Preparing Teachers of Bilingual Students

REBECCA BLUM MARTÍNEZ

University of New Mexico

SUSAN BAKER

California State University, Sacramento

Bilingual education in the United States has been a controversial educational practice since its national inception in 1968. The question of how best to educate language-minority students has been less about pedagogy and more about the political relationship of English speakers vis-à-vis "the other" in this country and what those relationships mean in terms of citizenship and identity (Crawford, 2004).

The persistent tension over what kinds of educational programs will help bilingual students can be found across and within states. These disagreements ultimately affect bilingual teacher education programs, as they must prepare future teachers to work in particular programs and with particular groups of students. In this chapter, we describe the changes that have taken place in Bilingual Teacher Preparation since 1993 and analyze these changes in light of the political and social changes that have taken place both nationally and internationally. There is remarkable agreement across states about the standards and competencies that bilingual teachers need even though the kinds of state-supported educational programs may differ. Differences in teacher credentialing systems influence the amount of time bilingual candidates may spend in their programs, while state and local language and educational policies affect the delivery of these programs.

A closer analysis of these elements will also reveal persistent problems that have yet to be resolved.

National Society for the Study of Education, Volume 109, Issue 2, pp. 319–350
Copyright © by National Society for the Study of Education, Columbia University

THE COMPLEXITIES OF BEING BILINGUAL AND BILITERATE

The continua model of biliteracy developed by Hornberger (1989, 2004) illuminates the complex and overlapping relationships that exist between language and literacy, the contexts in which these are found, the ways in which these have been developed, the content used for development, and the media utilized.

> The notion of continuum is intended to convey that although one can identify (and name) points on the continuum, those points are not finite, static or discrete. There are infinitely many points on the continuum; any single point is inevitably and inextricably related to all other points. (Hornberger, 1989, p. 274)

Hornberger (2004) described one teacher education program in terms of these continua, underscoring how important it is for prospective bilingual teachers to understand that, while their students represent different points on the continua, these may well change. Teachers need to have then both a broad conception of how these continua interrelate and affect each other as well as the micro view of what may be happening with an individual student.

Three major dimensions must be considered in order to understand the profile of a particular group or individual student: (1) the biliterate context, (2) biliterate development, and (3) biliterate media. The first dimension, the biliterate context, includes three continua: the monolingual–bilingual continuum, the oral–literate continuum, and the macro–micro continuum. Examples of the biliterate context include national policies, language communities, types of schools, and schools' views and actions regarding language(s) and those who speak them and how they affect both the individual student and his/her teachers.

The dimension of biliterate development in the individual consists of three continua: the L1–L2 continuum, the oral–written continuum, and the receptive–productive continuum. A given student will find him/herself gaining a great deal of the second language (L2), while losing some of his/her native language (L1), and/or learning to read and write only in L2, but still able to produce L1 in the home. These continua, while affecting each other, are also being affected by the biliterate context dimension.

Finally, the dimension of biliterate media contains the continuum of divergent or convergent scripts, the continuum of simultaneous–subsequent exposure, and the continuum of similar–dissimilar structures. As in the previous dimensions, each continuum affects the others and is

simultaneously affected by the other two dimensions.

Hornberger presented two figures (2004, p. 157) that help understand the relationship between the three dimensions and the intersection of the continua. For example, a bilingual student can be an immigrant from a Spanish-speaking or Chinese-speaking area who may or may not be literate in their home language, know some oral English when entering school, and have some environmental literacy in English. Others may be of indigenous background from countries where they continue to speak the tribal language, but know little of the majority language. However, not all students living with two languages are immigrants. It is important to remember that families of many native-born children have used two languages as a normal part of their lives for several generations.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

According to the Pew Hispanic Center in 2007, immigrants accounted for 12.6% of the population of the United States (http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/foreignborn2007/Table%201.pdf.) The immigrant population has become the determinate factor in population growth of the United States. Two thirds of the population growth in 2002 came from immigrants (Center for Immigration Studies). According to this same study, the children of immigrants accounted for nearly all of the growth in public school enrollment (Camarota, S. 2007). Mexicans accounted for 30.9% of all immigrants, followed by 23.6% from South and East Asia. Caribbean people accounted for 8.9% of immigrants, while Central Americans made up 7.1%. Some 6.8% of immigrants are from South America (http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/foreignborn2007/Table%205.pdf)

The percentages listed here have remained fairly consistent over the last 10 years, with dramatic changes in immigration occurring in those areas of the country where previously there was little to no migration. For example, southern and mid-western states have more recently been the recipients of large numbers of immigrants. In the Pew Hispanic Center study of 2007, the following states saw increases in the number of immigrants of over 40%: Arizona, Georgia, North Carolina, Nevada, Tennessee, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Nebraska. These states have struggled to find educational solutions to accommodate new non-English-speaking children—more will be said about these solutions later in this chapter.

On the other hand, the refugee population has dropped dramatically from 207,116 in 1999 to only 60,108 in 2008. The majority of refugees during these 10 years have come from China, Ethiopia, Haiti, and

Colombia (Yearbook of Immigrant Statistics, 2008).

Between 1993 and 2001, the Clinton years, bilingual programs continued to grow across the country. Most of the programs functioned in states that had traditionally received large numbers of immigrants: California, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, Illinois, and New York. Spanish–English and Mandarin–English made up the bulk of programs, although some less-represented languages such as Haitian Creole, Hmong, and Arabic were also used. Federal funds were instrumental in the growth and maintenance of these programs.

However, the passage of the English for the Children proposition in California in 1998, and its spin-offs in Arizona and Massachusetts aimed at curbing the rights of immigrants, brought a nationwide conservative backlash against bilingual education. Some states such as Colorado and New York were able to fight off English-only initiatives after lengthy struggles.

"ENGLISH FOR THE CHILDREN" MOVEMENT AS PRECURSOR TO ENGLISH-ONLY MOVEMENTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY

The English for the Children initiative in California, the first anti-bilingual education legislation in the nation during modern times, passed in 1998 and had grave consequences for the preparation of bilingual teachers, as it effectively outlawed the use of native-language instruction for English learners. As a result of the initiative, the percentage of students receiving native-language instruction dropped from 30% in 1997 to 8% in 2007 (Parrish et al., 2006; Williams et al., 2007). In 2000 and 2002, Arizona and Massachusetts, respectively, passed similar measures restricting the use of native-language instruction. Other states, such as New Mexico and Colorado, have successfully resisted such measures.

English-only efforts in the United States have a long history (Crawford, 2004). As in earlier English-only movements, the current movement is, to a great extent, a backlash against immigrants and immigration and what is perceived as a "disuniting" of the United States through the use of languages other than English. Prospective and current politicians, eager for a cause, make language a proxy for language speakers and whip up public sentiment against programs supporting the languages of marginalized groups. The current English-only movement in California also took advantage of the Proposition system, which allows voters to have decision-making power over issues that are politicized, but whose nuances are rarely understood. Bilingual education was an easy target, since, as a fairly new program, it was somewhat unformed. Many bilingual teachers were inexperienced and undertrained with a large percentage working on an

emergency waiver. Furthermore, as most programs served poor populations, their schools were underfunded and suffered from a high level of teacher transiency. Anti-immigrant sentiment coupled with less-than-hoped-for performance of many bilingual programs created a perfect storm allowing the English-only movement to pass legislation severely curtailing bilingual education in a number of states.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

The accountability movement, characterized by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation at the federal level and similar measures at state levels, has impacted the scope and content of native-language instruction and therefore the training of bilingual educators. While the STAR system allows for testing English-language learners (ELLs) in their native language, only 11 states have taken advantage of this possibility (with varying limits; Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students, 2008). Guidelines for the implementation of NCLB have not been consistently enforced to the detriment of English learners. For example, in California, the State Department of Education has chosen not to allow the test to be administered in any language other than English, meaning that ELL students are held to the same standards for language proficiency as fluent English speakers. This decision was recently upheld by California courts ("Appellate Court," 2009). Among other factors, the lack of availability for assessment in the native language has led California ELL students to be the subgroup least likely to meet state benchmarks. As the pressure to have even recently arrived ELLs achieve in English has risen, programs offering native-language instruction have lost support, and their numbers, already diminished by English-only initiatives, have dropped further. In many states, it is difficult to disentangle the effects on bilingual education of the English-only movement from those of the accountability movement. In states that were able to resist efforts to end bilingual education, the effect of the accountability movement on the scope of native-language instruction is more evident. In New Mexico, for example, many indigenous language programs have been scrapped in favor of remedial English programs.

While the overall number of programs offering native-language instruction has dropped, they are spread over a larger number of states than ever before, due especially to the migration of Mexican and Central American immigrants to the eastern and southern United States. Currently, there are bilingual education programs in 40 states as well as the District of Columbia (Office of English Language Acquisition,

Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students, 2008). This is an increase of two states since the 2006 survey of number of states offering bilingual programs, to which we now turn.

PROGRAM TYPES: TRANSITIONAL, MAINTENANCE, AND DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAMS

Transitional bilingual education programs have as their goal to transition students into all-English programs after several years of assistance in the native language. Over the years, the standard has become three years of native-language support, after which students were to be placed in all English programs. These types of programs were the most popular and still operate in several states (Illinois, Texas, and New York). However, more recent studies have confirmed that three years is not enough time for most language-minority students to learn the kind of language needed in the upper elementary and secondary grades to engage fully in academic content classroom experiences (Cummins, 2001b; see also Gibbons, 2009, and Valdés, 2004, for a greater discussion of this issue).

The main difference between maintenance bilingual programs and dual language immersion programs is the participation of language-majority children. Although, in some states, language-majority children have been included upon request in maintenance bilingual programs, the focus of instruction is on language-minority children. The objectives for maintenance bilingual programs are generally (1) to support language-minority children in their native language, (2) to support language-minority children in learning English, and (3) to bring this group to high levels of academic achievement in both languages. These programs have had great success in educating language-minority children, and studies have shown that the longer language-minority children are able to study in their native language in addition to English, the greater the academic gains (Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey, & Pasta, 1991).

The inclusion of and concern for language-majority children in two-way or dual immersion programs may well be an important reason for their growth. In a 2006 report, *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in U.S. schools,* the Center for Applied Linguistics listed 310 programs in public and private schools in the United States. The states with the highest number of programs at that time were Louisiana, Hawaii, Oregon, Minnesota, and Virginia. The most commonly taught languages were Spanish at 42% of immersion programs, French at 29% of these programs, and Hawaiian at 8.4% of programs.

Dual language immersion programs face many of the same challenges

as maintenance bilingual programs. Finding qualified teachers whose language skills allow them to teach all of the academic content can be quite difficult. Most U.S.-born bilingual teachers have been educated in English-only teacher education programs. Although they may be native speakers of the target language, they rarely have had opportunities to develop high levels of fluency and literacy in academic subject matter. Therefore, using the correct terminology and phrasing for multiple subjects may be well beyond their linguistic abilities (M. D. Guerrero & Guerrero, 2008). For those who are foreign-born speakers of the target language, it is often the case that they have little to no knowledge of the customs, philosophies, and practices of American public education. This lack of information, in addition to a general lack of experience with the diversity of students, can often leave foreign-born teachers at a loss when faced with teaching responsibilities. Finally, there are growing numbers of majority-language teachers who are becoming dual language teachers. Many of these teachers have spent considerable time living and learning the target language. They too may be unfamiliar with teacher and academic registers in the target language. Moreover, they often lack an understanding of the sociohistoric and cultural issues that U.S. bilingual students face and thereby unwittingly maintain a majority-group view of teaching in the minority language.

Other challenges include a lack of appropriate non-English-language materials. This problem mirrors the problems with qualified teachers. Materials developed in the United States are often translations of English material that do not reflect the cultures of the non-English language. Furthermore, the translations frequently utilize unnatural phrasing that can interfere with children's learning. The materials from other countries, although much more natural and reflective of some of the target cultures, may not be geared to the concepts, competencies, and skills for particular American grade levels (Hernández-Zudell, Takahashi-Breines & Blum Martínez, 2003). The language arts materials developed by Alma Flor Ada and Isabel Campoy hold great promise, as they are authentic Spanish language texts aimed at Spanish-speaking students in this country (see www.delsolbooks.com for a list of books by these authors).

As stated earlier, dual language immersion programs are growing in popularity. This growth may be in part because of interest and participation by majority-language families and teachers. That majority families with greater political power and know-how now have a stake in the continuation of such programs allows these programs to function and grow without the constant attacks to which traditional maintenance programs have been subjected. In fact, some of the political support that Colorado bilingual activists were able to garner in their fight to maintain bilingual

education in the state came from majority parents whose children were studying in dual language programs (Escamilla, Shannon, Carlos, & Garcia, 2003).

Nevertheless, it is important to heed the cautions raised by Valdés (1997). Dual language programs can become so focused on the needs of majority language children that those of the minority group may not be met (Hernandez-Zudell, 2007, Potowski, 2007). As the amount of research on dual language programs grows, there is increased concern about the actual use of the minority language by the participating children—both language majority and language minority (Harley, Allen, Cummins, & Swain, 1990; de Jong & Howard, 2009; Potowski, 2007). Although the consequences of learning a minority language are not substantial for language-majority children, this is not the case for language-minority children who continue to live and need to communicate with family, community members, and often, the home country of the parents.

Another area of recent growth is heritage language programs. Heritage languages are defined as those languages with which learners have some proficiency or cultural connection. Thus, Chinese language programs for students from Chinese homes or indigenous students who are trying to learn their tribal language are heritage language programs (Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001).

BILINGUAL TEACHER PREPARATION

In this section, we give a brief overview of the competencies or standards required by different states in the preparation of bilingual teachers.

All states are concerned with ensuring bilingual teachers have the ability to deliver instruction in both English and the other language. Most states require passage of a language proficiency test in the other language. It is difficult to know at what level proficiency has been set in each state without examining the tests themselves. Furthermore, some tests may be more concerned with oral proficiency and less with the written mode. However, only New York requires that prospective bilingual teachers also pass an English proficiency test. This no doubt reflects the large numbers of teachers in the state who have received their education in an institution outside of the United States and in a language other than English.

Most states require that bilingual teachers have an understanding of the different models of bilingual education and the history of how these models came about. It is also important to understand the processes of bilingualism and biliteracy and how second languages are learned.

Nevertheless, in the area of biliteracy, several scholars have acknowledged that most bilingual teachers lack information and skills in the methodologies of teaching literacy in the native language. There is an implicit assumption that what one has learned about reading in English can be used in the other language despite differences in script, language structure, and cultural traditions (Escamilla, 2000; Pérez, 2004).

What differs from state to state (and even within states) are the goals of bilingual programs that states and districts are willing to support. This has been a problem since the inception of public bilingual education (Ovando, Combs & Collier, 2006)). Some have seen these programs as a transition into an all-English program, while others have advocated for the maintenance of the native language and English throughout the educational career of a student. In Illinois, the Department of Education's website only refers to transitional bilingual education, even though Illinois is home to many two-way immersion programs (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2006). Similarly, in Texas, where many bilingual teachers are prepared, the Texas Educational Agency describes bilingual education as a program for limited-English speakers that helps them learn English (TEA, Bilingual Education Programs: Benefits for Your Child) with no mention of the native language, despite the growth in two-way programs in that state as well.

Another difference lies in the amount of time that bilingual teacher candidates spend in their programs and the extent of their preparation. In some states (Illinois, Texas), bilingual teacher preparation consists of 18 hours of extra coursework in addition to practica. In other states, bilingual teacher preparation has been reduced to one or two courses.

To illuminate the issues facing bilingual teacher preparation programs, we present two state profiles: California and New Mexico. Following these profiles, we discuss the successes and challenges common to bilingual teacher education programs.

BILINGUAL TEACHER PREPARATION IN CALIFORNIA

Organization and scope of bilingual teacher preparation. The formal training of bilingual educators began in California in 1972 with the passage of a number of bills outlining requirements for native-language instruction for ELL students. Prior to this bill, there were bilingual classrooms, but their teachers had no formal training specific to teaching bilingually. In 1976, the state created two pathways to becoming a bilingual educator: (1) simultaneously with earning a teaching credential and (2) for already practicing teachers, the Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC), an examination testing fluency in a language other than English, bilingual

methods, culture, and content-area instruction in the primary language (Montano, Ulanoff, Quintanar-Sarellana, & Aoki, 2005). The BCC was offered only in Spanish, but the state approved alternative assessments in eight different languages administered by state-approved assessor agencies (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2004). To be authorized to offer certification along with a teaching credential, institutions of higher education submitted program proposals to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing outlining their prospective program, using guidelines supplied by the Commission. By 1977, 20 institutions offered a bilingual cross-cultural credential. The number of bilingual certifications issued in the early years of bilingual education grew exponentially, from almost 500 in 1976 to 4,000 in December 1978.

However, supply did not keep up with demand: In 1979, the Commission's estimate for the year was that there would be between 5,000 and 10,000 teachers on bilingual waiver (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1979). Although the main legislation requiring native-language instruction sunset came in 1987, the California Department of Education continued to issue bilingual cross-cultural certification. At the time of the legislation sunset, supply still lagged behind demand. In 1985, only 458 new teacher education candidates were eligible for *bilingual* credentials (Crawford, 1987), and in 1986, 43% of all bilingual educators in California were teaching on emergency bilingual waivers (Burr, 1986).

In the early 1990s, the state updated guidelines for bilingual teacher training programs, creating the Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development or BCLAD Certification. The BCLAD (and CLAD for teachers serving ELL students only in English) was more comprehensive in its scope than the BCC and could be earned through coursework as well as by examination. The BCLAD certification required teacher candidates to demonstrate competency in six areas: (1) language structure and first- and second-language development; (2) methodology of bilingual instruction, English language development and content instruction; (3) culture and cultural diversity; (4) methodology for primary-language instruction; (5) the culture of emphasis; and (6) the language of emphasis (listening, reading, speaking, and writing).

A series of six examinations, focused on the areas listed above, was available to already practicing teachers pursuing their BCLAD Certificate. Practicing teachers also had the option of taking coursework to fulfill the first three competencies, but could only take the examination to fulfill the last three. Preservice teachers could earn a "BCLAD Emphasis" by taking coursework on the above competencies during their program. Examinations were available in nine languages: Armenian,

Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

While the number of bilingual educators serving California ELL students had grown, it had not grown at the pace needed to fully staff California's bilingual programs. In 1996, only one third of bilingual classrooms were served by fully credentialed bilingual educators (Gándara, 1997).

New legislation, passed in 1998, created a two-tiered credentialing system in California. The first tier is comprised of coursework and fieldwork and is completed at institutes of higher learning. According to the legislation, the coursework corresponding to this tier cannot exceed the amount of coursework that can be completed in a one-year full-time program. The second tier, induction, occurs during the first two years of teaching and is comprised of fieldwork exercises carried out at the new teacher's school site, supported by teacher mentors. While the new legislation mandated that all prospective teachers receive instruction in educating English learners, the new preservice requirements were watered down compared to those previously in place. Previous requirements for courses on multicultural education, sheltered instruction, second language acquisition, and English language development were eliminated, and programs were allowed to "embed" such content within regular coursework. Unlike the first tier of the credential program, the second tier or the induction phase has no material specific to the support of bilingual educators. In fact, a 2005 study revealed that only half of new teachers surveyed (BCLAD and non-BCLAD) had received any training during their induction period on the teaching of ELL students, although, by law, all new teachers should have received such instruction through their induction program (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005).

While it is impossible to disentangle the effects of the English-only movement, the accountability movement, and legislation restructuring teacher education in California, either individually or as a group they have had a great effect on bilingual teacher preparation in the state. It is evident that the restructuring of teacher education and the new unit cap on programs have had an especially chilling effect on bilingual teacher preparation. According to Montano, Ulanoff, Quintanar-Sarellana, & Aoki (2005), citing a survey of a subset of BCLAD faculty after the restructuring of teacher education in 2002,

> 56% [of respondents] reported removal or restructuring of [BCLAD] courses, 44% saw a change in the number of students in the BCLAD program and in faculty assignments for those who

> teach in the BCLAD, and 20% cited a reduction in the frequency of [BCLAD] course offerings. (p. 112)

In addition to a restructuring of already existing programs, the new legislation precludes institutions that do not already have a BCLAD program from starting a new one. Such institutions are allowed to offer support to students who wish to take the state BCLAD examinations, but, for the first time since bilingual teacher education programs began in the state in 1972, programs that do not already have a bilingual teacher preparation program cannot create one.

Although requirements for training teachers serving ELL students were updated, the new legislation did not update requirements for bilingual teacher training. In response to this need and pressure from focus groups supporting native-language instruction such as the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE) and the newly formed California Association for Bilingual Teacher Educators (CABTE), the state convened a task force to update standards for bilingual teacher training programs and bilingual teacher examinations.

Current landscape of preparation for bilingual teachers. In 2007, the state adopted the task force's proposals, creating the new Standards for the Reauthorization of Bilingual Teacher Preparation, which were finalized in 2009 (Cadiero-Kaplan & Rodríguez, 2008). The new program is based on updated knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs), as follows:

1. Current research and best practices related to pedagogy, first- and second-language development, linguistics, and biliteracy
2. Current legislation and policies pertaining to second-language learners and teacher preparation
3. Bilingual program models, (e.g., transitional, two-way/dual language immersion, foreign language, maintenance, etc.)
4. Other instructional program settings for ELLs, including those that provide specialized English-language development instruction for secondary students
5. Social, economic, and cultural contexts of the target community
6. Student teaching or internship in bilingual instructional settings with English language learners in K-12 public schools

Item number two represents an addition to the KSAs for the BCLAD. As well as the updated KSAs, the task force also created program standards for bilingual teacher preparation programs. Current and prospective programs must submit new program proposals meeting these standards and receive authorization by 2011.

The updated bilingual teacher training system continues to offer multiple routes for bilingual teacher preparation. New teacher candidates can take coursework during their credential program to fulfill requirements, and already practicing teachers can take a series of three examinations offered through the state. A key difference between the new program model and that of the BCLAD is that already practicing teachers can take university coursework to fulfill three of the six competencies, whereas under the previous program, inservice teachers were only allowed to take the state examination.

Another influence on bilingual teacher preparation is the new Teacher Preparation Examination (TPE), part of the legislation creating a two-tiered credentialing system. The TPE is a high-stakes examination teacher candidates must pass to receive their preliminary teaching credential. Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) are able to create their own TPE, but it must meet state standards for reliability and validity. Currently, three TPEs have gained state approval, and, of those, only one has a separate test for bilingual teacher candidates.

Currently, there are 122 BCLAD programs in California. Most are found at public and private universities, but 25% are supported by the County Offices of Education. Bilingual credentials are offered in14 languages, with the majority (95%) granted in Spanish. While the number of two-way programs in Asian languages, especially Mandarin, have grown (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2009), the number of BCLAD emphasis credentials in that language have not increased, with only four granted in 2008. BCLAD Certificates (earned by examination) tend to be about one third the number of those earned through coursework. While that proportion is mirrored by the Spanish BCLAD, Asian language BCLADs tend to be evenly split between those earned through coursework and those earned through examinations. In addition, the number of BCLAD Certificates earned through examination has decreased only slightly, while the number earned through coursework has diminished by almost two thirds (see Table 1). This finding is disturbing as the depth of understanding gained (and demonstrated) through studying for and passing the examination is probably more superficial than that gained through coursework.

BILINGUAL TEACHER PREPARATION IN NEW MEXICO

New Mexico was the first state to pass bilingual education legislation in 1969. In 1973, a comprehensive Bilingual Education Act was passed in which state funds could be used to support instruction in Spanish and the indigenous languages of the state. This legislation was also supported

by the state constitution, which states that teachers must be educated in both English and Spanish in order to better serve the Spanish-speaking children of New Mexico. Unlike most of the other states that passed bilingual education legislation, the original purpose of bilingual education in New Mexico was focused on serving native-born populations. The comprehensive Act of 1973 stated that all children in New Mexico could enroll in bilingual programs.

Since the 1970s, most of New Mexico's five state universities have had bilingual teacher education programs. Most teachers undertake a teacher education program as undergraduates, graduating with a BA or BS in education. The bilingual education programs are typically made up of six to eight courses that students must take in addition to the elementary or secondary teacher education courses required for all students. Thus, New Mexico bilingual teachers receive an elementary or secondary teaching license at the undergraduate level and then add an endorsement through coursework and language tests. For this reason, many undergraduates forego bilingual endorsements until they have had more economic stability after several years of teaching. In recent years, the number of teachers returning for a master's degree with an interest in bilingual education has grown. As teachers face a wide diversity of students, they realize that their elementary or secondary degree coursework has not prepared them adequately to meet the needs of bilingual students. Therefore, several graduate programs include coursework that will lead to bilingual endorsement. That many school districts in the state now pay an extra stipend for bilingual or English as a second language (ESL)-endorsed teachers has helped increase interest in this area.

However, there was no consistency among bilingual teacher education programs in the early 1970s. Some programs stressed the development of cultural sensitivity over language ability. Others focused the lion's share of attention on developing future teachers' language skills and gave scant attention to pedagogy. It was not uncommon for principals and other educational leaders to hire a teacher with a Spanish surname, assuming that having a Spanish surname guaranteed Spanish-language competence. In 1974, the state set minimum standards for bilingual teacher education programs at the universities. However, these were so general that they made little difference in the ways each university operated with respect to bilingual teacher preparation.

In 1979, the state revised the standards, making them much more specific and thus bringing some consistency in terms of language study, pedagogy, and curriculum. Bilingual teacher preparation in Spanish continued to be a source of great tension. On the one hand, native Spanish-speaking New Mexicans were concerned that their particular

Spanish language varieties be respected. On the other hand, there were those who agreed that the language varieties needed respect, but that the focus should be on using and learning the standard variety, especially for teaching academic content and literacy(Valdés, 1989). In the early 1980s, the Four Skills Test (Valdés & Hannum, 1989) was developed and adopted by the New Mexico State Department of Education (NMSDE) as the evaluation tool for ensuring a minimum standard for bilingual teachers' language abilities. A specific section on the New Mexican variety was included. More recently, in 1994, a new Spanish language test called *Prueba* was developed by experts in the state. This language test included more performance-based assessments and also incorporated a section on New Mexican Spanish.

In 1986, when the NMSDE moved to a competency-based licensure system, new competencies were set for Spanish-English, Navajo-English, and ESL teachers. Several years later, the NMSDE worked with Pueblo indigenous educators and leaders to develop a process for Pueblo teachers to become endorsed in bilingual education (see New Mexico Public Education Department, Bilingual Bureau for explanation).

In 2004, several state legislators worked with bilingual education activists to revise the original Bilingual-Multicultural Education Act. In part, this initiative was motivated by a concern over funding and accountability. Because the funds allocated by the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED, the renamed NMSDE) for bilingual education are not categorical, school districts have utilized these funds for other purposes. During a statewide audit, the Legislative Finance Committee discovered that this practice was widespread, especially in districts with large numbers of indigenous students (New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee, 2004). Outraged by this finding, Senator Leonard Tsosie, a Navajo legislator, took the lead in trying to make the funding categorical. District superintendents fought back this initiative, just as they had during a previous attempt. However, not all was lost. Legislators and bilingual educators were able to include heritage language learning and language revitalization programs in the revised Act.

New Mexico bilingual teacher competencies are similar to those in other states, covering language, culture, pedagogy, leadership, and community.

Language (including knowledge of and ability to use Spanish and English, both orally and in written form). Although no coursework is required to meet this competency, it is strongly recommended that students take courses in the Spanish departments to improve their abilities, particularly in reading and writing so they can pass Prueba. In 1994, after hearing testimony from bilingual educators, the New Mexico legislature allocated a small

fund to the NMPED to distribute to the state universities to support Spanish language institutes for bilingual teachers in the summer. Some universities offer one course designed to strengthen teachers' reading and writing of Spanish before they take Prueba. At the University of New Mexico, four courses are offered in Spanish in an intensive three-week session, dealing with curricula, Mexican history and culture, Spanish reading methodology, and children's literature.

Other language issues such as those contained in the "monolingual–bilingual" continua and the "development of biliteracy dimension" (Hornberger, 2004) are learned through coursework. Later, students experience these issues directly in practica and student teaching.

Culture. Although specific courses may not be entitled "culture," many courses incorporate the cultural issues that future teachers must confront. Some courses offer a macro view (contexts of biliteracy dimension), while others teach students how to incorporate cultural content into the curriculum and work with specific Southwestern cultures.

Methodology. All prospective bilingual teachers take methodology courses for teaching in bilingual programs. In undergraduate programs, candidates must also participate in at least one year of practica in bilingual settings. In several universities, some of the methodology courses are offered in Spanish. In this area, students engage in questions about the "media of biliteracy," examining the differences between simultaneous exposure to written forms in two languages and those of subsequent exposure. They also develop the skills and frames for teaching receptive and productive abilities in both languages and their literacies. Courses typically taken in this area include the teaching of biliteracy, the teaching of ESL, curriculum development in multicultural education, and so forth. These are in addition to the methodology courses required for an elementary or secondary license that are not typically focused on language-minority students.

Professional leadership. Throughout their coursework, students receive guidance and information about their roles as advocates and leaders in the field. As students enter schools for practica, they become more aware of the need for teachers to play a leadership and advocacy role for bilingual students. Several universities offer their students opportunities to participate in local and state conferences and in presentations to the state legislature.

Parents and community. In this group of competencies, students are exposed to a more macro view of the contexts in which they will teach (contexts of biliteracy dimension). Some universities offer specific classes

in this area; in other cases, students are given specific assignments to work with parents or learn about the communities in New Mexico through coursework.

EFFECTS OF NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

While New Mexico has not had to deal with English-only propositions, the effects of NCLB, particularly in the area of testing, have been felt in bilingual education programs. The requirement of testing in English has pushed some schools to abandon native or heritage language instruction. Furthermore, until just recently, the NMPED's Quality Assurance bureau was requiring failing schools to give up their bilingual programs so as to better meet AYP (Annual Yearly Progress). Luckily, bilingual activists were able to convince the Department that improvements to the bilingual program might be a better way to improve language-minority children's academic achievement. Nevertheless, the focus on AYP and English-language testing has affected the enrollment of students in bilingual education teacher preparation programs. In one of the largest state universities, the average number of students in this program dropped from 15 to 20 per year during the Clinton years to 8 to 10 in the last five years. Despite this downturn, the numbers of students in graduate programs seeking bilingual endorsement has remained steady. Furthermore, the number of districts maintaining bilingual education programs has remained fairly steady, with 67% of districts having bilingual education programs in 2004 and 65% in 2008.

Another effect of NCLB has been in the area of achieving "highly qualified" status for teachers. Many teachers are now able to receive "high quality" status through a test. In 2008, the NMPED adopted Content Knowledge Assessment in TESOL, as the test for ESL teachers. This now means that licensed teachers seeking an ESL endorsement do not have to take coursework if they can pass this test. However, the ESL teacher test is so general, and of such poor quality, that many teachers are able to pass it without any knowledge of ESL. Luckily, no such test has been developed for Spanish-English bilingual teachers.

A JUXTAPOSITION OF TWO STATES

Once again, we turn to Hornberger's model to illuminate differences and similarities in bilingual teacher preparation. The contexts in each state are strikingly different. California has effectively outlawed native-language instruction, while New Mexico attempts to maintain it. There

are sizeable differences in population—36 million in California and only 1.5 million in New Mexico—and large differences in terms of the diversity of the population. California is home to many people from Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America in addition to the indigenous groups of California, the native-born Hispanic, and African American groups, while New Mexico has a large Mexican immigrant, native-born Hispanic, and sizeable indigenous population. Most Californians are urban dwellers, whereas many New Mexicans still live in rural areas. California is one of the richest states in the country, while New Mexico is one of the poorest (47th). California teacher credential programs occur after students complete a bachelor's degree. In New Mexico, while it is possible to gain a teaching license after a bachelor's program, all state universities continue to maintain undergraduate teacher education programs.

Thus, in California, the contexts both macro (state level) and micro (local or school level) are affected by national education policies (NCLB and the accountability movement), and these in turn affect state language policies and prohibitions. In addition, the push and pull of many different language groups in close proximity affect both state and local policies and funding sources. Educational structures (teacher education programs) in state and private universities and educational agencies are affected by macro policies, and these affect the ways in which bilingual teachers are or are not prepared.

In New Mexico, the macro and micro contexts are also affected by national education policies (NCLB and the accountability movement), but this influence is tempered somewhat by the historical preoccupation with the Spanish language. Furthermore, because of a very low population base, indigenous groups have been able to play a more vocal role in education than in other states. However, the overall poverty of the state has a great effect on academic achievement, leaving educational institutions more vulnerable to the pressure of the national accountability system. Therefore, state universities, while maintaining bilingual teacher education programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, are pressured to include national curricula such as Reading First.

At the individual level (the development of biliteracy), we can see that bilingual teacher education in both states maintains a concern for individual students to develop biliteracy. Teachers are required to have knowledge about the L1–L2 continua and how to develop both languages in both oral and written modes despite state language policies. Both states require language testing of bilingual teacher candidates, but only one offers candidates explicit assistance in gaining proficiency. New Mexico has maintained a concern for the Spanish vernacular of the

region, while California has had to deal with multiple languages and their varieties, including English. Both states are very concerned that teachers learn how to develop more academic registers of English. Interestingly, neither state has specific coursework to address the curricular, program, and assessment issues of two-way immersion programs.

In both states, teacher preparation programs influenced by national policies are concerned with the media of biliteracy, especially how the first language can be utilized to benefit English-language literacy. Most bilingual studies have confirmed the long-term benefits of introducing minority-language literacy first and then successively introducing English literacy (Thomas & Collier, 1997). However, the national accountability movement and the penalties within NCLB for schools that do not achieve AYP have moved some schools and some teacher education programs to promote English language literacy much earlier (Blum Martínez & Flores Dueñas, 2010). Despite the contexts, this pressure to produce results in English as quickly as possible has also been felt in two-way immersion programs across the country.

In both states (and in many others), there is a notable lack of coursework to help teachers prepare to work in two-way immersion programs. Although many of the competencies and standards that presently exist help meet the educational needs of two-way teachers, there are greater needs than in early transition programs in terms of curricula—how to balance and work with the different content areas in two languages, program models and development, assessment and students' development of their two languages.

The notion of continua in the three dimensions has allowed us to identify areas of similarities and differences. It has also pinpointed continuing areas of concern—the amount of time bilingual teachers spend in specific coursework, whether included within a "regular" teacher education program or in addition to it; how best to prepare bilingual teachers in the other language of instruction (M. D. Guerrero & Guerrero, 2008); the lack of specific coursework in reading methodology of the other language; inattention to the study of assessment for bilingual populations; a total lack of attention to the needs of two-way immersion teachers; and the roles bilingual teachers should play in advocating for their students and their students' families and communities.

TENSIONS/ISSUES IN PREPARING BILINGUAL TEACHERS

As Merino (2007) stated, "teacher education research in general, and for ELLs in particular, is one of the most neglected areas of scholarship in the social sciences" (p. 7). Within the area of research on teacher educa-

tion, studies on the preparation of bilingual teacher educators are scant. In the following section, we explore the relationship between bilingual teacher preparation program models, standards, and areas identified by research as necessary for the preparation of bilingual educators. We continue to explore these areas through the lens of Hornberger's continua of biliteracy. In outlining the continua, Hornberger argued that it is crucial for teacher preparation to focus on these specific areas and to examine the role of power in the relationship between them:

> In educational policy and practice regarding biliteracy, there tends to be an implicit privileging of one end of the continua over the other such that one end of each continuum is associated with more power than the other (e.g., written development over oral development); there is a need to contest the traditional power weighting by paying attention to, granting agency to, and making space for actors and practices at what have traditionally been the less powerful ends of the continua. (pp. 158–159)

DEVELOPMENT OF BILITERACY

Due to the pervasive and ongoing linguicism in U.S. education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, 2001; Cummins, 2001b), most bilingual educators who are native speakers of a non-English language (native bilingual educators) control a limited number of domains in the language (M. D. Guerrero, 1999; M. D. Guerrero & Guerrero 2008). While they often have a full sociolinguistic knowledge of the language and control over the language domains of home life, they often have not had access to a "teacher-like" academic register of the language. According to the above authors, this is due in part to the inabilities of teacher educators who often suffer from the same linguistic limitations as their students. Currently, there is a small cohort of bilingual teachers who themselves received bilingual education and therefore are more likely to have acquired some competency in the academic register of that language. However, due to the recent English-only movement and the outlawing of bilingual education in key states, that source of prospective bilingual teachers will soon end. Therefore, it has been incumbent on bilingual teacher preparation programs to ensure, if not provide, academic proficiency in the non-English language, either through coursework in the department, in a language department of a university, or other means. Unfortunately, each route to providing academic proficiency in the non-English language has proved to be potentially problematic. Language courses outside of a school of education do not teach a teacher-like reg-

ister of the language and often unquestioningly teach only the most powerful variety of the language, implicitly or explicitly disparaging other less powerful varieties, often those spoken in the language community of the students themselves. As for courses taught in the native language within schools of education, again, because of the linguicism inherent in the U.S. educational system, many, if not most, bilingual teacher educators who are native speakers of a non-English language also are less proficient in the teacher-like academic language in the target language and therefore have difficulty providing coursework in that language (M. D. Guerrero, 1999). It is critical that bilingual teacher education programs provide instruction in the academic register of the target language(s) as well as differentiated instruction for native and non-native speakers of the target language. Instruction in language varieties, including the power relations between them, and their appropriate and explicit use in the classroom, is also crucial.

Bilingual educators must also have knowledge *about* the two languages in which they teach and teach about. For bilingual educators, Fillmore and Snow's (2002) instructive work, "What Teachers Need to Know about Language," outlines broad areas of linguistic knowledge that bilingual educators need to know. In addition, bilingual educators need to have a deep knowledge of the relationships between the two languages (Kerper Mora, 2008), allowing them to draw explicit comparisons between the two languages on multiple levels including lexical, semantic, and rhetorical. Furthermore, as stated in the preceding section, bilingual teachers must also be knowledgeable about the methodologies used in teaching native-language literacy and how these differ from those used in teaching English literacy because of differences in language structure and script (Sharken Taboada & Kerper Mora, 2009).

As stated by Hornberger, bilingual teachers must be not only academically proficient in both languages, but also cognizant of the power relations between the languages and language varieties and how to teach in such a way that recognizes and yet works against power disparities. This is especially crucial for teachers in dual language immersion programs, given the bringing together of students from both powerful and marginalized language backgrounds within the same classrooms (Valdés, 1997). A study by de Jong and Howard (2009) revealed that language-minority students in TWIPs are often disadvantaged by teachers' accommodations for language-majority students as well as by teachers' assumption that native speakers of the target language automatically control an academic register of the language. De Jong and Howard pointed to various strategies that might mitigate differences in power and status between the two languages, including separating minority- and majority-language

speakers during specific periods of time for targeted instruction in the minority language and providing minority-language speakers with opportunities for extended discourse in the target language with other minority-language speakers.

It is not enough for bilingual teachers to be proficient in an academic register of the target language, they must also know how to teach the language and academic content in that language to native and non-native speakers (requiring different content and pedagogy (Valdés, 2004). As Merino (2007) stated, "Teachers of ELs are also teachers of language; not just language as a static entity, but as it is situated and used within the classroom, within a discipline, in multiple modalities, and with students of varying social identities" (p. 2). The pedagogical content knowledge needed to accomplish the above is deeply tied to the teachers' knowledge of the context of biliteracy continua. It is vital that bilingual teachers have a profound knowledge of the context/s within which they are teaching and their students are learning. These contexts include the macro-national, state, and district language policies, as well as immigration trends, immigration policies, immigration trends and policies' relationship to language policies, literacy practices in the minority language community and the micro include: school language policies, community language policies and norms, power relationships between the community and the school and the role of language, and power relationships between language groups within schools and classrooms. A key way for bilingual teacher education programs to ensure that candidates have this knowledge is to recruit prospective teachers from language-minority communities. In high schools where there are college recruitment activities, schools of education can let language-minority students know that their native-language abilities are greatly needed in the public schools of the area and the nation.

Given the unfortunately low percentage of minority teacher candidates, it is also necessary to construct bilingual teacher preparation course content that allows non- minority teacher candidates to acquire knowledge by asking questions about the "macro" and "micro" contexts of teaching and learning. Such activities might include ethnographic studies of language use in the local language-minority community and panel discussions led by language-minority teacher candidates about the relationship of schooling, language, and power in language-minority communities. For non-language-minority bilingual teacher candidates, it may be useful to provide them with ethnographic tools that can be used to learn about language-minority communities during both their preservice and inservice experiences (Baker, de León, Phelps, Martín, & Suarez, 2009).

BILINGUAL TEACHERS' POSITIONALITY

Prospective bilingual teachers need to have knowledge of their own positionality. Maher and Tetreault (1994) define positionality as the "knower's specific position in any context as defined by race, gender, class, and other socially significant dimensions" (p.22). It is crucial that bilingual teacher education programs guide student teachers to interrogate their positionality and the implications of their positionality for their practice. Likewise, it is important for bilingual teacher educators to recognize differences both within and between bilingual teacher candidate populations, for example, the differing levels of acculturation experienced within the Latino population (Flores, Clark, Guerra, & Sanchez, 2008). As well, bilingual teacher candidates need space for reflecting on changes in their positionality as they grow and learn throughout their program (Jones, Young, & Rodríguez, 1999). In a study of language-minority Canadian bilingual educators, Taylor (2008) found that "Analysis of teachers' presentations and interviews suggests that, in their processes of examining their design and implementation of multiliteracies curriculum [processes of collaborative planning, documenting and presenting, and/or participating in interviews], different teachers revisited, reconsidered, and reframed personal histories of migration and minoritization" (p. 108). In a study of Latino preservice bilingual teachers, Clark and Flores (2001) argued that it is not enough to guide teachers to examine their evolving understandings of their own positionality; bilingual teacher educators must also explicitly guide that evolution:

> We think it is imperative that teacher-training programs focus on the development and enhancement of ethnic identity in teachers in order to ensure school success for language-minority students. As well, teacher-training program should model the value of cultural knowledge and provide teachers with the skills necessary to enhance ethnic identity of their future students, in this way enhancing their students' internal power. (p. 83)

Likewise, Berta-Ávila (2004) contended that it is not enough that Latino educators are of color, but rather that they must critically interrogate their positionality and self-identify as agents of change in order not to be co-opted and unwittingly reproduce educational inequities currently experienced by most Latino students.

For White teachers as well, it is crucial that they interrogate their own positionality as White bilingual teachers. Jones, Young, and Rodríguez (1999) found the following trends among the White bilingual teachers they interviewed: acquisition of Spanish was additive, had occurred outside the boundaries of the United States, and most often not in Mexico.

They also found that the White bilingual teachers were more focused on the role of language versus culture than their Latino counterparts, stressing the value of language maintenance but rarely mentioning cultural maintenance. Baker (2003), in a study of White bilingual teachers, reached similar conclusions, finding that teachers focused more on language than they did students' culture, and also that they had a thin understanding of students' daily lives. This superficial understanding often led teachers to misunderstand parents' behaviors and blame students' low achievement on what the teachers perceived as lack of parent involvement and parents' failure to care about their children's education.

It is imperative that bilingual teacher education help White bilingual educators to reflect on and identify their positionality as a member of the dominant race and language group in the United States. Tatum (2003) found that White students could move through a continuum of steps towards reaching a healthy White self-identity—an identity that would help the individual acknowledge and work against White privilege. Tatum argued that White individuals can be guided to acknowledge the racist assumptions they have often unconsciously been operating on and can learn to recognize those assumptions and work against them. Marx (2004), in her study of White teachers tutoring Latino language-minority students, found that, after continuous interrogation of their assumptions about Latinos (which mirrored mainstream racist assumptions), the White teachers began to come to some understandings about their own thinking and how it often shaped their practice in unfortunate ways for their students. In addition to recognizing their assumptions, it is crucial that bilingual teacher educators assist White bilingual teachers in identifying their role in becoming change agents and working for social justice. Too often, in the "imagined history" of the Civil Rights movement and other struggles for justice, Whites have been repositioned to the center stage as those who led the movement and took many of the risks. White bilingual teachers need to be guided to identify and resist that myth in popular literature and film and grow to see themselves as "allies" in the struggle for equity, as opposed to leaders and directors of the effort.

It is only with a deep knowledge of the macro and micro contexts and their own positionality that bilingual teachers can become effective advocates for their students. For many years, the advocacy role of bilingual educators fell into the binary "pro/against bilingual education." Bilingual teacher education must help candidates reflect deeply on what they believe should be the outcomes of advocacy, hopefully leading to a more nuanced vision of what advocacy is, including crucial issues such as assessment of language-minority students, access, funding, language poli-

cies, and curriculum. Bilingual teacher candidates must learn how to gather information about federal, state, district, and school language policies and also how to take advantage of the policy levers that are available to them (Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). As Cahnmann and Varghese (2005) argued, "In sum, if bilingual teaching is fundamentally a job for those with thick skin, activist training, biliterate expertise, and political savvy, then teacher preparation programs must be charged with the task of explicitly developing these skills" (p. 70).

In terms of advocating for the use of native-language instruction, research indicates that several factors specific to bilingual teacher training can have an effect on teachers' willingness to be advocates for native-language instruction, namely, their confidence as bilingual teachers and the strength of their self-identification as bilingual educators (Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). Studies have revealed that, when teachers feel confident about their bilingual teaching abilities, they tend to be stronger supporters of native-language instruction. This speaks to the need for strong bilingual instruction at the preservice level, both in terms of content and delivery. Another finding was that bilingual teachers' level of motivation to teach bilingually was tied to their level of advocacy (Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). When bilingual teachers entered the field unintentionally or simply because they were proficient in the target language, their level of advocacy for native-language instruction was low. However, bilingual teachers who felt strongly that native-language instruction was a student's right and that they were helping right the wrongs of previous generations of linguicism were more vocal and purposeful about their language advocacy. It is crucial that bilingual teacher preparation programs help prospective teachers interrogate their motives for becoming bilingual educators, have ongoing communication with students as to their perceived abilities in teaching bilingually, and dissuade those who do not feel strongly about their role or their abilities from entering the profession.

STRUCTURE

The structure of bilingual teacher education programs has implications for the retention and level of success of bilingual educators. In New Mexico, bilingual educators must complete additional coursework to gain their bilingual endorsement. This often dissuades teacher candidates from pursuing a bilingual endorsement until they pursue their master's degree, often years after graduating from the credential program. The additional coursework and fieldwork involved in earning the BCLAD in California has a similar outcome (Jones et al., 1999). Structures for the

recruitment and retention of bilingual teacher candidates from language-minority communities have been identified. For example, Carrier and Cohen (2003), in a project recruiting language-minority candidates from a low-income community, found that, when advising took place in an easily accessible location and the staff was perceived as caring, coupled with coursework in cohorts, this created an environment in which language-minority bilingual teacher candidates thrived. Wong et al. (2006), in a study of the Bilingual Multicultural Education Department at California State University, Sacramento, a department that recruits primarily teacher candidates of color, found that, in addition to the factors identified by Carrier and Cohen (2003), the presence of bilingual teacher education faculty of color who grew up in low-income communities was helpful in recruiting and retaining bilingual teacher candidates from similar backgrounds.

BILINGUAL TEACHER EDUCATORS: WHO ARE THEY?

Given the research cited above and the analysis of the status of bilingual teacher preparation, it is crucial that we as bilingual teacher educators interrogate our own positionality with our students and the communities we aspire to assist. If we are of the minority-language communities ourselves, we must reflect on our own relationships with the local communities, how well we understand their challenges and aspirations, and whether we represent these in our classes. In addition, we must critically and honestly assess our own abilities in our heritage language and continuously seek to improve our abilities, especially in the written form. M. D. Guerrero and Guerrero (2008) challenged bilingual teacher educators to begin publishing in their heritage language to (1) improve writing abilities in the language and (2) develop a tradition of publications in the heritage language.

If we are White bilingual teacher educators, it is imperative that we interrogate our own positionality with our students and the communities we wish to serve. We must acknowledge and identify the role of White privilege in our own lives and its impact on our interactions and opportunities in our professional lives. It is important that we do not conflate knowledge of the language with knowledge of the language community and that we are frank with our own White students about not doing so as well. It is crucial that we strive to be allies in the struggle for social and linguistic justice and actively support the effort to increase the numbers of linguistic-minority student teachers and bilingual teacher educators. All bilingual educators should examine our bilingual teacher education

programs with Hornberger's bilingual continua in mind. How well are we addressing the L1 ends of the continua? What specifically are we offering in terms of native-language literacy methodologies? What practica do our teacher candidates have in working with students across the bilingual spectrum (in each continuum), and what answers can we give them about the strategies and methods they should utilize? As Cahnmann and Varghese (2005) argued: "Our findings lead us to recognize missed opportunities to be publicly honest and explicit about the shortcomings of working within the largely compensatory models of bilingual education that have been put in place in highly stressful and under-resourced school sites" (p. 71).

Moreover, if we desire that our students become advocates for positive changes for bilingual students and their communities, we ourselves need to model this behavior. In California, the CABTE organization of bilingual educators has been instrumental in developing the new bilingual teacher standards. In New Mexico, a similar recently formed organization has lobbied the NMPED and legislators for more appropriate testing practices and were instrumental in the 2004 revision of the Bilingual and Multicultural Education Act. Many members of this organization have been very active at the state level for years. At the same time, we must recognize that much of our advocacy must also be aimed at our own universities and other teacher education programs that often misunderstand or do not support our efforts. Furthermore, we need to work with our allies within schools of education to develop better and more flexible structures that maintain challenging content while meeting the needs of financially stressed students.

Finally, we must work harder at recruiting and supporting bilingual teacher candidates from language-minority communities. In New Mexico, when Title VII supported teacher education candidates, we saw 20 to 30 students graduate in this area per semester. However, without additional financial support, students our now forced to wait until they have worked as teachers for several years before they can return to complete this coursework. Thus, we must call on our allies both nationally and locally to support our efforts.

We believe that, no matter what one's training might be, wider school, community, and national support are required for bilingual education to exist and for bilingual educators to thrive. It is enough to fight battles on the outside, but when teachers are fighting antagonism from within their own school environment, the potential for burnout is even greater. (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005, p. 70)

References

Appellate court rules against school districts. (2009, August 5). Retrieved January 3, 2010, from http://www.californianstogether.org/nclb/

Baker, S. (2003). *Anglo-American anglophone bilingual teachers and teaching the "other": A look at the linkages between teacher discourses, teacher backgrounds, and teacher practice* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Baker, S., de León, E., Phelps, P., Martin, M., & Suarez, C. (2009). Education of the community, by the community, and for the community: The Language Academy of Sacramento. In P. Wong & R. Glass (Eds.), *Prioritizing urban children, teachers, and schools through professional development schools* (pp. 87–103). New York: SUNY Press.

Berta-Ávila, M. I. (2004). Critical Xicana/Xicano educators: Is it enough to be a person of color? *High School Journal, 87*(4), 66–79.

Burr, S. (1986). *Bilingual education: A sunset review.* Sacramento, CA: Legislative Analyst's Office.

Blum Martínez, R., & Flores Dueñas, L. (2010). Countercurrents: State and national education policy in New Mexico. In E. Sandoval, R. Blum Martínez, & I. Andrews (Eds.), *Espacios para la preparación docente: Desafíos y posibilidades/A place for Teacher Education: Challenges and possibilities.pp 59-78.* Mexico DF: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K., & Rodríguez, J. L. (2008, July 1). The preparation of highly qualified teachers for English language learners: Educational responsiveness for unmet needs. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 48*(3), 372–387.

Cahnmann, M., & Varghese, M. (2005). Critical advocacy and bilingual education in the United States. *Linguistics & Education, 16*(1), 59–73.

Camarota, S. (2007). Immigrants in the United States 2007. A Profile of America's Foreign-born Population. Retrieved April 10, 2010, from http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/back1007.pdf

Carrier, K. A., & Cohen, J. A. (2003). Personal and professional success in a bilingual teacher training project. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 1*(1).

Center for Applied Linguistics. (2006). *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in U.S. schools.* Retrieved August 9, 2009, from http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/. *Directory of two-way bilingual immersion programs in the U.S.*

Center for Immigration Studies. Retrieved August 12, 2009, from http://www.cis.org/

Clark, E., & Flores, B. (2001). Who am I? The social construction of ethnic identity and self-perceptions in Latino preservice teachers. *The Urban Review, 33*(2), 69–86.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1979). *Memorandum: Statewide assessment for bilingual certificate of competence.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2004). *Agenda item 5B: Information: Bilingual education certification: Policy considerations and questions for discussion.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Crawford, J. (1987, April 1). California program grapples with problems, scores successes. *Education Week.* Retrieved February 22, 2010, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1987/04/01/27calif.h06.html

Crawford, J. (2004). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice.* Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.

Cummins, J. (2001b). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society.* Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

de Jong, E. J., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalising linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(1), 81–99.

Escamilla, K. (2000). Teaching literacy in Spanish. In J. M. Tinajero & R. A. Devillar (Eds.), *The power of two languages 2000: Effective dual-language use across the curriculum.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Escamilla, K., Shannon, S., Carlos, S., & García, J. (2003). Breaking the code: Colorado's defeat of the anti-bilingual education initiative (Amendment 31). *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(3), 357–382.

Fillmore, L. W. & Snow, C. E. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7-54). Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Flores, B. B., Clark, E. R., Guerra, N. S., Sanchez, S. V. (2008). Acculturation among Latino bilingual education teacher candidates: Implications for teacher preparation institutions. *Journal of Latinos & Education, 7*(4), 288–304.

Gándara, P. (1997). *Review of research on the instruction of limited English proficient students: A report to the California Legislature.* Davis, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners: Academic literacy and thinking.* Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Guerrero, M. D. (1999). "Spanish academic language proficiency of bilingual education teachers: Is there equity?" *Equity & Excellence in Education, 32*(1), 56–63.

Guerrero, M. D., & Guerrero. M. C. (2008). El (sub)desarrollo del español académico entre los maestros bilingües: ¿Una cuestión de poder? *Journal of Latinos and Education, 8*(1), 55–66.

Harley, B., Allen, P., Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1990). *The development of second language proficiency.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hernández-Zudell, E. P. (2007). Language attitudes and perceptions of New Mexican students in a dual language immersion program (Doctoral dissertation). University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.

Hernández-Zudell, E. P, Takahashi-Breines, H., & Blum Martínez, R. (2003). "Spanish in my blood": Children's Spanish language development in dual language immersion programs. In A. Roca & C. Colombi (Eds.), *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States pp123-153.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research, 5*(3), 271–296.

Hornberger, N. H. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record, 92*(2), 213–229.

Hornberger, N. H. (2004). The continua of biliteracy and the bilingual educator: Educational linguistics in practice. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(2-3), 155–171.

Jones, E., Young, R., & Rodríguez, J., (1999). Identity and career choice among Mexican American and Euro-American preservice bilingual teachers. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 21*(4), 431–446.

Kerper Mora, J. (2008). *Metalinguistic transfer in biliteracy instruction: Theory, research & effective practice.* Retrieved February 22, 2010, from http://edweb.sdsu.edu/people/jmora/MoraModules/CABE2008WordStudy.ppt

Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. (1994). *The feminist classroom.* New York: Basic Books.

Marx, S. (2004). "Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education." *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*(1), 31–43.

Merino, B. (2007). Identifying critical competencies for teachers of English learners. *UCLMRI Newsletter, 16*(4), 1–8.

Montano, T., Ulanoff, S., Quintanar-Sarellana, R., & Aoki, L. (2005). The DEbilingualization of California's prospective bilingual teachers. *Social Justice, 32*(3), 103–121.

New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee. (2004). *Audit of bilingual multicultural education program. Hearing held January 19, 2004.* New Mexico Legislative Session, Santa Fe, NM.

New Mexico Public Education Department, Bilingual Bureau. Retrieved February 9, 2010, from www.ped.state.nm.us/BilingualMulticultural/.../fullPackageBilingualTAM.pdf

Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. (2008). *Biennial report to Congress on the implementation of the Title III State Formula Grant Program, school years 2004–06.* Washington, DC: Author.

Ovando, C., Combs, M. C. & Collier, V. (2006). *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms. Teaching in Multicultural Contexts.* NY, NY: McGraw-Hill

Parrish, T. B., Perez, M., Merickel, A. M, Linquanti, R., Socias, M.,…Delancey, D. (2006). *Effects of the implementation of proposition 227 on the education of English learners, K–12: Findings from a five-year evaluation.* Washington, DC: The American Institutes for Research.

Peyton, J., Ranard, D., & McGinnis, S. (2001). Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Pérez, B. (Ed.). (2004). *Sociocultural contexts of langauge and literacy* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pew Hispanic Center. *Statistical portrait of the foreign-born population in the United States, 2007: Table 1. Population, by nativity: 2000-2007* [Data file and code book]. Retrieved April 10, 2010, from http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/foreignborn2007/Table%201.pdf

Pew Hispanic Center. *Statistical portrait of the foreign-born population in the United States, 2007: Table 5. Country of birth: 2007* [Data file and code book]. Retrieved April 10, 2010, from http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/foreignborn2007/Table%205.pdf

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., & Pasta, D. J. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children* (Vols. I & II). San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Sharken Taboada, D., & Kerper Mora, J. (2009). *It's time to revisit approaches to Spanish literacy instruction.* Paper presented at the National CABE Two-way Bilingual Immersion Conference, Monterey, CA.

Skuttnab-Kangas, T. (1995). Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children. In *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education: A Reader Extending the Foundations.* (Colin Baker & Ofelia Garcia (Eds). Multlingual Matters: Clevedon.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). The globalisation of (educational) language rights. *International Review of Education, 47*(3/4), 201–219.

Tatum, B. (2003) *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race.* New York: Basic Books.

Taylor, L. (2008). Of mother tongues and other tongues: The stakes of linguistically inclusive pedagogy in minority contexts. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues viventes, 65*(1) 89–123.

Texas Education Agency: Bilingual Education Programs: Benefits for Your Child. Retrieved August 12, 2009, from ritter.tea.state.tx.us/curriculum/biling/lpacmanual/12BilEdProgBenefits.doc

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997) *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Valdés, G. (1989). Testing bilingual proficiency for specialized occupations: Issues and implications. In B. R. Gifford (Ed.), *Test policy and test performance: Education, language and culture*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391–429.

Valdés, G., & Hannum, T. (1989). *The four skills test*. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico Department of Education.

Varghese, M., & Stritikus, T. (2005) Nadie me dijo [Nobody told me]: Language policy negotiation and implications for Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(1)73–87.

Williams, T., Perry, M., Oregon, I., Brazil, N., Hakuta, K., Haertel, E.,…Levin, J. (2007). *Similar English learner students, different results: Why do some schools do better? A follow-up analysis based upon a large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving high proportions of low-income and EL students: Report of findings*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

Wong, P., Murai, H., Berta-Ávila , M., William-White, L., Baker, S., Arellano, A., & Echandía, A. (2007). The M/M Center: Meeting the demand for multicultural, multilingual teacher preparation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 34*(4), 9–25.

Yearbook of Immigration Statistics. (2008). Retrieved August 12, 2009, from http://www.dhs.gov/files/statistics/publications/YrBk08RA.shtm

REBECCA BLUM MARTÍNEZ is a Professor in the Department of Language, Literacy and Sociocultural Studies in the College of Education at the University of New Mexico. She also directs the Latin American Projects in Education Office for the College of Education. Dr. Blum Martínez's scholarship focuses on Spanish/English bilingualism, and language revitalization in Southwest indigenous communities. She recently edited a bilingual volume comparing multicultural teacher education in three countries: Mexico, the United States and Canada, entitled *Espacios para la preparación docente: Desafíos y posibilidades/ A Place for Teacher Education: Challenges and Possibilities*. Dr. Blum Martínez received her PhD in Education from the University of California, Berkeley with specializations in bilingualism and second language acquisition.

SUSAN BAKER is an Associate Professor in the Bilingual Multicultural Education Department in the College of Education at California State University, Sacramento. Her areas of interest include effective teaching practices for English learners, and, in the area of multicultural education, practices that bridge distances between teacher candidates and racially, socioeconomically, and culturally diverse populations of students. Dr. Baker is the co-author of "Education of the Community, by the Community, and for the Community: The Language Academy of

Sacramento," in *Interrupting Tradition: Prioritizing Urban Children, their Teachers and Schools through Professional Development Schools*; and the article "The M/M Center: Meeting the Demand for Multicultural, Multilingual Teacher Preparation." She earned her doctorate in Language, Literacy, and Culture at Stanford University, and is currently board president of the dual language charter school The Language Academy of Sacramento.