<td>Don’t get to pick our own stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn key words</td>
<td>Too many kids in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets loud and hard to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forget information because of re-reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need more interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break it down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough student comments and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do not read enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t learn enough from the stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too many notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading score going down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat story over and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overwork our brains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tracy also mentioned the types of books her students wanted to read: chapter books, interesting, adventure, historical, mystery, and funny books.

The student-generated Plus/Delta chart highlighted the fact that students did not find their literacy block stimulating academically, emotionally, and socially for various factors. I will point out two responses that caught the attention of the upper grade teachers. First, ‘we do not read enough; many of the students did not appreciate not having independent time to just read. All upper grade teachers followed a guided reading format (teacher led reading with some student input) during their English and Spanish literacy block. The teachers realized that the literacy block was too structured and did not provide a space for independent reading or self-selected reading. Therefore, the teachers decided to add an independent reading component to their literacy block by implementing Literature Circles. Tracy and Marisol approached me to collaborate with them in developing and organizing their Literature Circles (LC). As part of my action research responsibilities, I agreed and met with them throughout the month of February 2010 to develop and March 2010 to implement LC in the classroom. Second, ‘not enough student comments and ideas,’ implied that the students wanted time to talk about the book and to voice their opinions and understanding of the reading text. Through the implementation of LC, the teachers provided an opportunity for more student-centered dialogue. As a result of the student input, the teachers responded and generated an adapted version of Literature Circles (Flores, 2008). After several weeks of implementing LC, Tracy noted that one of her students, after reading and sharing her insights about the book, said, before departing for lunch, “pero yo quiero seguir hablando del libro.”
[But I want to continue talking about the book]. This was an interest to reading that Tracy had not seen in her students since the school year started.

In addition, Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy had attended a school wide professional development on the New Mexico Standards-based Assessment (NMSBA) for 2009. The teachers shared with me during a critical dialogue that the instructional coach mentioned that their students (third-through-fifth) did not do well in “critical thinking” types of questions. Further, Tracy said that “most students had a difficult time with inference, examining a text, and hypothesizing.” This led the teachers to reevaluate how they did Spanish and English literacy. As a result of this student input about their literacy block and NMSBA results, most of the third-through-fifth grade teachers modified their literacy block to include more critical teaching/learning through literature circles, more conversations of the texts and creating their own tests that included higher order of thinking (analyze, infer, and examine). However, as stated earlier, this does not necessarily include a critical literacy perspective.

Critical teachers. At first glance, upper grade teachers (Tracy, Amanda, and Marisol included) appeared to view critical literacy equivalent to critical thinking. But on closer inspection during a critical dialogue, the teachers expressed how they understood the differences. What follows are the teachers’ views of critical literacy as they understood it and struggled to apply in their classroom.

Amanda expressed in the post interview that critical literacy view was one that she “wants to implement in her classroom next year.” Subsequently, Amanda conveyed that critical literacy was a view she did not implement in her classroom. In the following example, Amanda provided an explanation of critical literacy and how she interpreted this literacy.
Amanda: ... para mí la última [lectura crítica] yo la miro como por ejemplo, la biblia todos tenemos una interpretación de lo que significa y es por eso que hay diferentes religiones. Entonces no todos estamos de acuerdo, pero usamos el libro e interpretamos lo que significa a nosotros en muchas maneras, es lo que creo que significa lectura crítica.

[Amanda: …for me the last one [critical literacy] I see it, for example, the bible we all have an interpretation of the meaning and it is because of this that there are different religions. Then, not all of us are in agreement but we use the book and interpret what the meaning is to us in many ways, this is what I think the significance of critical literacy means]. (Critical Dialogue, April 20, 2010)

Amanda provided analogy by referencing the bible as being a text that is interpreted differently by many people. Amanda’s bible example represented her belief of what critical literacy was to her. As I mentioned, she did not express critical literacy view as one that she practices in her classroom. However, I did observe her asking students questions such as “¿Qué piensan?”[What do you think?] in turn to get to their thoughts on the subject. Of course, I do agree with Amanda that critical literacy was an area she needed to learn and teach more about in making this a professional learning goal. Being open to multiple interpretations of texts is one facet of critical literacy, but only if those interpretations are rooted in discussions of power, privilege, position, and other tenets of critical literacy. Allowing for personal interpretation is transactional (Rosenblatt, 2004), but not necessarily critical.

In what follows, Marisol articulated the significance of critical literacy and how she was in the beginning steps of developing a critical literacy view in her classroom.
Lectoescritura crítica es esencial. Yo fui a una universidad que el enfoque era crítico. Estudiamos a Paulo Freire y los profesores siempre inculcaron que todos trabajamos juntos para ayudar uno al otro...tenemos un dicho que ‘No te lo tragues entero.’ Es decir que cuando te digan algo tienes que pensar lo que otros digan pero también lo que uno opina y piensa. A mis alumnos siempre les digo que me den su opinión y que piensen. Les doy tiempo para pensar y hablar sobre lo que quieran decir y luego les pregunto por su opinión.

[Critical literacy is essential. I went to a university where the focus was a critical one. We studied Paulo Freire and the professors always encouraged us to work together in order to help one another...we have a proverb that ‘do not believe everything you hear.’ This is to say that when someone tells you something you have to think about it and not just respond back and mention what others are saying but also what your opinion and thoughts are. I always tell my students to give me their opinion and for them to think. I give them time to think and speak about what they want to say and later I asked them for their opinion]. (Critical Dialogue, April 20, 2010)

Marisol’s educational background drew from a critical perspective. Marisol also stated a popular Latino dicho [proverb] that connotes a critical view that is, “No te lo tragues entero.” [Do not believe everything you hear]. This dicho became our mantra throughout our dialogues about critical literacy since it represented the meaning of what “critical” meant to us. Marisol also pointed out that she required that her students voice their opinion and think about the topic at hand in order to question and not simply state what others in the class have shared out. For instance, in Chapter 4 Marisol asked her students “¿Cómo creen que sus padres obtienen el dinero para pagar la comida, bills…?” [How do you think your parents...?]}
get their money to pay for food, bills…?] The students then shared their thoughts about how parents earn money. One student’s response was “mi mamá trabaja en asistencia…” [my mother works in assistance living…] Marisol often asked open ended questions to generate a dialogue in her classroom. Still, admitting that she was beginning to consider critical literacy is made evident by her openness to her students, yet her hesitancy to engage with issues of, for example, position (perhaps by asking about her student families’ SES) suggests she has more to learn about critical literacy.

Tracy understood in theory critical pedagogy and literacy from her graduate courses; however, she did not know how to put it into practice. Tracy mentioned that “lectura crítica es algo que quiero aprender más en mi practica de enseñanza.” [Critical literacy is something that I want to learn more about in my teaching practice]. Consequently, Tracy asked me to co-teach with her a critical literacy lesson in her classroom. I agreed to co-teach with her and we planned the lesson together. I have included the critical literacy lesson plan (Appendix U) we co-created to address issues of peer-pressure in school. After co-teaching in Tracy’s class for several days in May 2010, I asked Tracy to send me a reflection about the teaching and student learning. The following example represents Tracy’s thoughts about her students not participating too much during our class discussion about peer-pressure. Tracy wrote the following: “Creo que siempre tienen esta idea en su mente que la maestra quiere escuchar o oír algo, que están buscando la respuesta correcta en vez de su propia explicación de lo que estábamos aprendiendo en clase.” [I think that they have this idea in their head that the teacher wants to hear the correct response instead of their own explanation of what was being studied in class]. In Tracy’s reflection she mentioned, “la respuesta correcta” [correct response]. I interpreted this as meaning her students’ classroom interaction
reflected a pattern in which the teacher initiated a question, students responded, and teacher evaluated (IRE) (Mehan, 1979). Tracy pointed out in other conversations of how difficult it was for her students to “think critically” when discussing a text. I wholeheartedly agree with Tracy on the IRE point. While teaching the peer-pressure-critical literacy lesson, I found it difficult to have an extended discourse about their feelings, thoughts, and opinions on the topic at hand. Several students did have input on the topic, while others listened attentively. Tracy and I later discussed the reasons why we thought the students were hesitant to discuss the topic. We concluded the following:

1) The topic was difficult and one lesson on this was not enough;
2) The lesson was in Spanish and language was a factor since some students felt that they could only communicate their ideas in Spanish during this lesson, and
3) The discourse pattern was often IRE and students needed more practice using more of a dialogue or instructional conversation discourse patterns.

I asked Tracy if she would consider doing more critical literacy next year in her class. Tracy’s response was:

Me gustaría enfocar más en lectura crítica el próximo año…durante lectura preguntarles a los estudiantes ¿por qué fue escrito? y ¿quién lo escribió este texto? ¿...qué experiencias trae el auto? Este año, por ejemplo, estudiamos Amistad y aprendimos sobre la historia de esclavos, pero a la próxima quiero preguntar, si ustedes fueran en esta posición, ¿Cómo reaccionarían?...más esta perspectiva, tomarlo más en la realidad en vez de ...en este nivel superficial del cuento.

[I would like to focus more on critical literacy next year…during their reading asking the students why was this written? and who wrote this text?… what experiences does
the author offer? This year, for example, we studied *Amistad* and we learned about the history of slavery but in the future I want to ask, if you were in this position, how would you react?... do more of this perspective, focus more on the reality instead of...in this superficial level of the story]. (Classroom Observation, May 10, 2010)

Although Tracy had studied critical pedagogy at the graduate level, she never had the opportunity to implement critical literacy teaching/learning in her classroom until she asked that we co-plan a critical literacy lesson. As she expressed in the previous example, she wants to employ more critical literacy in the following school year and in her own words “*tomarlo más en la realidad en vez de ...en este nivel, superficial de cuento.*” [take on more realistically rather...than a this superficial level of the story]. She may need a community of teachers with whom to explore this area, reflecting back on the theories she learned and making decisions about how those look when implemented.

**Cultivating a whole harvest.** As a result of this reflective process, the teachers realized the need to further develop their literacy instruction by developing a more holistic dual language pedagogy that included critical literacy. The last two critical dialogues with Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy, I included readings from Gibbons (2009) on balanced reading and student roles during reading. Also, I asked the teachers to read two versions of Columbus’ voyage to the Americas and to “critically” deconstruct both texts.

**Holistic literacy view.** Amanda described how Gibbons’ (2009) summary of “bottom-up” (phonics-based approaches which focus on the basic skills for decoding written symbols) and “top-down” (whole language approach which focuses on reading for meaning at the level of the whole text) approaches to literacy were new knowledge to her. In particular, Amanda learned about these terminologies and the importance of implementing
both of these approaches in her classroom. Amanda also provided an example of how bottom-up approaches could be harmful to kids. Amanda taught in the Los Angeles Independent School District and while teaching there, the district adapted the Open Court program. She felt this reading program was a phonics-based approach that “taught students sounds and not meaning.” Amanda also stated that the other important finding through the Gibbons’ readings was the balanced reading pedagogy offered by Gibbons (2009) and Luke and Freebody (1990) that included: Reader as Code Breaker, Reader as Text Participant, Reader as Text User, and Reader as Text Analyst. Amanda stated, “el estudiante como analista es muy importante.” [student as analyst is very important]. The role of the student as text analyst captivated Amanda’s attention so much that she purchased a book with short stories that helped students analyze texts. The only drawback according to Amanda was that “no lo tienen en español.” [They don’t have it in Spanish].

Marisol explained her understanding of the Gibbons text and agreed with Amanda that the students needed to be text analysts more often. However, she did not think that the students could “leer entre líneas.” [read between the lines]. Marisol described why she thought this “es algo que se tiene que enseñar desde el kínder para saber cómo leer entre líneas, muy importante.” [It is something that needs to be taught from kinder in order to know how to read between the lines]. She then explained how she did not want to blame the lower grade (K-2) teachers; rather, she wanted to point out the importance of teaching critical thinking and functions of language from the initial stages of reading. Tracy agreed with Marisol’s comment and mentioned that teaching literacy should use all four roles and have “una mezcla” [a mix] approach. Further, Tracy described how she wanted her students to learn the language by using “cross-linguistic” strategies in order to better analyze texts in
both Spanish and English. Tracy provided an example: “*por 30 minutos nosotros tomamos un texto de inglés y español para analizar las diferencias lingüísticas y aprender por qué son diferentes.*” [for 30 minutes we take a text in English and Spanish in order to analyze the linguistic differences and learn why they are different]. (Critical Dialogue, May 12, 2010)

Our final critical dialogue session began with a brief review of our previous CD session since it had been a three-week interval since we last met by explaining the synthesis on the síntesis de actividades de lectoescritura (Synthesis of Spanish literacy activities) reference sheet implemented in their classroom (Appendix F). I created a synthesis reference sheet of their Spanish literacy activities and strategies enacted in their classrooms and placed in an outline form beginning with Actividades para lectura [Before reading activities], Actividades durante la lectura [During reading activities], and Actividades después de la lectura [After reading activities]. I also explained to them that our focus for this CD was to use the synthesis reference sheet, particularly the section on the strategies in the Actividades durante la lectura (During reading activities). These were: interrogando el texto (interrogating the text) y preguntas al lado (margin reading). Further, I reminded the teachers of the possibility of presenting together at La Cosecha (The Harvest); a local dual language conference which they all agreed was a good idea. We discussed what the agenda should include and decided on making the presentation practical rather than theoretical. Therefore, we all agreed on using the actividades para lectura (activities for literacy) synthesis as our guide when planning our presentation. The dialogue we had in regard to the importance of being critical with texts read in class follows.

I asked the teachers to read two texts that described the discovery of the Americas by Christopher Columbus (from Rethinking Schools, Bigelow, 2008). After reading the texts, we
discussed the differences between the texts and using the “interrogando el textos” [interrogating the text] questions:

1. ¿Por qué se escribió el texto?
2. ¿Para quién se escribió este texto?
3. ¿Qué perspectiva representa el texto?
4. ¿Qué no está mencionado en este texto?
5. ¿De qué otra manera se puede escribir este texto?

[1. What is the purpose of the text?
2. This book is written for whom?
3. What is the perspective of the text?
4. What is missing from the text?
5. How can you re-write this text?] (Critical Dialogue, June 10, 2010)

Tracy explained “un texto es sobre Columbus como un héroe y el otro que no es tan común…” [one text is about Columbus as a hero and the other not so common…]. Further, she mentioned that the shorter text (Bigelow, 2008) had a position and the longer one (6th grade Social Studies Text) did not. Marisol and Amanda agreed and mentioned that the Rethinking Schools text was written to make the reader angry. I mentioned if they thought one text was more biased than the other. Marisol and Amanda replied, “de seguro este el de Rethinking Schools.” Tracy replied, “los dos tienen biases pero uno es lo que nos han enseñado y el otro no es tan popular” [I think both have biases but one has been taught to us and the other is not so popular]. The teachers then expressed concern over teaching controversial topics in class. Marisol explained how problematic it can be to teach topics which may cause conflict between students and the fact that parents may not want certain
topics to be discussed in class. Tracy mentioned that this critical approach could be used for
deep discussions about any topic during literacy time. Thus, there was some fear, yet a sense
of urgency or need for such intellectual and political activity in the classroom.

Through our dialogue about texts, the teachers realized that they had been doing
certain approaches such as discussions in class that could be enriched through a more critical
lens. Marisol mentioned our CD session motto, “no te lo tragues entero” [do not believe
everything you hear] and the importance of promoting this in public schools. Amanda
provided an example of how her students brought their own experiences to the classroom and
teachers needed to be ready. She explained that a student asked during English literacy,
“Where do clothes come from?” and then answered his own question “from little people,
right.” Amanda mentioned that she did not know how to discuss this in class. However,
Amanda shared with us that her interpretation of the students’ questions was that “clothes
and other materials are often made by poor people from around the world.” Amanda
reminded all of us of the importance of connecting to what the students’ experiences are and
the need to ask questions about all the various texts that students are exposed to in school.

Cultivating organic literacy practices began with the teachers implementing
functional and progressive literacy through meaningful interaction and literacy understanding
as a goal for all their students. However, the teachers recognized the need for a more holistic
approach to literacy so that the students could reach their fullest potential in their literacy
education. The generative themes derived from the critical dialogues, collaborations and
classroom observations data in this chapter suggest the lack of multicultural and critical
literacy in the teachers’ literacy pedagogy.
Chapter 6 – Conclusions and Implications

*Political clarity is the recognition by teachers of the structural relationships between schools and society that largely determine the successes and failures of students.*

(Lilia Bartolomé, 2008, p. 376)

**Introduction**

The above quote suggests the need for teachers to develop clarity at the macro-level and micro-level of our society in regards to how our pedagogy can promote success or failure in academics for our students. Implicit in the quote and relevant to this study are the experiences of students who have entered public education through a dual language setting in which they will become bilingual and also have access to the promises of public education. A more general or abstract reading of the quote might suggest that “structural relationships” are the tensions between U.S. educational policies and classroom pedagogy that are in a dialectic relationship with the goal of creating a space for students to succeed. Taken with this broader interpretation in mind, I use this final chapter to consider the political and ideological clarities of the three case study participants. They each, at various times, described insights and frustrations with trying to better serve their students as subjects rather than objects. The students’ bilingual literacy and cultural funds of knowledge inspired the teachers to interrogate and challenge views that objectified their students to a critical view of the students’ learning as it was influenced by the teaching taking place in their classrooms, the work we did during the interviews, and the processes and thoughts they shared during critical dialogues.

This study began with the objective of analyzing the dual language teachers’ Spanish literacy instructional practices and how they were enacted in their classrooms. I suggested
that the teachers’ views of their students would impact their instructional dynamic and that
critical dialogues would help teachers to further develop literacy practices for their students. I
was prepared to find in this study a confirmation of Bartolomé’s findings that teachers’
instructional views can be compared and contrasted with the dominant educational policies
with which they must deal. By supporting the teachers in interrogating some of these policies
as they influenced the teachers’ practice, I found that they came to more fully understand the
ways in which their views reflect those of the dominant society thus perpetuating inequitable
conditions. Indeed, through our critical dialogues, the teachers did uncover inequitable
practices; they assumed the responsibility to “critically appropriate” literacy methods that
could benefit the students’ bilingual literacy and language development in a dual language
context.

**Overview of Major Contributions of this Research**

The major contributions of this research are naming the teachers’ core values, holistic
literacy, and pedagogical clarity.

The teachers’ core values were *con cariño*, *con respeto*, and *como familia*. Although, I
represented the teachers’ views separately in my findings, all three teachers appropriated
these core values in their teaching and learning. The teachers taught their Spanish literacy
“*con corazón*” [with heart] demonstrating this through their passion for teaching and caring
enough to deliver equitable practices in their classrooms. These knowledge-seeking teachers
were were not content with just delivering the basic skills and knowledge, more importantly,
transfroming their literacy practices to more holistic ones including critical literacy and
multicultural literacy.
Spanish literacy instructional practice is creating lessons plans, collaborating with colleagues and deliver of instruction in Spanish that focused on the students’ educational success. The teachers needed to transform their literacy practice by developing awareness about critical literacy and building upon their multicultural literacy foundation. This was done through developing pedagogical clarity in their literacy instruction, curriculum, and assessment.

The teachers developed pedagogical clarity through knowing their literacy practice, the theory involved, and their ongoing reflective process to reach clarity about what to enact in their class. The following section will further explain pedagogical clarity.

**Definition of Pedagogical Clarity**

Pedagogical clarity is based on Bartolomé’s definition of political and ideological clarity. Pedagogical clarity is the increased consciousness that teachers have of their own practice. Consistent with Freire (1974), once teachers have this consciousness, they increasingly rely upon it in teaching. It becomes the frame (Lakoff, 2006) of mind from which they draw as they reflect upon their practice and make decisions about what to enact with their students.

**Continua that Articulate Pedagogical Clarity**

The idea of continua originates from Hornberger (2009) and García and Kleifgen (2010). The continua are rooted in the daily teaching dilemmas that the teachers encountered as they enacted their Spanish literacy instructional practices. We, teachers and researcher, took on the challenge of developing a consciousness of how to define and negotiate the tensions existing between both ends of the continua. We could do this work because the teachers framed their literacy views and practices in response to their deepening
understanding of their students’ sociocultural, linguistic, and academic contexts. In what follows, I describe six continua, each being much more than the endpoints that name them. Each continuum is intended to explain some of the tensions between policies and practices, basal programs and teacher created curriculum, state and national demands and the real needs and interests of the students in a local setting, and more. Teachers moved in different directions along these continua and did so at different times during their teaching lives. In that sense, the continua are organic and are intended to portray the struggles (dialectically) of becoming a critical literacy educator.

**The Functional Literacy View/Progressive Literacy View Continuum**

The tensions between functional literacy and progressive literacy seemed polarizing at times. Functional literacy draws from a skill-based and teacher-centered literacy curriculum; progressive literacy is a more student-centered and authentic approach to literacy learning. Although at first glance these views may seem impossible to reconcile, the teachers were able to frame their literacy instruction to reflect both, consistent with Luke and Freebody’s (1999) use of the four quadrants of literacy activity.

The functional literacy view has been the sanctioned literacy practice since the enactment of “No Child Left Behind” Act (2002) and most recently “Race to the Top initiatives.” The impact that functional literacy had on the teachers’ literacy practice was evident as they tried to incorporate certain skills and concepts; they felt tension doing so because of their commitments to student-centered approaches. The functional literacy view promotes a teacher-centered approach that prescribes the teaching of specific literacy skills such as phonics, vocabulary building, and reading comprehension. A progressive literacy view focuses on a learner-focused curriculum that places the learner at the center and
respects students’ voices, languages, cultures, curiosities, needs, and cultures. This is accomplished via literature that is selected, inquiries that are pursued, and actions that are rooted in the needs and interests of students. The teachers’ dilemma was negotiating their teaching and learning of both of these literacies in order to develop a more holistic literacy practice for their students.

Integrating functional and progressive literacy into their instruction was at times daunting for the teachers; they had to deliberately plan for both. The instructional plans sometimes required for the teacher to start with a teacher-centered approach, teaching the students certain skills for writing, then gradually releasing the responsibility to the students supporting them through this transition. Figure 6.1 presents all of the continua ‘on top of each other as a way of suggesting that teachers are engaged with all of these simultaneously and that teachers move along them in both directions. Pedagogical clarity means that the teachers are aware of this movement and make pedagogical decisions that are rooted in what they want their students to learn and know. Thus, when students need to know a specific skill or strategy, a pedagogically clear teacher is not shy about using direct instruction. She also will know that she is doing so and consider how her teaching will be evident (via assessment) as she moves her class to the right along the continuum. The continua articulating pedagogical clarity should be viewed as a series of teacher decisions that blend into each other, seemingly so gradually and effortlessly that it may be close to impossible for naïve observers to detect. Yet, a teacher with pedagogical clarity can explain her decisions, her teaching, and her students’ actions and responses because of her consciousness. This is resonant with Freire’s praxis (1974).
The Critical Thinking View/Critical Literacy View Continuum

The tension between endpoints of the critical thinking and critical literacy continuum was created by the school’s expectation of preparing their students as critical thinkers and the teachers’ own expectation of developing more critically conscious students.

At one end of the continuum is critical thinking that derives from the Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956) hierarchy cognitive domain. Bloom’s Taxonomy provides a very concrete structure that helps foster the development of critical thinking skills in the classroom. These six levels are: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. The teachers often used these levels in discussions, especially prior to our reading and discussing of critical literacy. The school expectations were that the teachers prepare their students for standard-based assessments using the Bloom’s Taxonomy as a device to measure, name, and evaluate students’ critical thinking in class. For example, the test preparation materials evaluated how well students answered correctly to a multiple choice test question. This directive to teach to the test was a school decision and to an extent provided certain test strategies that could possibly carry on to high stake standardized tests. The teachers’ dilemma with focusing only on test strategies in order for their students to become better test takers was problematic because the teachers had raised their consciousness.

Critical thinking rooted in Bloom created a tension between choosing to teach skills and teaching to be critically literate. The other end of the continuum is critical literacy described in greater depth in Chapter 3. This model for teaching critical literacy offers a multi-method approach towards reading instruction through coding competence, semantic competence, pragmatic competence, and critical competence (Luke & Freebody, 1999). Part
of the journey of developing pedagogical clarity is to critically view the different literacy practices in one’s classroom. The teachers understood that their pull towards critical thinking was stronger because of school wide demand of this literacy practice. However, as they became more conscious of the differences between critical thinking and critical literacy, their movement on the continuum (see Figure 6.1) gradually moved towards critical literacy understanding. Tracy was the only teacher that enacted critical literacy in her classroom. Amanda and Marisol were developing a deeper understanding of what critical literacy entailed in teaching and learning. The critical thinking/critical literacy continuum represents the teachers’ gradual understanding of the differences and intersection of these two practices that brought us closer to a more student-centered learning space. The teachers moved along this continuum by consciously making choices, which is an important part of pedagogical clarity. This continuum also suggests the political nature of pedagogical clarity because teachers’ enhanced consciousness about critical literacy practices places them in tension with their school, district, and state. That political position influences what they will do because they do not want their jobs in jeopardy.

The Additive Approach /Critical Action Approach Continuum

The teachers taught through an additive approach in that they selected multicultural literature for their classrooms as a way to add on to what they were already doing. Their literacy practices focused more on the cultural representations of the text rather than the deeper level of analysis suggested by multicultural education (Banks, 1993). For example, during literature circles the teachers selected a wide range of books that represented different cultures. In reading the text, the teacher and student did point out several differences and similarities that pertained to the various cultures in the literature selection. Their additive
approach towards multicultural literacy helped the teachers develop and implement effective strategies that place importance on cultural diversity. However, they did not move to a critical action approach.

Developing a critical action approach to multicultural education was a goal that the teachers envisioned in their classrooms. Actualizing this critical action approach began with them realizing that a “Eurocentric” approach, such as cultural literacy (Hirsch, 1991) has to be recognized as being a literacy practice that promotes mainstream ideas rather than pluralistic ones. Although the teachers enacted an additive approach, they knew that multicultural education was about teaching cultural diversity by planning units that focus on social issues, language diversity, reducing prejudice in students, and other issues that involved interrogating and acting upon their worlds. Thus, the additive approach/critical action approach continuum (Figure 6.1) reflects the teacher’s pedagogical clarity towards developing a more holistic multicultural literacy view that includes a critical action approach.

The Translanguaging/Dominant Academic Spanish Language Continuum

Dual language education is at the dominant academic Spanish language end of the continuum; DL does allow cross-linguistic or transfer strategies to occur in the classroom. The apprehension that many dual language teachers have is how to monitor between structured and spontaneous cross-linguistic strategies in their classrooms. The view is that if the cross-linguistic strategies are not purposely planned or structured in instruction, then the students will tend to use English more than Spanish in communicating their ideas. I am suggesting, based on lessons that I saw and that the teachers discussed, that the teachers are not taking into consideration how the bilingual students process and create meaning when learning language and content. In dual language education, the need to compartmentalize
languages has occurred in order to avoid concurrent translation in the classroom for teachers. In recent years, some bilingual education scholars (García & Kleifgen, 2010) have rethought the strict separation of languages that concurrent translation has brought upon the bilingual education context.

Teaching literacy in one language should still be intentionally planned by the teacher. However, the ways in which the literacy instruction unfolds should be student-generated, the learning may be relevant and make a greater impact on student learning. For example, Tracy planned her “Lluvia de Plata” [Rain of Gold] literacy lesson in Spanish, and the students used English phonetic cognates to help them make sense of certain words or phrases. Translanguaging refers to the fluid language practices that are part of sense-making; students and teachers are seen and heard moving between languages to support the learning of both languages. While Tracy had structured her literacy lesson only in Spanish, she allowed her students to use translanguaging to communicate their ideas. Many of the bilingual students who enroll in dual language education are users of both English and Spanish in oral communication. Consequently, these bilingual students will interchangeably use both languages to communicate and make sense of the learning taking place in their classroom.

The teachers in my study valued the students’ translanguaging. Nonetheless, the teachers understood that they needed to teach the dominant academic Spanish in their classrooms. The teachers created language objectives that emphasized certain grammar, conventions and vocabulary pertaining to dominate academic Spanish discourse. This tension between translanguaging and dominate academic Spanish brought an awareness to the teachers of how to enact more just practices for their bilingual students. The tension generated at the translanguaging end of the continuum may help actualize a space for
translanguaging where students can reach back and move between their language repertories, fluidly. Teachers’ consciousness of this movement is part of their pedagogical clarity as they make decisions about and across languages, may support more effective bilingual learning.

**The Literacy-based Practices/Content-based Practices Continuum**

The Spanish literacy instructional practices enacted by the teachers drew from integrating literacy-based practices with content-area concepts and skills. This instructional approach afforded the teachers time to study a content-area concept in depth while building on the students’ reading and writing capacity. The teachers based their literacy instructional practices on the content-based (language arts, science, and social studies) state standards. These standards provided some of the content that the teachers taught; then they integrated into their lessons the literacy skills, strategies and texts that they identified as needing to teach.

Literacy-based practices reduce the focus on content and highlight, instead, reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presented with a focus in a variety of literatures. Of course, there is overlap into content areas, but at the literacy-based practices end of the continuum, the focus would be, for example, less on science content and more on personal responses, interpretations, etc. In all classroom contexts there are time constraints on when to teach the content-based standards in a thoughtful and meaningful manner, including a dual language context. Considering literacy-based practices and content-based practices as a continuum and keeping in mind that the continuum helps to articulate pedagogical clarity may allow teachers to understand their movement from one end to the other. They may, for example, understand more clearly that literacy-based practices afford them time to consider strategies that are more student-centered. When they consciously choose to focus on content-
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based practices while keeping in mind that they are always teaching literacy, they know that concepts and ideas will be intertwined to generate a lesson that is both teacher-centered and student-centered.

**The Teacher-made Assessments/Standards-based Assessments Continuum**

Classroom assessments made by the teacher can be a valid source of information that provides educators with information about the students’ learning. These assessments can be created from the teacher’s knowledge of the students’ learning in class or from predetermined standard benchmarks. The *teacher-made/standard-based assessments continuum* may appear as two polarized topics that cannot complement each other. Yet, I saw the teachers work to understand how to use both of these assessment measures to guide their instructional planning. The tensions between the two was a stress that they dealt with on a daily basis because they constantly felt pressure for their students to perform better on standards-based assessments, even when the results of those assessments contradicted what they were seeing on the assessments they constructed.

Creating teacher-made assessment tools was a challenge for the teachers because they also wanted to make sure to prepare their students for the upcoming standard district tests for writing and reading. To meet this challenge, the teachers created literacy goals for all their students in Spanish and English. The literacy goals were that the students be able to demonstrate one or two grade levels higher, according to the EDL and DRA standard reading test, from the beginning of the school year to the end in reading. Also, they wanted the students to be able to read a variety of texts that offered the students an opportunity to use reading as a learning tool. In writing, the teachers wanted their students to express themselves using a wide-range of genres throughout the school year. These goals created by
the teachers led them to construct student-centered measuring tools that were based on their growing understanding of what their students could do, rather than a predetermined endpoint on a standards-based test. Developing tests that combined teacher goals and standard benchmarks was made possible through the creation of teacher-made tests. For example, the teachers created tests that included the students’ literacy knowledge and skills being learned in class through a standard format that included multiple choice, essay, and true and false questions. The teachers worked to support authentic learning and, concomitantly, to support their students’ success on the standards-based tests. Pedagogical clarity must include such consciousness because, short of a revolution in education, teachers need to know about and respond to the reality of standards-based and other assessments not locally made. The tension arises as their clarity informs them of their students’ growth that is not demonstrated in the results of those outside tests. They engage their pedagogical clarity to support genuine student learning while ensuring that the students are prepared for the formats and contents of those tests.

Progressive literacy view--------------------------------------------Functional literacy view
Critical literacy view--------------------------------------------Critical thinking
Additive approach----------------------------------Critical action approach
Translanguaging-----------------------------------Dominant academic Spanish
Literacy-based practices-----------------------------------Content-based practices
Student driven assessments----------------------------Standards-based assessments

Figure 6.1 Continua of Spanish Literacy Instructional Practices

The teachers were able to move between points along these continua in order to better negotiate their Spanish literacy instructional practices, some of which were educational
directives imposed upon them by others. Teaching and learning along these continua does create tension and teachers with pedagogical clarity are able to move between the two endpoints in order to better serve their students’ literacy needs, desires, interests, questions, and more.

**Implications for Practices**

Making implications that might apply to a larger population of dual language educators who teach Spanish literacy to upper grade students based on the qualitative data that has been collected and analyzed was a challenge. To do so, it is necessary to first and foremost acknowledge that each teacher, in this and/or future studies, was unique and comes with views, methods, strategies, and understandings specific to her/him. There is a wide variety of pedagogical clarities that are inherent in practice.

A critical feature of the teachers’ Spanish literacy instructional practices was their positive and humanistic manner of treating, viewing and interacting with their students as they cultivated, built, and guided their students’ Spanish literacy process. The following implications for teaching were derived from the teachers’ Spanish literacy practices that promoted a more humanizing pedagogy and holistic literacy practices. These practices involved *student-generated teaching, conscientious teaching*, and *reading to learn*.

**Student-generated teaching.** Student-generated teaching is based on sociocultural approaches to teaching and learning that build upon the students’ home languages, literacy practices, and cultural experiences. In a dual language context, the students being taught come from many different racial, linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic profiles; therefore, it is important that the teaching and learning be grounded in a student-generated approach. Dual language educators need to mindfully plan instruction that includes all our students’
“funds of knowledge,” literacy and language practices. By including these culturally and linguistically responsive practices, we can envision a more equitable and effective dual language education for all our students. For example, student-generated teaching should involve the students using their home language in ways that include translanguaging in the classroom to better communicate and express ideas. Translanguaging is organic in nature in that it is generated by the students and used as an identity marker of who they are as they express their thoughts and feelings about texts that are discussed in the classroom. Such an honoring of the student is a sociocultural act that supports the students in the co-construction of a space to think and learn and the way that languages are used in that space.

**Conscientious teaching.** Conscientious teaching is the interrogation of every program, curriculum, approach, strategy and any other text influencing students’ needs to be closely examined and critically viewed in order to provide equitable literacy practices. To demonstrate this kind of teaching requires a certain level of consciousness of what teaching practices enacted cultivate positive and productive attitudes about learning. Freire (1974) coined the term conscientização (critical consciousness); it represents the development of the awaking of critical awareness. For teachers to develop a conscientious teaching they need to reflect, dialogue, and help change any educational practice or curriculum that does not engage and regard students in their learning. Amanda, Marisol, and Tracy began the study with an understanding level of consciousness. I believe that through our critical dialogues we were able to further develop and define what conscientious teaching meant on a personal and educational level.

Throughout our dialogues, I was consistently amazed at the level of autonomy and agency that the teachers placed in their teaching practice. Their methods did not dictate their
teaching; rather, they all adapted approaches and strategies to best meet the students’ educational goals. Freire (1974) believed in an education of I wonder, instead of merely doing. The teachers did not say “I do” what has been mandated from the top-down district/state directives; rather, they had the attitude of “I wonder” how this literacy directive (e.g., having to follow a reading basal) will affect my students’ Spanish literacy development; they questioned each component of the directive. The teachers developed more humanistic pathways towards learning that included being creative and inventing new practices with their students. Taking ownership of their practice meant not to take any teacher professional development verbatim, but instead to be thoughtful in how they enacted their teaching. Conscientious teaching requires a devotion or “profesionalismo” [professionalism] —in other words, how the teachers respected and regarded other teachers, students, and their practice was not only about their teaching, but was ultimately about a more just world.

**Reading to learn.** Reading to learn in a dual language classroom for upper grades of elementary requires that the teachers teach in two languages. Teaching reading in two languages through decoding and encoding the message being conveyed in a text is called biliteracy. Being biliterate is being able to understand the two linguistic and cultural worlds represented in the written and oral message presented in the communication. Many believe that in order for the students to be biliterate they first learn how to read by acquiring certain skills such as directionality and sounding out letters, for example. Then in the upper grades of elementary, students are reading to learn texts from various content-areas through skills such as incorporating previewing, scanning, and skimming; reading for main idea, and recognizing patterns of organization in two languages. This is an artificial divide because
students are always reading to learn and learning to read. The children dealing with the spelling of ‘satellite’ were looking at sounds and letters; they also were keeping in mind that they were reading in a content area. The two, reading to learn and learning to read, cannot and should not be arbitrarily separated. Keeping them both active by focusing on genuine events and curiosity will support bilingual students in becoming truly biliterate.

Reading to learn also means learning to take a critical stance on texts, with texts defined broadly. A critical stance involves uncovering the pretext, text, and context being read through an analysis, examination and application of possible explanations or solutions. This critical stance does not just apply to the students; more importantly, it applies to the teacher so that she or he can appropriate critical literacy pedagogy stemming from the child’s inner being and the tensions between that being and external elements.

These implications for practices advocate for teaching and learning organically through humanizing pedagogy and holistic literacy practices. Metaphors by which the teachers taught in this study created authentic, holistic, and organic teaching and learning environments that cultivated the students’ linguistic, cultural, and academic knowledge and experiences. Moreover, these literacy practices were tilled and sowed through student-generated teaching, conscientious teaching, and reading to learn. Of utmost importance for teachers is to develop holistic literacy pedagogy that includes a critical stance to their practice so that students will truly understand the importance of power, position, authority, and voice in a democracy.

**Implications for Future Research**

The field of bilingual education has survived and strived the past forty years amidst many *English Only* political attacks. Educators and students who advocate for bilingual
education have made this educational opportunity of being biliterate and bicultural possibly for future generations to embrace. Future research into how students develop and become biliterate is a research topic that needs to be further explored in pre-adolescent and adolescent years of schooling. This is important because we want our students to continue on their journeys involving learning to read and reading to learn the language of school and most importantly “reading the world” around them.

Literacy education in U.S. includes, for the most part, progressive, functional, and multicultural literacy views. However, future research needs to be done on how teachers enact critical literacy in their classrooms in order to create more holistic literacy practices. Further, future research is needed on examining how teachers negotiate their literacy instructional practices within the continua in Figure 6.1, rather than dichotomizing their practices. During that work, I fully expect other continua to emerge.

Future research on critical dialogue (CD) is important. Critical dialogue provides a forum to better understand what and how the teachers teach in their classrooms, including creating lesson plans, collaboration with colleagues, and delivery of instruction focusing on student-generated teaching and learning. Using critical dialogue to examine teachers’ literacy views is a research need in the bilingual education field. Through critical dialogue, teachers can make explicit the literacy ideology underlying their instructional practices in order to advocate for more equitable schooling for students in bilingual education, especially in a dual language context. Critical dialogues are a thoughtful forum in which teachers can interrogate their pedagogy, clarify their pedagogy, challenge each other, and become informed about new ideas and the ways in which they might be enacted and studied.
In closing, to visualize a more humanizing pedagogy in the 21st century, literacy educators need to develop an increased consciousness of their own practice leading to a frame of mind that actualizes just holistic literacy practices with their students.
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### Appendix A – Framework for School Literacy Curriculum & Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/Participant</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Documents/Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Classroom Environment &amp; Initial Impressions</td>
<td>Based on school/classroom site observation with main participant DL teacher, including students and reading text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Design &amp; Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Value of Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expectations for Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructional Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Literacy Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Reading Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accountability &amp; Assessment: Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parent Involvement/Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B – Literacy Web

Literacy Web Questions

- What is your definition of literacy?
- What form of literacy do you feel is most important for emergent bilinguals?
- How would you define biliteracy?
- How do you put into practice your ideas of literacy in your classroom?
- What do you expect your emergent bilinguals to accomplish by the end of the semester? School year? By graduation?
- What are your Spanish literacy instructional goals for the school year for your emergent bilinguals?
- To achieve these goals, identify the Spanish curriculum resources and teaching methods you utilize.
- How do you value professional development? What has been the most beneficial form of professional development you have received?
- How are you held accountable for the progress of your students?
- What forms of assessment do you use? How often?
- Do you think parent involvement is important?

Adapted from Karen Cadiero-Kaplan (2004).
Appendix C – Critical Dialogue Focus Group

Date: February 12, 2010

Time: 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Four Literacy Ideologies

- **Cultural Literacy Ideology**: A set discourse that is developed by students through the use of literary works from mainstream society.

- **Progressive Literacy Ideology**: Literacy development is student-centered and allows discourse which respects the students’ voice and culture through the use of literature selections.

- **Functional Literacy Ideology**: Teaches students certain skills that will enable them to become part of the workforce and society with the specified literacy skills needed to operate in this societal context.

- **Critical Literacy Ideology**: When we are critically literate, we examine our ongoing development, to reveal the subjective positions from which we make sense of the world and act in it.

1. Explain the purpose of the study.
2. Discuss Karen Cadiero-Kaplan’s 4 literacy ideologies.
3. Schedule teacher observations.
Appendix D – Preguntas para el diálogo crítico

Fecha: 10 de marzo 2010

Horario: 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

➢ Compartan una actividad que muestra ser efectiva para todos los alumnos/as durante la lectura en español.

➢ ¿Qué son ventajas/desventajas de ser una maestra de lenguaje dual?

➢ Piensan que ensenan diferente antes y después de los exámenes estatales.

➢ ¿Qué tipo de cosas no comprenden en su práctica?
Appendix E – Critical Dialogue Focus Group

Date: April 20, 2010
Time: 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Four Literacy Ideologies

Our first CD focus group I mentioned four literacy ideologies (views):

- **Cultural Literacy Ideology**: A set discourse that is developed by students through the use of literary works from mainstream society.

- **Progressive Literacy Ideology**: Literacy development is student-centered and allows discourse which respects the students’ voice and culture through the use of literature selections.

- **Functional Literacy Ideology**: Teaches students certain skills that will enable them to become part of the workforce and society with the specified literacy skills needed to operate in this social context.

- **Critical Literacy Ideology**: When we are critically literate, we examine our ongoing development, to reveal the subjective positions from which we make sense of the world and act in it.

1. What would you consider to be your expressed literacy ideologies (views) for Spanish literacy instructional practices?
2. How has the critical dialogue group and observations affected your literacy views and practices?
Appendix F – Síntesis de actividades de lecto-escritura

Actividades para lectura:

➢ Concept board
➢ Pictorial input
➢ Mapa semántica
➢ Diccionario cognitivo
➢ Secuencia de hechos
➢ Experiencias personales
➢ Predicciones oral y escritas

Actividades durante la lectura:

➢ Pausa y predicción
➢ Andamiaje de patrones lingüísticos
➢ Párrafo cooperativo
➢ Interrogando el texto:
  o ¿Por qué se escribió el texto?
  o ¿Qué se escribió este texto?
  o ¿Qué perspectiva representa el texto?
  o ¿Qué no está mencionado en este texto?
  o ¿De qué otra manera se puede escribir este texto?
➢ Preguntas al lado
➢ Análisis del lenguaje

Actividades después de la lectura:

➢ Pruebas sobre conocimiento: Verdad o falso, rubrica, etc.
➢ Gráfico de aprendizaje
➢ Resume del texto
➢ Párrafo cooperativo
➢ teatro
Appendix G – Preguntas para el diálogo crítico

Fecha: 10 de junio 2010

Horario: 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Un repaso de nuestro diálogo hace tres semanas. Si recuerdan hablamos sobre el capítulo de Gibbons (2009) en que escribió sobre lectura y los propósitos de la lectura que son:

1. Lector que lee el código/palabra – La relación entre letras y sonidos, leyendo desde la izquierda a la derecha (dirección), y el conocimiento alfabético.

2. Lector como participante del libro – El lector tiene un a conexión con el texto que viene de sus experiencias y conocimiento personal, social y cultura.

3. Lector y el uso del texto – El lector participa o usa el libro en diferentes maneras y varía de cultura a cultura.

4. Lector que analiza el texto – El lector lee críticamente.

Actividad:

✓ Vamos a leer un texto críticamente y luego contestar varias preguntas sobre el contenido del texto.
✓ Estrategia
✓ Discusión

Finalmente:

➢ ¿Qué se puede mejorar en tu práctica de lecto-escritura, programa dual o cualquier otra cosa?
➢ ¿Qué serán tus próximos planes en la enseñanza de lecto-escritura en español?
Appendix H – Amanda’s Concept Map
Appendix I – Tracy’s cuéntame algo Teaching Process

Introducción al cartel para cuéntame algo: Lluvia de plata

Explicar que es para presentar un cuento a la clase y para capturar su interés. Viendo los dibujos ayuda los estudiantes a prestar atención.

☐ 1ª manera de utilizarlo:
  • Papelitos de resumen – en grupo entero. Antes, hago un resumen del cuento en partes de una o dos oraciones. Intento hacer suficientes para que todos los estudiantes tengan uno. Leo el cuento de nuevo, esta vez tomando pausas cada página o cada dos páginas para que el estudiante quien tiene el resumen de esta parte puede compartir lo con la clase. Los estudiantes tienen que prestar atención y les da experiencia con que consiste un resumen.

☐ 2ª manera de utilizarlo:
  • Papelitos de resumen – en grupos pequeños. Doy los mismos papelitos de resumen, todos mezclados, a un grupo quienes pueden usar el cartel narrativo (los dibujos) para poner los papelitos en orden. Es buena práctica para el orden de sucesos de un cuento.

☐ 3ª manera de utilizarlo:
  • Un resumen de los estudiantes, usando los dibujos – Paso los dibujos a grupos pequeños (1 o 2 dibujos cada grupo) y ellos hacen un resumen de una o dos oraciones en su grupo. Después, volvemos al grupo entero y ponemos el cuento en orden, usando los resúmenes de los estudiantes.
Appendix J – Literature Circles Wheel

- Choose one of the characters, how are you different? Explain.
- ¿De qué manera eres diferente a alguno de los personajes? Explica.
- If you were the main character would you have acted differently? Explain why.
- ¿Cuál fue la mejor parte de esta historia? ¿Por qué?
- Which was the best part of the story? Why?
- This book reminds me of...
- Este cuento me recuerda de...
# Appendix K – Free Nodes Coding Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic dialogue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic progress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledging Nadre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/28/2010 2:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actividad de Prefectura en estu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/24/2010 12:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actividades principales</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adapting para guir la enseñan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 12:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressing issues for CDs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/1/2010 8:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Maria's actividades de lect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apoyos de enseñanza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 12:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprendizaje interactivo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative voice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond teaching duties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/24/2010 11:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrowing language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builder of knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building interactive opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 1:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canto de transicion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causa y efecto la multi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/6/2010 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 10:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cielito Lindo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cien Agues DLI school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulos de literatura</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom Instructions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom Interaction styles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom Interruptions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom meeting la Junta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom objectives or agenda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/30/2010 11:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom organization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 4:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom set-up</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom spirit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 7:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom transitions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom turn-taking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/16/2010 7:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-facilitator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colaboracion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Created On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborate dialogue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colaboracion de aprendizaje</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comer la calabaza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community dialect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community funds of knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9/8/2010 9:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentro en las normas del es</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/16/2010 7:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conexiones familiares</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/28/2010 12:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumidor juicioso</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 9:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content based literacy matemati</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content specific knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/16/2010 8:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content-based literacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creando expectativas altas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crear documentos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crear el espacio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 1:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crear en estudiantes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 10:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical dialogue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/1/2010 8:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenta me halgo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturally relevant books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9/27/2010 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of reading in action</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeper thinking and dialogue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstration of concepts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denme una porra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desarrollo de vocabulario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desarrollar la prediccion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desarrollar todos los estudiantes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 10:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the context</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing a foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desk work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/30/2010 1:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Díchos para crear dialogo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/24/2010 12:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:13 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinamica energica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discurso de aprendizaje</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discurso de Maestra a alums</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse (language use)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displaying student work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLI teacher challenges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects of testing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/28/2010 9:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Created On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el canto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/5/2010 2:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el dicatado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el estudio raises, prefijos...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/5/2010 2:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El juego de competir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El lapiz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en espanol por favor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energia y salud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enseñanza cívica-etica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enseñar en manera académica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 1:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escribean así como eso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/30/2010 11:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>escritura</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuchar el autor de EL nino qu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/30/2010 11:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estudio de palabras</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitating learning and understand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival de Bellas Artes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/12/2010 12:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format of LCOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/12/2010 9:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip to Santa Fe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/27/2010 8:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formative assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to move</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/5/2010 2:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly correction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit of your labor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuentes de conocimiento</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gramática interactiva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greetings and communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guest teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/9/2010 9:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guiando el aprendizaje</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:10 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guided language acquisition de</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/19/2010 3:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hechar mentiras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herramienta para aprender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 1:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humor y comunidad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lluminar la situacion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent reading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inequities of testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iniciar pensamiento</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 9:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integracion de temas academico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/30/2010 11:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactive learning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactive participation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interruptions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/5/2010 10:55 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Free Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interview stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 1:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing students to text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/24/2010 10:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of playwrite project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/8/2010 9:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRE discourse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know or Not Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/2/2010 8:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La conexion de Lecto-escritura</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/24/2010 10:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La mirada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/1/2010 1:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la plastica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la plastica academia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la tarea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/28/2010 1:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language distribution by subject</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las tablas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/28/2010 2:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning through correction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/28/2010 9:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecto-escritura</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/5/2010 10:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lectura en espanol</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leer imagenes primero</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leer su mundo primero</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 1:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life is a pop quiz discourse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic cross-over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literal interpretation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make-up testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>math literacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful and explicit teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/24/2010 11:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediated structure for writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediar informacion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metacognitive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metalinguistic scenario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling RACE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/24/2010 12:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mothers networking para sobre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving along</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multimodal learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7/5/2010 10:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native language assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native language literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/8/2010 9:53 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New classroom layout (Gamlin)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niveles de lectura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/24/2010 11:14 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Free Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMSBA Assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mas, no menos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:13 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No right or wrong answers (inter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observer comments</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer's comment on organiz</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-size-fits all or uniformity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palindromas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/31/2010 11:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectiva del alumno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectiva o ideologia de mae</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/1/2010 12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pictorial input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/15/2010 3:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plasticas del libro</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pobrecito syndrome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/26/2010 11:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reinforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practicar el formato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preguntas para conversacion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/27/2010 9:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profesora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prompting a response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto de dia de las madres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/20/2010 11:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pruebas como guia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE strategy for reading</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6/24/2010 10:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read out loud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/6/2010 10:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading the room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/31/2010 11:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading the world</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/4/2010 10:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflective teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/15/2010 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescheduling interview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research interaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research suggestions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researcher as a mediator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/1/2010 9:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher developing rapport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/1/2010 12:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect for others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reteach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/30/2010 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reteach math concepts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/28/2010 2:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role–play reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role-playing questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salir adelante</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saludos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 1:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT referrals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say and Pink</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding in writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6/24/2010 11:10 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Created On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>script writer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/8/2010 9:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sembrando juntos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 12:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/15/2010 9:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si se cuenta aungue...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sile Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish language use L2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/30/2010 11:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. Salazar's libros para LCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/5/2010 11:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staging the learning experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards as a guideline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/15/2010 5:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student as learner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5/12/2010 12:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student as monitor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student as parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/28/2010 9:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student curiosity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:12 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student helpers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student interrogates (safe have)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/28/2010 1:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student reaction to LCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/27/2010 8:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9/8/2010 9:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student turn-taking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students as guides</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students knowledge and expere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students knowledge counts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6/28/2010 12:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students percepion of testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students perspective and attitu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/24/2010 12:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students reflection about teach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/12/2010 9:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/23/2010 1:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/28/2010 1:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and student critical stan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/28/2010 1:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher as advocate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/12/2010 11:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher as corrector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/6/2010 3:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as cultivator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9/2/2010 9:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher as researcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/26/2010 9:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher as transcriber</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher expectations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5/1/2010 9:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher interaction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher justification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher rapport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher walks to that area and t</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/24/2010 10:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers experiences to cone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/5/2010 2:14 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Free Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers view of BLLs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5/1/2010 1:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching and learning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4/16/2010 6:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching scenarios</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/28/2010 9:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/30/2010 12:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/5/2010 10:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temas de la platica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/28/2010 5:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terms of endearment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/28/2010 2:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testing marathon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testing perception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tests as prime movers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tienen 10 segundos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/1/2010 11:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of cuentos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/8/2010 9:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todo que sea juego les gusta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/6/2010 3:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trabajar juntos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformation of Spanish litera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/1/2010 9:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water cycle and reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/16/2010 5:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole group instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/28/2010 12:50 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix L – Tree Nodes Coding Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILINGUAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 12:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/22/2010 9:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY FUNDS OF KNO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 10:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT DRIVEN TEACHING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT DRIVEN TEACHING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 10:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL DIALOGUES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 10:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL DISCURSO DE MAESTRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 1:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL MARATON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 1:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 10:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 11:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER RACE CLASS OPPO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 11:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 11:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALISM or COLLECTIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/2/2010 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PRACTICA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 1:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/6/2010 9:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/8/2010 9:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS VOCES O SILENCIO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTO-ESCRIPTURA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/12/2010 2:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIATED STRUCTURES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/12/2010 3:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROAGRESSIONS AND PEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 1:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONEY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/12/2010 3:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVE (DIF)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/12/2010 3:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURALIZATION (TAKING TH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVER COMMENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 11:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy SPANISH LITERACY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 12:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATICA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 11:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 12:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS AND FAMILIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 11:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS TO NATURE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 12:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATION (SHOWIN)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC TEACHING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/3/2010 11:31 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT STRATEGIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/20/2010 12:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER AS ARCHITECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/29/2010 11:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER AS CULTIVATOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/29/2010 10:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER AS GUIDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/29/2010 10:59 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M – Pedagogical Clarity, Spanish Literacy Instructional Dynamic, and Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEDAGOGICAL CLARITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL DIALOGUES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL MARATON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALISM or COLLECTIVI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVE (DIFF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURALIZATION (TAKING THE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVER COMMENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATION (SHOWING)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH LITERACY INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILINGUAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT DRIVEN TEACHING a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT DRIVEN TEACHING A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PRACTICA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTO-ESCRITURA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIATED STRUCTURES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy SPANISH LITERACY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATICA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC TEACHING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEWS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY FUNDS OF KNOW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY FUNDS OF KNOW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT DRIVEN TEACHING a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT DRIVEN TEACHING A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL DISCURSO DE MAESTRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER RACE CLASS OPPOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALISM or COLLECTIVI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL LANGUAGE AS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS VOCES O SILENCIO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICROAGRESSIONS AND PEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONEY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS AND FAMILIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/23/2010 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS AND FAMILIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS TO NATURE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT STRATEGIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER AS ARCHITECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER AS CULTIVATOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER AS GUIDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12/27/2010 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N – Visual Image of Analysis and Findings

Chapter 4 Data Analysis

**Salient Characteristics Across All Three Teachers**

*Critical Consciousness, Devotion, Cultivating Spirit*

**Metaphors Teachers Teach**

- Teacher as Guide
  - Guiando la enseñanza
  - Pruebas como guía
- Teacher as Cultivator
  - Sembrando juntos
- Teacher as Architect
  - Los estándares

**Teachers’ View of Dual Language Learners**

- Marisol: Como familia
  - Marisol the Teaching Mother
- Tracy: Con cariño
- Amanda: Con respeto
  - Conclusion

Chapter 5

**Dual Language Pedagogy**

- Views Yielding a Half Harvest
  - Functional Literacy: Sowing the Seeds of Oral Production
    - Destrezas interactivas.
    - Destrezas del idioma.
    - Charla del lenguaje académico.
- Progressive Literacy: Nourishing the Ground Through Literacy Understanding
  - Enseñanza integrada.
  - Nuestra voz.
  - Cuéntame algo.
  - Discussion

- Seeds Fallen on Fertile Soil Flourish
  - Rhythm of Teaching
  - First Language Literacy

- Developing a Whole Harvest
  - Towards a Multicultural Perspective
  - Critical Learners
  - Critical Teachers
  - Cultivating a Whole Harvest

Conclusion/Implications

Chapter 6

Cultivating Pedagogical Clarity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Critical Literacy</th>
<th>Functional Literacy</th>
<th>Multicultural Literacy</th>
<th>Progressive literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Expressed Views</td>
<td>Critical literacy is highly valued and an asset in order to develop critical stance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multicultural literacy is essential in developing students literate identity and integrating students cultural experiences.</td>
<td>Multi-year literacy values biliteracy development through translanguaging, and reading to learn by applying new knowledge through dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Enacted Views</td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional literacy develops the academic discourse and literacy skills for academic success.</td>
<td>Cultural and linguistic capital Multicultural education</td>
<td>Sociocultural theory Sociopsycholinguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Frameworks</td>
<td>Critical Pedagogy</td>
<td>Dominate Academic discourse Academic Schooled language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelection Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Review of Literature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Practices</td>
<td>Critical literacy Palabra generadora</td>
<td>Strategic &amp; Explicit teaching Scaffolding</td>
<td>Culturally relevant pedagogy Literature circles</td>
<td>Sociocultural approaches Mediated structures Dialogue/plática</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Assessment and</td>
<td>Authentic (portfolios) Project-based</td>
<td>Miscue analysis Standard-based assessments Rubrics</td>
<td>Authentic (portfolios) Project-based</td>
<td>Teacher-made tests Project-based Dialogue journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P – Prueba del gobierno (Government Quiz)

Nombre: ___________ Fecha: ________

Prueba del gobierno

1. ¿El Presidente de los Estados Unidos es parte de cuál poder del gobierno?
   a) El Poder Legislativo
   b) El Poder Judicial
   c) El Poder Presidencial
   d) El Poder Ejecutivo

2. ¿El Senado representa cuál poder del gobierno?
   a) El Poder Judicial
   b) El Poder Senado
   c) El Poder Legislativo
   d) El Poder Ejecutivo

3. ¿El Corte Supremo representa cuál poder del gobierno?
   a) El Poder Judicial
   b) El Poder Supremo
   c) El Poder Legislativo
   d) El Poder Ejecutivo

4. ¿Cuál NO es un poder del gobierno?
   a) El Poder Legislativo
   b) El Poder Judicial
   c) El Poder Ejecutivo
   d) La Cámara de Representantes

5. ¿Cuántos senadores hay en el Senado Federal?
   a) 50
   b) 25
   c) 100
   d) 435

6. ¿Cuántos representantes hay en la Cámara de Representantes Federal?
   a) 100
   b) 435
   c) 50
   d) 25

7. ¿Cuántos jueces hay en el Corte Supremo Federal?
   a) 50
8. Comparar y contrastar el gobierno federal al gobierno del estado. ¿Qué son las semejanzas? ¿Qué son las diferencias?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. ¿El poder del gobierno viene de quien?
   a) El Presidente
   b) Los Ciudadanos
   c) Los Senadores
   d) La Policía

10. Describe el significado de Democracia. ¿Qué es una democracia? ¿Por qué es tan importante en los Estados Unidos?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
11. ¿Cuáles de los siguientes son los 3 Poderes del Gobierno?
   a) Legislativo, Judicial, Presidencial
   b) Legislativo, Judicial, Estado
   c) Judicial, Legislativo, Ejecutivo
   d) Federal, Estado, Local

12. La Constitución de los Estados Unidos es....
   a) Un cuento de nuestra historia.
   b) Un documento que es la ley suprema de nuestra tierra
   c) La ley suprema del estado
   d) La historia de América

13. Nuestro gobierno se llama una Republica Democrática porque los ciudadanos eligen nuestros líderes. Identifica las partes del gobierno (Legislativo, Judicial, y Ejecutivo) y explica porque hay una separación de poderes. También explica cómo los tres poderes trabajan juntos para mantener un balance de poder.
Appendix Q – *El parrafo escrito por maestra y alumnus/as* [Written paragraph of teacher/students]

El gobierno federal de los estados unidos se llama el gobierno federal. El poder legislativo es el poder que hace las leyes. Tiene el congreso que tiene dos partes, el Senado con 100 senadores y la Cámara de Representantes con 435 representantes. El poder ejecutivo lleva a cabo las leyes. El Poder Ejecutivo tiene el presidente elegido por los ciudadanos. También tiene los departamentos del gobierno y el gabinete del presidente. El poder Judicial determina si las leyes han sido violadas. Tiene la Corte Suprema con nueva jueces quien trabaja para la vida (o hasta jubilación). El presidente elije los jueces y son confirmados por el congreso.

El Formato:

El gobierno de ______________se llama ________. El poder legislativo tiene __________. También hay _________________. El poder ejecutivo tiene _________________. También hay ________________. El poder judicial tiene ___________. También hay _________________.

En este nivel del gobierno ________, ________, _______, y ________ son importantes.
Abajo hay una tabla del proceso de los diferentes niveles del gobierno en los Estados Unidos. Usa los párrafos que escribiste para llenar la información que falta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre del gobierno</th>
<th>Nivel del gobierno</th>
<th>Hace las leyes</th>
<th>Determina si las leyes han sido violadas</th>
<th>Datos importantes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estados Unidos</td>
<td>Poder Legislativo</td>
<td>Senado (100 senadores) - Cámara de Representantes (435 representantes)</td>
<td>Poder Judicial - Jueces elegidos por el presidente, confirmados por el congreso para la vida</td>
<td>- capital en - La Constitución de EEUU establece una de poderes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poder Ejecutivo</td>
<td>- departamentos del gobierno - elegido por el presidente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Poder Legislativo</td>
<td>- Congreso - 70 Senadores - Cámara de Representantes - elegidos porNuevo mexicanos</td>
<td>Poder Judicial - cinco jueces que deciden si decisiones de los cortes menores deben vetarse o no, - escuchen los que contra las decisiones de las elecciones - Parte del sistema de los cortes del estado todos los jueces son elegidos.</td>
<td>- capital in Santa Fe, NM - centro de ambos Poderes - legislativos y ejecutivo - proveen educación pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poder Ejecutivo</td>
<td>- secretario o escribano del condado - Asesor - Tesorero - Todos elegidos por la gente del condado de Bernalillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Condado de</td>
<td>Poder Legislativo</td>
<td>- comisión del condado - elegido por la gente en el condado de Bernalillo - hacen las leyes locales</td>
<td>- Corte del Condado de Bernalillo: asuntos de la propiedad - Parte del sistema de cortes del estado</td>
<td>- La 'silla oficial' del condado está en Albuquerque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo</td>
<td>Poder Ejecutivo</td>
<td>- Alcalde - Departamentos de la ciudad (Parques y Rec. Policia, Control de animales)</td>
<td>Poder Judicial - Parte del sistema judicial del estado - La mayoría de los casos son escuchen en el Corte Municipal o en el Corte del Distrito.</td>
<td>- La alcaldía es la casa del Poder Ejecutivo y Legislativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad (municipal)</td>
<td>Poder Legislativo</td>
<td>- Ayuntamiento o Concejo de la Ciudad - Hacen las leyes locales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S – Literature Circles!

Literature Circle Guide:

- You will be working with a Literature Circle to share thoughts and ideas about books you are reading. After reading and writing independently each day, you will meet in a group to talk about your book. This will help you learn to think and understand more about what you are reading, listen to others, and to learn to ask questions about stories.

How It Works:
Every day you will:

- Read independently for twenty minutes or more.
- Write down your thoughts about what you’ve read.
- Meet with your group to share thoughts about this story.
- Write about your group’s discussion.

While You Read:

Things to Think About:

✓ Think about the character and how she or he feels about the people in his life.
✓ Think about how characters in the story handle problems.
✓ Try to imagine how you will feel if you were that character.
✓ Have you had a similar experience to what the character experienced? Think about what you did and what the character did.
When You Write:

- After you read independently each day, you may write anything you want about the story.
- If you like, you may use a “prompt card” to give you an idea.
- Be sure to write down any questions you might have about what’s happening in the story, so that you can remember to bring them up in your group.
- Use this format in your journal to organize your thoughts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this space you may write any questions you had while you were reading. This will help you remember what you want to ask your group members when you meet as a group. You may also write here the prompt questions you picked so you understand what you were responding to in the ‘thoughts’ column when you meet with your group.</td>
<td>In this space you may write any thoughts that you had while you were reading today. It may be what you were thinking about while you were reading or it may be a response to one of the prompt cards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Your Group:

- You will talk about the book you are reading.
- Take turns to share the questions you each wrote in your question column during the writing time.
- Work together to answer the questions your group members ask about the story from their own notes.
- On the back of this paper is a list of discussion questions your group can use after you have answered your own questions.
- You can also use the discussion questions for writing ideas after meeting with your group.
After You Meet With Your Group:
• You will write again!
• You can write about something your group talked about.
• You can make a prediction about what might happen next in the story.
• You can write a response to one of the discussion questions your group didn’t get a chance to discuss that day.
• You can share some of this writing at your next group meeting too!
RHYTHM OF TEACHING CHART

KEY: ○ = assessment only for English Language Learners (ELLs)

ACCESS
4 WEEKS

2 WEEKS
District Benchmark Assessment (DBA)

4 WEEKS
New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA)

2 WEEKS
District Benchmark Assessment

January
February
March
April
May

SPRING ASSESSMENT 2010
# Appendix U – Critical Literacy Lesson Plan

| Focus: | To introduce students to critical literacy using the analysis of a peer-pressure video clips as the context for learning. |
| Learning intentions: | The students investigate the attitudes, values and assumptions about peer pressure. Identify and discuss the features of peer pressure. Share learning intentions with the students. |
| 1. Immersion | Have students watch a video clip (about 8 minutes) of a variety peer pressure scenarios to become familiar with the topic. This will be done in school but could also be assigned as homework. |
| 2. Prediction | Have students brainstorm in pairs or small groups. Jot down your ideas in your notebook. Peer pressure is… (write on chart paper) |
| 3. Deconstruction | You will view another short video. Then move your desks so that they form a large discussion circle. Fishbowl technique (5 students move towards center of the room) ✓ How did the peer pressure text (video) affect you? ✓ What is the text about? ✓ Why are we viewing this text? ✓ What do the images suggest? ✓ How are young adults and adults viewed in this text? ✓ Why is the text written the way it is? For fishbowl the students will use the following questions as a guide written on right side. En español: ¿Cómo te afecto el video (texto) de estar sometido a presión? ¿De que es el texto? ¿Porque estamos mirando este texto? ¿Qué sugieren las imagines del texto? ¿Qué es la opinión de los adultos en este texto? ¿Por qué esta escrito este texto en una cierta manera? |
| 4. Reconstruction | ✓ What is real in the text? ✓ How else could the text have been written? Students might work in pairs to create a pictorial input or narrative input chart show a different sequence or view of the text. |
| 5. Taking social action | ✓ If students feel strongly about the issues of peer pressure, they could take action such as: writing a flyer/newsletter about peer pressure for the school. |
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