

8-1-2010

Navigating Tensions in the Process of Change: An English Educator's Dilemma Management in the Revision and Implementation of a Diversity-Infused Methods Course

Mileidis Gort

University of Miami, mgort@miami.edu

Wendy J. Glenn

Recommended Citation

Gort, Mileidis and Glenn, Wendy J., "Navigating Tensions in the Process of Change: An English Educator's Dilemma Management in the Revision and Implementation of a Diversity-Infused Methods Course" (2010). *Teaching and Learning Articles and Papers*. 1. http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/etl_articles/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Teaching and Learning at Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching and Learning Articles and Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact repository.library@miami.edu.

Navigating Tensions in the Process of Change: An English Educator's Dilemma Management in the Revision and Implementation of a Diversity-Infused Methods Course

Mileidis Gort

University of Miami

Wendy J. Glenn

University of Connecticut

In response to growing concerns among faculty regarding the lack of attention to the bilingual student population in our pre-service teacher education program, the authors engaged in a shared self-study of the process of revising and implementing a secondary English methods course with explicit attention to the special needs of bilingual/bicultural learners. The paper describes how the second author, an English educator, with support from the first author, a mentor/colleague in bilingual education, identified and negotiated tensions and dilemmas that arose in a process of curricular transformation toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education practice. The study highlights several points of disjuncture, or critical turning points, experienced by the English educator and the ways in which she navigated the contradictions that resulted at these points of disjuncture through conversation with her mentor. Our documentation and articulation of this process may assist content area teacher educators in negotiating new knowledge and creating strategies for managing the dilemmas in practice that arise in the design and implementation of revised course curricula aimed at supporting culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

As I contemplate how to begin work in my methods course this semester, I'm feeling a bit overwhelmed. There is so much we could address. I've done some initial brainstorming, but, in the amount of information I want to address, I am feeling like I am planning to teach a course in English Learner¹ instruction rather than English methods.

Wendy, the second author and an experienced English educator, expressed this concern a week before she implemented a newly revised secondary English methods course, which included explicit attention to language and cultural diversity and the special academic needs of bilingual/bicultural learners. Although Wendy was a confident instructor whose teaching evaluations were consistently superior, her

knowledge of bilingual learner education was still emerging. Early in the process of implementing the revised curriculum and throughout the semester, Wendy grappled with concerns related to her efforts to achieve a comfortable balance between addressing bilingual learner issues and covering the established English/language arts content, her own and her students' emotional discomfort with English learner (EL) content, and feelings of self-doubt and vulnerability that emerged in a process of self-critique.

In this article, we explore how Wendy negotiated the different tensions and dilemmas that arose in this process of curricular transformation toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education practice with support from Millie, the first author and a mentor/colleague in bilingual education. When we speak of tensions and dilemmas, we refer to points of disjuncture, or critical turning points, experienced by Wendy in the process of implementing the revised course. These moments resulted when, for example, Wendy witnessed discomfort among students in response to bilingual learner-oriented activities, experienced frustration in the process of curricular planning, and/or felt moments of inadequacy and ill-preparedness in the midst of teaching or during the reflection that followed. At these points of disjuncture, Wendy found herself questioning what she thought she knew and struggling to make sense of evidence that ran counter to her existing knowledge of and dispositions toward the education of bilingual learners. Wendy grappled with the contradictions that resulted at these points of disjuncture by engaging in conversation with Millie in the attempt to navigate the tensions through the incorporation of new understandings into her existing beliefs. These conversations occurred, at times, prior to implementation of some component of the revised course and, at other times, after Wendy made an instructional choice in the process of teaching and, following the class session in which the choice was made, attempted to make sense of what happened through reflection and dialogue.

Studying Dilemmas in Practice

The literature on teacher practice and decision-making suggests that teaching is complex and messy and involves identifying and facing conflicting choices in trying to solve pedagogical problems, which often leads to practical dilemmas (Cuban, 1992; Lampert, 1985; Windschitl, 2002). Dilemmas usually symbolize an argument that presents two or more equal alternatives of action and a tension between options of equally perceived values. According to Lampert (1985), a pedagogical dilemma is:

'an argument that presents an antagonist with two (or more) alternatives, but is equally conclusive against him whichever alternative he chooses.' This definition focuses on the deliberation about one's alternatives rather than on a choice between them. The conflicted teacher is her own antagonist; she cannot win by choosing. (p. 182)

From this perspective, Lampert (1985) portrays the teacher as a *dilemma manager*, an active negotiator who balances a variety of interests that need to be satisfied in the classroom and accepts conflict as a continuing condition with which persons can learn to cope. Thus, an important element of the teacher's work involves recognizing the dilemma, engaging in a series of deliberate arguments with oneself that serve to articulate alternative responses to the dilemma, considering the consequences of various alternatives, and constructing responses or courses of action in the face of often unsolvable problems. In this way, teachers embrace conflict, and continued efforts to manage it, as characteristic and valuable aspects of their work (Cuban, 1992; Lampert, 1985).

Katz and Rath (1992) offer an alternative construction of dilemmas as unsolvable predicaments. According to their definition, a dilemma

involves a situation that offers a choice between at least two courses of action, each of which is problematic, and . . . concerns a predicament in which the choice of one of the courses of action sacrifices the advantages that might accrue if the alternatives were chosen. [Thus] a dilemma is a situation in which a perfect solution is not available. Each of the available choices in such predicaments involves a choice of negative factors as well as positive ones. (p. 376)

Under this definition, dilemmas in practice cannot be mastered or resolved. Yet, it is precisely their enduring nature that provides us the opportunity to study how teachers address dilemmas in an attempt to better understand the complexities of teaching and learning.

Developing strategies for dealing with dilemmas calls for a particular kind of professional thinking as it involves weighing alternatives for action and deciding upon the one that best meets specific needs (Windschitl, 2002); this is quite different from the kind of thinking that might lead one to conclude that a correct choice can be made between dichotomous alternatives. Teachers' (and teacher educators') management of dilemmas in practice has been investigated as a way to better understand the deliberations, intentions, and decisions of the practitioner, as well as frustrations that might impede a teacher's course of action, thereby linking professional thinking and strategies for practice (Berry, 2007a; Lampert, 1985; Tillema & Kremer-Hayon, 2002, 2005). Relevant research suggests that although dilemmas are about external problems, they represent teachers' internal struggles as they find themselves pulled in different directions by competing philosophical and pedagogical demands within their work (see, for example, Enyedy, Goldberg, & Welsh, 2005; Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004; Tillema & Kremer-Hayon, 2002, 2005). Examination of how teachers create strategies for coping with dilemmas in practice, thus, constitutes a powerful means of revealing how teachers succeed in connecting their views on teaching to their actual teaching in the construction of a pedagogy of teaching. Our study focuses on the tensions that

emerged in the process of secondary English education curricular revision and implementation, as well as a teacher educator's attempts to mediate these tensions with support from a (bilingual education) colleague and mentor.

Impetus for the Study

Changing demographics are transforming the fabric of the American classroom. In 2005–2006, U.S. schools enrolled over five million ELs (NCELA, 2007), most of whom spend the majority of their school day in general education classrooms (Ruiz-de-Velasco, Fix, & Clewell, 2000). By the year 2030, it is projected that 40% of the K–12 population in the U.S. will be comprised of children whose first language is not English (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Conversely, more than 85% of all beginning teachers are white, monolingual native English speakers who have been prepared to teach native English speakers in English and have had very little, if any, training in working with culturally and linguistically diverse learners in general and bilingual learners in particular (Commins & Miramontes, 2005; Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002; Garcia & Guerra, 2005; Menken & Antunez, 2001; NCES, 2002; Vavrus, 2002; Zeichner, 2005).

Like most teachers, the majority of teacher educators are also white, middle-class, and monolingual English speakers who have had little academic experience or training in diversity (Nieto, 2000). Although teacher educators are beginning to rethink their approaches to preparing teachers to teach children with cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds different from their own (Kidd, Sanchez, & Thorp, 2008; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), few are prepared to systematically address issues related to language and language acquisition, cross-cultural issues in schooling, state and national regulations surrounding the education of bilingual learners, and the design and modification of culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum and instruction across the teacher education curriculum (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; Lucas & Villegas, 2007; Meskill, 2005; Milner & Smithey, 2003; Waxman, Tellez, & Walberg, 2006). One way to address this problem is to engage teacher education faculty in comprehensive professional development around the infusion of bilingual learner issues across the general teacher education curriculum (Costa, McPhail, Smith, & Brisk, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2007; Meskill, 2005).

The teacher preparation program at the institution in which the study took place is housed in a professional School of Education at a Research I university in the northeast region of the United States. Students are selectively admitted and fit the profile of the national teaching force at large, with the vast majority of students falling into the categories of white, monolingual English-speaking, and female. Of the 12 secondary English education undergraduate students enrolled in the course described in this paper, for example, one was male, and all were white, U.S.-born and raised, monolingual English speakers. These students enrolled in the English

methods course in the fall semester prior to their student teaching experience. At this point in the program, they had taken courses in educational psychology, assessment, and exceptionality but had enrolled in no courses emphasizing issues of diversity—language or otherwise. A field placement component accompanied the methods course; students spent one day each week in the classroom of the English/language arts teacher with whom they planned to student teach the following spring. Nine of the 12 students selected placements in urban settings.

Although the teacher education program at this institution professes to adequately prepare pre-service teachers to support culturally and linguistically diverse students in their future classrooms, anecdotal evidence suggests that not enough is being done to achieve this goal satisfactorily.² To address faculty concerns regarding this gap in the preparation of its teacher education candidates (and faculty), Millie established a faculty study group in the spring of 2006. Participation in the group was open to all teacher education faculty. Wendy, along with six other faculty members representing Science, Math, Social Studies, Bilingual Education, and Multicultural Education, volunteered to take part in the group. Our study group structure, goals, and activities were informed by previous and on-going faculty development and curricular enhancement initiatives at other institutions (e.g., CLAD Faculty Training Program at San Diego State University, Training all Teachers Project at the State University of New York at Albany, Project ALL Faculty Seminar Series at Boston College).³

At the outset of the faculty study group experience, Wendy, along with other group members, read and reflected upon various bilingual/bicultural education scholarly articles in preparation for each meeting.⁴ Wendy and group members worked with Millie and another faculty member in bilingual education to apply these concepts, principles, and new understandings to classroom practice with the goal of creating a revised bilingual learner-infused methods course which would be implemented the following semester.

Over the course of the spring semester, the group met once each month for approximately two hours to share concerns and emerging understandings of the process of language acquisition, the role of language in learning and assessment, cultural awareness and sensitivity, and classroom implications in the areas of planning, instruction, and assessment. In the interim between whole group meetings, Wendy (and other content area faculty) met individually with a bilingual education faculty mentor to receive additional, more personalized support and guidance in the revision of the methods course curriculum. Participants identified or were provided readings related to bilingual learner education in their respective content areas (e.g., bilingual learner policy statements generated on behalf of professional organizations, journal articles describing bilingual learner theories into practice), thus developing richer knowledge of and skills for how to incorporate the newly acquired bilingual learner information into their area of specialization.

As a direct result of this professional development experience, Wendy significantly altered her secondary English methods course. Revisions to her course centered on: (1) reorganization of the course around essential questions intended to raise and address pervasive myths regarding the education of emergent bilingual learners; (2) incorporation of texts (novel, poems, memoirs) that represent often unheard and/or silenced voices (i.e., bilingual/bicultural authors and characters); (3) implementation of activities designed to explicitly address fears and misconceptions about working with bilingual/bicultural learners; (4) embedding of bilingual learner issues in the cumulative unit plan assignment; and (5) discussion of bilingual learner issues in almost every class meeting as enrichment to the pre-existing curricula. Wendy implemented the changes that emerged from the collaborative faculty study group experience when she taught the methods course the following fall semester.

Our earlier work describes more explicitly the study group process, including more thorough discussion of specific readings and related activities, revisions made to the course, and teacher candidate responses to these revisions (see Glenn & Gort, 2008; Gort, Glenn, & Settlege, 2007, in press). Building on previous work that (re)conceptualizes tensions as a sign of learning about teaching and uses them as an analytic tool for studying practice (Berry, 2007b), we shift our focus in this paper to the tensions that emerged in the process of curricular and pedagogical transformation, as well as Wendy's attempts to mediate these tensions in collaboration with a Bilingual Education mentor, Millie. This work lends further support to existing research by exploring the following question: How might a content area teacher educator negotiate new knowledge and create strategies for managing the dilemmas in practice that arise in the design and implementation of revised course curricula aimed at supporting culturally and linguistically diverse learners?⁵

Method

As teacher educators committed to improving our practice through rigorous scholarship, critical reflection, and responsive action, we engaged in a shared self-study, following and examining Wendy's efforts to integrate her developing knowledge about bilingual learners into her secondary English methods course. Self-study research is a mode of scholarly inquiry in which teacher educators intentionally and systematically examine their beliefs and actions within the context of their practice.

The self-study paradigm, as delineated by Beck, Freese, and Kosnik (2004), demands a "personal-constructivist-collaborative" approach" (p. 1261). Our self-study contained each of these components. It was personal; we examined Wendy's process of thinking, planning, negotiating, and rethinking in the implementation of revised English education methods, materials, and curriculum within the context of her range of experiences and interactions. Our self-study was also constructivist in that, through our dialogue and negotiation of EL content

infusion, we created useful shared knowledge about the journey toward culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and teacher education. Reflecting our sociocultural-constructivist approach to teaching and learning, we assume that “culture, personal experience, implicit or personal theories, values and privilege, all intersect with teaching, learning, and learning to teach” (Goodwin, 2002, p. 141). Lastly, our self-study was collaborative in that we worked in partnership throughout the training, course modification, and revised course implementation phases (described below), examined our data together, and generated themes we identified as crucial to understanding Wendy’s process through collaborative dialogic practice. Working, inquiring, and reflecting in community provided a testing ground for Wendy’s active negotiations of tensions, as well as a forum in which to put form to what she was thinking and feeling throughout the process of implementation (Rodgers, 2002).

We framed our study within the broader research perspective of practitioner inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2004), or inquiry as stance (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Freire, 1995/1970; Mills, 2001; Wells, 2002). Our approach to inquiry was reflexive (Cole & Knowles, 2000) and rooted in critical perspective. That is, we acknowledge that teaching and teacher development “is imbued with the beliefs, values, perspectives, and experiences developed over the course of a teacher’s lifetime” (Cole & Knowles, 2000, p. 2). This process recognizes that making sense of both prior and current educational experiences within the context of present practice often involves tensions, contradictions, unintended consequences, difficulties, and risks (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Cochran-Smith et al, 1999).

The Participants

At the time of the study, Wendy was in her fifth year of teaching at the university. A white, monolingual English speaker, she taught middle and high school students in Arizona for six years prior to completing her Ph.D. and transitioning into post-secondary education. Her teacher preparation program paid little attention to issues of language diversity despite the high prevalence of native Spanish-speakers in the surrounding public school community. Prior to participation in the faculty study group, Wendy addressed issues of diversity more generally with her students. Essential questions designed to guide earlier versions of the English methods course focused on the integration and interaction of literature, language, writing, and speaking/thinking in the English curriculum; instructional strategies that optimize student learning, interest, and motivation; the design of activities, assignments, and assessments to meet students’ needs and content area objectives; and the development of a reflective stance. Although course objectives claimed to address ways to support the learning needs of all students, emergent bilingual learners were noted only in passing, primarily in discussions about differentiation. No explicit discussion of strategies necessary to support emergent bilinguals and their unique instructional needs was included. Wendy entered the study group

with the desire to (re)educate herself and determine effective methods for (re)educating the English education pre-service teachers in our program with respect to bilingual learners.

Millie had been teaching and directing the graduate program in bilingual/bicultural education at the university for five years. A Spanish-English bilingual and childhood immigrant from Cuba, she taught elementary bilingual learners and supported bilingual, mainstream, and special education teachers in the northeastern United States for several years before earning a doctorate in developmental studies with a focus on language, literacy, and culture and becoming a teacher educator.

Data Collection and Analysis

The study involved two levels of data collection and preparation. In the first, Wendy assumed a participant observer stance (Kawulich, 2005). During methods class sessions that occurred for two hours twice each week over fifteen weeks, she documented teacher and student behavior and comments witnessed and heard during bilingual/bicultural learner-related classroom events that ultimately shaped course content over the duration of the semester. During class meetings, Wendy used a notebook to record student responses to the lessons, striving to capture comments made during discussion, questions posed, physical responses, etc. as they happened. Immediately following class meetings, she drafted an observational journal entry that resulted in an elaborated-upon summary of the notes taken in the moment.

The second level of data collection and preparation occurred when Wendy, within a day or two of each class meeting, used the gathered notes to formulate more comprehensive narratives of what transpired. These extended beyond summary to include personal reactions, critiques, questions, wonderings, etc. Each week, these narratives were shared electronically with Millie. Serving as a critical friend (Schuck & Russel, 2005), Millie read the narratives and responded in writing or orally over the telephone. Oral conversations were documented by notes taken independently by both participants. Over the duration of these exchanges, Millie posed additional questions for Wendy to consider, probed into why certain decisions were made, and engaged in problem-solving conversation when Wendy wondered how to make sense of what happened or how to proceed. Wendy entered into discussion around documented data centered on a particular question with Millie to come to an explanation or understanding. To that end, the written and oral interactions between Wendy and Millie were interpreted as artifacts of intellectual development within a social context, and the texts served to mediate understandings rather than merely serve as transmissions of information (Wertsch & Toma, 1995).

Analyses of these data (narratives generated by Wendy from classroom observation notes and oral and written conversations between Wendy and Millie related to the narratives) occurred on two levels with two distinct goals in mind. While constant comparative analysis techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) were

implemented at both levels, the first set of analyses resulted in a regular and sustained data cycle involving implementation, assessment, revision, and revised implementation of classroom practices in the methods course with the larger goal of improving classroom instruction. At this micro-level of analysis, data were viewed recursively, with researchers living in the midst of new information that demanded incorporation into existing understandings. This cyclical process resulted in new questions, which led to new classroom practices, which led to new notes and new narratives, which led to further conversation and subsequent questions that shaped the course while it was happening.

The second level of analysis took a more telescopic view and occurred once the semester was over and implementation of the revised course was complete. The researchers employed constant comparative analysis techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) once again; however, the goal during this iteration was to examine the knowledge and behaviors invoked by the English educator in the process of identifying and navigating the tensions that arose in the implementation of the revised course curriculum. In the identification of such, narratives were read and re-read by the researchers and marked independently with notes centered on “moments of disjuncture,” those in which the researchers identified the English educator facing tensions unique to this implementation of the course. Researchers looked for examples of teacher or student behavior or response resulting from the infusion of EL-related content and creating contradiction or disequilibrium on behalf of the English educator, times when she expressed “discomfort” or “insight” or “deep questioning” related to issues of bilingual/bicultural learner instruction. Scholarly examination of these disorienting dilemmas through critical self-consciousness (i.e., genetic analysis from a Vygotskian perspective)⁶ provided insight into the role of such uncertainties, ambiguities, and contradictions in Wendy’s thinking and learning and made visible conceptual shifts in understanding and concrete shifts in practice.

Confirmation of these moments of disjuncture was achieved through regular email and telephone conversation between Wendy and Millie. After looking across the data for agreed-upon moments of disjuncture, Wendy and Millie collapsed and grouped the moments into categories that ultimately defined the findings along key tensions the English educator negotiated throughout the process of implementation. To increase the credibility and consistent identification and labeling of the resulting tensions, the researchers solicited support from another faculty study group member who acted as peer debriefer (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Guba & Lincoln, 1989), challenging the tensions, asking for clarification, and offering alternative interpretations of the data. Identified tensions, described more fully in the findings section below, reflect the dilemmas faced by Wendy and reveal the knowledge drawn upon and behavior enacted as she deliberated and determined how to navigate unfamiliar territory.

Findings

In this section, we describe the tensions and dilemmas identified and experienced by an English educator in the process of curricular transformation toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education, particularly the English educator's struggles to achieve a comfortable balance between addressing bilingual learner issues and English/language arts content, to mediate her own and her students' emotional discomfort with EL content, and to admit self-doubt and face the resulting feelings of vulnerability.

Struggling to Make Regular and Real Time for Bilingual/Bicultural Learners

In the attempt to re-conceptualize the methods course, Wendy faced a moment of disjuncture well before the course even began. As she sat at her desk and tried to identify ways to infuse her existing course with EL-related content, she found herself grappling with how to make room for what she was increasingly realizing was essential to her students as future teachers of bilingual learners—without losing sight of what they need to know as future English/language arts teachers. An early narrative excerpt reveals this tension:

As I contemplate how to begin work in my methods course this semester, I'm feeling a bit overwhelmed. There is so much we could address. I've done some initial brainstorming, but, in the amount of information I want to address, I am feeling like I am planning to teach a course in EL instruction rather than English methods. (September 1, 2005)

Wendy wondered, in particular, how she would find the time to include the EL-oriented information and strategies she wanted her students to acquire given the one-semester duration of the course, especially given the fact that this was the only methods course students would take. The addition of EL content, she was convinced, would surely require the elimination of existing English/language arts content. But how does one go about determining what's worth keeping and what might be sacrificed to ensure inclusion of this new EL content? Wendy deliberated whether to cut certain readings, activities, and assignments, weighing and balancing their relative merit and assessing the likelihood of students receiving instruction in these areas in other courses or experiences. If she eliminated a long-standing discussion leader activity, for example, it would certainly free up additional time for EL-related instruction and discussion, but would students have the opportunity to practice these skills elsewhere? Rather than taking time during class to have each student facilitate a brief discussion and receive feedback from peers and the instructor, perhaps, she debated, the students could engage in a discussion in the clinic setting, requesting feedback from the cooperating teacher and drafting a reflection piece that the instructor could read and comment upon outside of class. But, using that approach, all students would not have the opportunity to

witness and critique the many discussion styles of their peers. The discussion leader activity had to stay.

Wendy shared her frustrations with Millie during a one-on-one meeting in Millie's office. As part of the conversation, Millie reminded Wendy that teaching bilingual students requires explicit knowledge as opposed to intuitively-based decisions about how to enact practice and that this knowledge is imperative for preservice teachers to acquire; if they do not possess this and act instead on what feels right, they will likely do more harm than good. This comment inspired in Wendy a recognition that integration rather than substitution was a potential course of action in response to this dilemma. The explicit knowledge that Millie spoke of, Wendy realized, might run counter to what students believe, have been taught, and have witnessed in their classroom placements. To identify potential moments of mismatch, Wendy located places in the existing syllabus where EL-oriented content might be used as a supplement to the existing content to uncover some of these false and faulty assumptions and understandings. Discussions around the assessment of writing, for example, might utilize multiple texts, including one written by an EL, as a means to encourage students to consider how commonly used assessment practices might actually be both discriminatory and detrimental to ELs. This, she realized, might allow for more natural integration of EL content into the course and help lessen the need to eliminate important English/language arts content.

Wendy recognized such significant potential in this examination of intuition as a misguided force that she decided to use this premise as the organizing framework behind the course revision. As a result, she designed the additional EL-related content around commonly held misconceptions about bilingual learners and their education in the generation of essential questions she wanted her students to explore. Drawing from handouts and readings distributed by Millie during the study group meetings, as well as her own understandings of the perceived needs of her students, Wendy identified three content strands to guide the infusion process: defining bilingual learners, understanding the programs designed to serve them, and possessing knowledge of a repertoire of effective practices for classroom instruction of bilingual learners.

While the first and second strands and resulting sets of questions became the focus of a few class sessions, the third provided the richest opportunity for infusion throughout the duration of the course. For example, discussion of teaching strategies allowed for a more recursive, regular discussion of bilingual learners through the selection of course readings, all shared by Millie during study group and individual meetings.⁷ In addition to using readings to supplement existing content with EL content along each element of the traditional English/language arts (reading, writing, speaking, and thinking), Wendy used bilingual learner content as the means through which to expose students to innovative teaching practices, thus modeling effective instruction while supporting students in their need to

garner key knowledge necessary for their work with bilingual learners. To further support students in their awareness that some commonly accepted and utilized teaching strategies hinder rather than support the bilingual learner, Wendy also focused explicitly on instructional strategies and their impact on bilingual learners, asking students to consider how they might modify a particular teaching practice to best support emergent bilinguals in their classroom.

The process of natural, expected, and regular infusion was not always easy to achieve, and the tension resurfaced and resulted in other moments of disjuncture for Wendy. At times, she feared an overemphasis on the bilingual learner component and missed subsequent opportunities for rich discussion and learning. As an illustration, on one of the class reading/writing workshop days, Wendy modeled a pre-reading strategy by asking students to engage in a Four Corners discussion in which students respond to statements by walking to different corners of the room, labeled Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree, physically taking a stand. She began by sharing an anticipation guide she had created for use with Nathaniel Hawthorne's novel *The Scarlet Letter*. After discussing briefly the purpose of such a guide and how it might be created, students worked in groups to read and create an anticipation guide for Pat Mora's "Elena" (in Santa Ana, 2004), a poem told from the perspective of a Spanish-speaking mother who feels as though she is losing her children in her inability to speak English. Students worked in small groups to generate two statements that were thematic and emotive and required judgment/evaluation on behalf of the reader. They wrote:

It is necessary to conform to society's standards.
Self-motivation is more powerful than outside sources.
Language can be limiting/isolating.
Embarrassment is motivating.
Ignorance is bliss.
Children are naive.
Every person in the U.S. should know English.
A mother's love transcends all obstacles.
Men are insecure about women who are smarter than they are.

Wendy worked with students to select three of these statements (italicized, above) for use in the conversation that followed. She asked students to suggest which statements they felt most compelled to address through an activity designed to encourage further whole class discussion. Although Wendy entered the lesson with the goal of infusing EL-oriented content into the discussion (having selected "Elena" with intention), she altered her planned course of action when student suggestions gravitated toward the non-language-focused statements. She debated whether or not to push students to consider statements other than those they selected, wondering if she should ask them whether they noticed the conspicuous

absence of EL-oriented content in their selections and why they might have selected the topics they did. Fearing that students were tired of discussing EL content, she took the path of least resistance and decided not to pose these questions or ask students to explicitly address their choices. The lesson proceeded as planned, minus the EL-related content. Wendy read the first statement aloud, students moved to different corners of the room, and an open dialogue followed.

While reflecting upon this activity later that day, Wendy questioned her decision to shy away from those statements that were related to language and allow students to focus on those that presumably felt more comfortable. A narrative excerpt dated September 21, 2006 reads:

In hindsight, I wonder if I should have advocated for statements that focused more on issues of language. I chose as I did because I wanted the poem to stand on its own as a piece of literature worth reading and thinking about for the large ideas about the human condition it conveys (rather than simply a tool for discussing bilingual learners written by a Latina author). Hmmm . . .

This rationalization felt false even as Wendy wrote it. She knew the decision to avoid the language-oriented topics was grounded in much more than wanting students to see the poem as a work of literature but was not able or ready to articulate what really happened in that moment.

In the writing of the reflection, Wendy wondered, too, about whether or not her mentor would agree with or understand her decision to hone in on the topics students selected; she, herself, questioned her practice and feared making her perceived blunder known. She sent the narrative describing the classroom event to Millie anyway. In the phone conversation that followed, Millie raised the question, “Why do you suppose you chose the statements you did,” to which Wendy, at the moment, had no answer. The posing of the question, however, gave rise to deep reflection and contemplation and resulted in a more acute understanding of the underlying reasons behind Wendy’s instructional choice.

Wendy realized that, in the classroom, at that moment, she acted upon the perceived fears of her students’ (and her own) discomfort. At this point in the course, much EL-related content had been introduced (definitions of various EL populations, EL student profile activity as discussed below, etc.). Wendy worried that the course was shifting too far toward EL content at the expense of the English/language arts content that she assumed students expected (and was herself trained to teach). If, at that moment, she chose the topics that dealt with language, students might feel that too much attention was being paid to EL-related concerns, not really the focus of the course. Or worse, students might sigh and roll their eyes and say, “Not this EL stuff again.” If she chose the other topics, she could avoid the potential for their disappointment.

Facing Emotional Discomfort with Bilingual/Bicultural Learner Content

Wendy held concerns around student resistance to addressing EL-related content when facing the first implementation of the revised course. She worried that students, as future English teachers, might not recognize or accept the responsibility to support ELs as their own and instead assume that bilingual educators or aides might respond to that charge instead. She was prepared to take up intellectual arms in the fight to convince pre-service teachers that they needed to learn how to support ELs even if they entered their teacher-training program wanting only to profess what they knew about various literary masters and mistresses. Wendy had not anticipated, however, the lack of awareness of ELs as students by her pre-service teachers altogether. And, she did not expect the depth of emotional discomfort that students experienced when they faced the limits of their own experiences. Students held a vision of their future classrooms as devoid of ELs, a population with which they themselves, by virtue of their own schooling, had rarely, if ever, considered as part of the school community. When an alternate picture of the classroom setting arose, one that included ELs, students expressed anxiety and hesitation.

During a class session early in the semester, students began to consider two essential questions that guided the EL-related components of the revised course: Who are English Learners (ELs)? and What experiences do they bring to the classroom? To begin deconstructing these questions, students were asked to compose a written profile of a bilingual learner with whom they anticipated working in their current placement setting or future classroom, with attention paid to name, gender, age, race, culture, socioeconomic background, family/community make-up, previous schooling experiences, family literacy practices, levels of linguistic proficiency in first language and English, and immigration-migration experiences (if applicable). Students came to class having read two chapters, "Our Changing Classrooms" and "Language Acquisition and Literature Based Instruction" (both in Hadaway, Vardell, & Young, 2001), which address some of the descriptors on the list above.

Prior to writing, students were asked to consider these descriptors in light of their own experiences with bilingual learners to determine whether these were adequate and/or worth keeping on the list. Tension in the room mounted, as evidenced by uncharacteristic silence and eyes averted or redirected to avoid Wendy's gaze. Students added reluctantly a few additional descriptors (personality and internal and external expectations placed on students). Wendy, sensing and sharing in the awkwardness of the moment, honored the students' reluctance and instead encouraged students to begin writing and thinking about the student profile to get some initial ideas on paper while she roamed to get a sense of their initial perceptions (and contemplate how to proceed). One student called Wendy over to explicitly express her concerns, telling her in confidence that she was afraid her profile was sounding stereotypical. She was soon followed by another who, during a quiet conversation with Wendy, said, "I don't feel comfortable doing this. I don't know this kid that I am trying to imagine."

On this first day of implementing a new component of the course, Wendy experienced a moment of disjuncture. The fight she was prepared to fight fizzled out before it even got underway, and she was faced with an unexpected instructional dilemma: “Should I proceed with the planned lesson consisting of drafting and sharing and pretend all is well, or should I face the obvious discomfort and see where it takes us?” Wendy recognized the courage it took for those two students to share their frustrations. She remembered her own fears of admitting that she did not know what she should do when it came to supporting ELs, much less preparing future teachers how to support them as learners and people. If she opted to continue with the lesson, pushing students forward when they were not ready to proceed, she would not only ignore their concerns and silence their voices; she would also potentially create feelings of animosity and reluctance in future discussions of EL content. Addressing these fears, however, meant entering into territory both unknown and unpredictable. What if students shared perceptions Wendy did not want to hear or did not know how to address? What if her own deficiencies became apparent? What if students were unwilling to engage in the conversation at all?

Looking out over her classroom of students diligently trying to draft this profile, Wendy opted to face student fears with the support of additional scaffolds and opportunities for discussion. While students continued their writing, she ran up to her office to grab two poems, “Learning Silence” (Maria Mazziotti Gillan) and “I Recognize You” (Rosario Morales), that she had found in a literature collection (Santa Ana, 2004) that Millie had shared with her during a one-on-one meeting as part of the study group experience. The first poem describes a first-grade female student who wishes she could enter the pages of her Dick and Jane reader and, in her inability to do so, chooses silence instead. The second presents comments of a Latina speaker directed at another Latina who succeeded in American schools but, in the process, denies herself access to her own language and culture.

Upon returning to the classroom, Wendy put the words, “Difficult/Uncomfortable,” on the board and broached the issue with students. Wendy admitted her own discomfort in this process of supporting bilingual learners, noting, in particular, her fears of sounding uninformed when interacting with colleagues in the faculty study group the semester prior. As a class, students and Wendy then generated some reasons they might feel as they do. Wendy recorded the resulting comments on the classroom white board:

“We have experienced a different reality and don’t understand the EL experience; we can’t relate.”

“We feel privileged and thus guilty.”

“We fear saying or doing something inappropriate.”

“We don’t know kids who are ELs; we have never seen models of good teachers who work with ELs.” (September 5, 2006)

Seeing the emergence of potentially incorrect perceptions regarding the kinds of students who might be considered bilingual learners, Wendy added the sentence, “This process is fraught with assumptions,” and asked students to consider the statement in light of the items they generated. They quickly realized and readily admitted that they envisioned bilingual learners as poor and living in run-down urban communities. One student pointed out that, in her experience, bilingual learners were seen as less intelligent and capable and cited the example of her mother who was encouraged, as a high school immigrant from Poland, to pursue data entry as a career due to the rote nature of the job and perceived non-necessity of strong English language skills. Here, students and Wendy talked about the diverse experiences of bilingual learners, from migrant workers to children in families seeking political asylum to native-born students living in communities in which a language other than English is spoken to children of academics or business leaders who accompany their parents to the United States for a temporary experience, information Wendy learned during one of the faculty study group meetings.

To help students avoid feeling incapable of meeting this challenge given the complexities of the issues, Wendy asked them to consider the question, “Given the difficulty of the task we face, why bother?” while she read aloud the two poems referenced earlier. After reading the poems, Wendy opened the discussion. Comments from students follow:

“We don’t want these poems to come from our students. The one shut down and became silenced by fear. The other refused to embrace her language and thus herself.”

“Both poems describe students who have lost who they are as a result of their school experiences.”

“The one girl wants to become one-dimensional in her quest to be more like Dick and Jane, and the other person has succeeded in becoming one-dimensional. Students don’t need to be one or the other.”

“Even the author of the second poem [the one who calls into question the choices made by the woman she describes] knows she is selling out; she uses words like ‘we’re’ to admit her own participation in the process of losing one’s cultural identity by giving up one’s native language.” (September 5, 2006)

After class, Wendy tried to make sense of this experience by reflecting in her journal. The resulting narrative includes this excerpt:

WOW! Given the fact that this was the first conversation surrounding ELs as a unique population, I think students are beginning to think in ways that give me hope. They willingly admit their own deficiencies and lack of knowledge and express their desire to learn what they need to learn. While it’s difficult to know if students truly hold these beliefs or are saying what they think I want to hear, I sense that the sentiments are genuine. I think my admission of my own fears and uncertainties helped to tear down

the façade of false confidence and/or indifference. (September 5, 2006)

Student comments reflect the ability of these pre-service teachers to engage intellectually with this content. However, Wendy wondered if she and her students had not taken time to address the emotions that surged to the forefront at the outset of the discussion if such honest deliberation and thoughtful commentary would have resulted.

Allowing for Critique of the Self in the Revision of What We Think We Know

As a middle and high school English teacher and university professor, Wendy found herself feeling embarrassed over her lack of knowledge revealed during the process of revised course implementation; these moments of disjuncture were particularly felt as they called into question her identity as a professional. “I was a classroom teacher for years; I have made a career out of preparing new teachers. How is it possible that I don’t know all that I don’t know?” she wondered. “How can I admit that I don’t know and still save face in front of my students and colleagues?”

At a faculty study group meeting held prior to the start of the methods course, Millie shared an article that recounted the story of Lupe, a Mexican immigrant living and attending school in the United States (presented in Escamilla & Coady, 2001). Lupe experienced continuous formal schooling in her home country and had resided in the United States for several months. Although Lupe was making progress in learning the new language, her English skills were still at the emergent stage. One day, Lupe was asked to respond to an English writing prompt in her mainstream (English-only) classroom. Her English teacher, upon reading the resulting draft and without collecting additional data on Lupe’s native language and literacy skills, noted Lupe’s “poor vocabulary and grammar” and difficulty achieving “logical sequencing” in her writing. She suggested that Lupe might have a cognitive processing problem and be in need of special education services.

As a direct result of knowledge gained through this infusion process and ongoing professional development, Wendy was appalled and disappointed by this teacher’s lack of knowledge and was frightened by her ability to irrevocably alter the life of this young girl as a result of her naiveté and given her power role in the school setting. Upon first reading this teacher’s comments during the study group meeting, however, Wendy found herself sympathetic to the teacher. If Millie had said that the teacher’s desired course of action was best for this student, Wendy likely would not have questioned her. As embarrassing as it was to admit (so much so that she was nervous to include it here), Wendy realized that she lacked essential knowledge that, in a classroom setting, might have resulted in the miseducation of a young person—and she was supposed to know better.

Given the emotional power of this scenario, Wendy decided to share Lupe’s story with her own students as a part of the methods class. After reading aloud

Lupe's written response to the assignment and the accompanying teacher's response, Wendy asked students to share their impressions. The resulting comments fell into three categories:

1. The teacher has jumped the gun in her assumption that Lupe might be in need of special education services. The teacher should garner additional information before making any determination of Lupe's needs and the teaching strategies that might best support her as a student of English (the content) as well as her English language development. Students suggested that the teacher ask Lupe to respond to the prompt in her native language, engage in a conversation surrounding the prompt with a strong Spanish speaker, and/or learn more about Lupe's performance in her home school in Mexico.
2. The teacher's comments reflect an uninformed view. Her responses regarding Lupe's vocabulary, use of grammatical convention, etc. could be applied to any struggling writer (EL or otherwise).
3. As teachers of ELs, we need to find a balance between holding students accountable for learning English and supporting them in their native language (L1). But, before even considering instructional strategies, we have to know where students are (and not make uninformed assumptions about where we think they are). This means allowing ELs to utilize their L1.

Imagine the surprise Wendy experienced when she realized that her students, as indicated by the knowledge-rich responses they provided, possessed more complex and perceptive understandings than she held upon first hearing Lupe's story. Wendy's optimism with respect to her students' success is revealed in a narrative excerpt entry dated October 1, 2006:

I am pleased at the discourse that is occurring surrounding issues of English language learning. Students are sensitive and willing to discuss issues about which they have limited understanding. It's quite clear that they are further along in their development than I had anticipated. I imagined having to be more persuasive as to why it is imperative to discuss issues of English language learning in the course and expected greater resistance on behalf of students.

Internally, however, the lingering doubt resulting from self-critique remained. Wendy wondered, "What else don't I know I don't know? What other inaccurate perceptions of ELs remain ingrained in my world view? What strategies do I continue to promote that inadvertently hurt those I determined I would support as a result of my commitment to this professional growth experience?" (Narrative excerpt dated Oct. 1, 2006). It is essential to note that the tension that resulted from

this moment of disjuncture, this recognition of inadequacy, was not resolved (and remains unresolved to date). This tension continues to inspire reflection, revision, conversation, and a renewed commitment to this work.

Discussion

The major focus of this shared self-study was to articulate, document, and analyze the challenges and complexities associated with an English educator's experiences as she, with the support of a (bilingual education) colleague and mentor, revised and implemented secondary English methods curricula with explicit attention to the needs of bilingual learners. The findings chronicle how, in the process of mediating the tensions that arose in this process of curriculum revision and implementation, Wendy was challenged to critically analyze her practices and perspectives related to preparing pre-service teachers to support bilingual learners in their future classrooms, a process yet in progress. The documentation and articulation of this process may assist teacher educators to reflect on current practice, employ a systematic and shared approach to problem solving, encourage cross-disciplinary discourse among teacher educators, and promote investigations of new perspectives and instructional strategies in the process of infusing diversity issues across the teacher education curriculum. As Wendy continues on this journey, striving to employ a critical inquiry stance, she recognizes the existence of remaining tensions—and the likelihood of others emerging with time and experience.

Managing Choices in EL-Infusion Content

Early in the course revision process, Wendy was committed to helping her students gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to support bilingual learners in their future classrooms but struggled to infuse the course with culturally and linguistically responsive content and pedagogy without losing sight of the English/language arts subject matter she felt her students needed to know. Although the results of Wendy's infusion process raised students' awareness of EL issues and provided them with classroom strategies, it would have been impossible for her to include attention to all topics related to teaching ELs within a single course. These choices meant that some bilingual learner content (e.g., explicit attention to second language acquisition process) was not addressed in detail, while other content was privileged.

The dilemma Wendy faced resulted from having to determine what elements to include in the course revisions. The decisions to rethink her literature selections and to integrate bilingual learner-focused assignments seemed to work well and felt comfortable from the start. But choosing them as focal course revisions, i.e., privileging them, did not make room for other less familiar and/or comfortable, yet important, EL content (Matthewman, Blight, & Davies, 2004). As a learner of bilingual education scholarship and culturally and linguistically responsive

pedagogy herself, Wendy was not yet versed in the more cognitive components of EL instruction (e.g., language acquisition processes, role of language in learning, development of academic vs. social language). The inclusion of this (still-developing) content, presumably, would entail much risk for Wendy, as this lack of knowledge might expose limitations and be perceived as a shortcoming by her students. As Wendy struggled to make curricular choices in the infusion process, she gravitated toward the EL content that seemed, in her mind, to best support the existing English education content as well as her own current development as a learner of bilingual student issues. In this way, Wendy's struggle to mediate the tension between exposing her vulnerability as a teacher educator and maintaining pre-service teachers' confidence in her as a competent leader (Berry, 2007a) mirrored the difficulties faced by experienced and novice teacher educators alike as they explore new ways of working with prospective teachers and enact new approaches to practice (Carson, 1997; Clandinin, 1995; Peterman, 1997; White, 2002).

Managing Curricular Structure While Being Responsive to Students' Needs

This portrait of Wendy's teaching and thinking contributes knowledge about the complexity of teacher education practice. In the process of curricular revision and implementation, Wendy strove to find a balance between setting a guiding framework for EL infusion while maintaining flexibility so that student interest could guide the course. Several related dilemmas emerged, particularly as issues of student discomfort around EL content surfaced in the context of course discussions and activities. For example, when Wendy realized that her students' limited experiences with bilingual learners prevented them from participating in a planned course activity ("Profile of Bilingual Learner"), she veered off course to provide additional scaffolds and opportunities for discussion. Wendy's courses of action in the management of these dilemmas reflect the responsive practice stance illustrated by Heaton and Lampert (1993), Nicol (1997), and Pope (1999) in their work with prospective teachers. At other times, however, following the students' lead was not conducive to fostering the EL goals for the course (e.g., going with students' choices of the non-language related statements in the Four Corners activity). Wendy's choice to take "the path of least resistance" as a way to avoid a potentially uncomfortable situation (i.e., student discomfort with EL content) led to the realization that one of the goals she set out to achieve had been inadvertently undermined by her own choice of actions to achieve it, and highlights the ways in which practice can be sabotaged by one's unconscious beliefs and/or perceived fears (Grimmett, 1997; Macgillivray, 1997; Senese, 2002; Tidwell, 2002). Wendy's realization that some assumptions and practices actually worked against her long-term interests (Brookfield, 1995) was prompted by reflection and dialogue with her mentor. For Wendy, this process of recognizing how some of her actions jeopardized the very goals she was working toward created opportunities for the acquisition of new

self-knowledge (Macgillivray, 1997). In this respect, our study illuminates the role of dilemma management in professional consciousness-raising with respect to the adaptation and adoption of new approaches to teaching.

Managing Uncertainty in Uncharted Waters

The tensions that emerged over the course of this study might very well have arisen on their own without the existence of the collaborative discussions that took place; in the classroom setting, for instance, pre-service teachers might have posed questions that identified gaps in Wendy's knowledge. Our work suggests, however, that positive changes for both teacher educators and pre-service teachers may result when sustained action originates from scaffolded discourse and purposeful reflection. It was the access to knowledge through the supportive partnership that allowed Wendy to move beyond safe discourse and begin to challenge her practices, perspectives, and assumptions (Hargreaves, 1994), acknowledge the emerging tensions in practice, and tap into the knowledge necessary to best understand and work through them (Cochran-Smith et al., 1999). While engaging in the profile development process, for example, Wendy, with Millie's guidance, was able to sympathize more fully with her students' fears and engage in the learning process with them in a process of shared inquiry and admit to students that she, too, lacked expertise in bilingual student education issues, that she remained a learner, one who faced discomfort among her peers when participating in similar study group conversations. Freire (1995/1970) argued that praxis is critical for transformation and can only occur as we reflect on theories and understandings when engaged in active dialogue and action. Without the support inherent in the collaborative process, it might be, quite simply, too easy to continue teaching what we think we know in ways we think we know are best.

The interactive and public nature of the collaborative process, while a certain strength, also proved to be its greatest challenge. Extensive and repeated conversations around making issues of cultural and linguistic diversity central to the daily work of teacher educators took Wendy outside of the safe space of her own area of expertise. Although this work provided opportunities for learning and increased awareness, and prompted new insights into the perspectives of others, it also increased tension around self-exposure and self-knowledge (Cochran-Smith et al., 1999; Lampert, 1985; White, 2002). Wendy's recognition that, although difficult and at times unnerving, being openly vulnerable and authentic with her mentor and her students with regard to her lack of knowledge was essential for creating safe learning conditions. This open vulnerability in the enactment of curricular reform and new approaches to practice is a risky business for teacher educators and requires the establishment of a trusting relationship with colleagues and students (Hoban, 1997; Loughran, 1996; Winter, 2006). At the same time, it sustained Wendy's commitment to forge ahead in this endeavor. In Wendy's admission of embarrassment regarding her lack of knowledge in the case of Lupe and the as-

assessment of her writing, for example, she opened herself to public scrutiny and criticism, dropping the protective cloak afforded by her title and position at the university. This very personal and complex process required a certain amount of readiness and commitment on behalf of Wendy to confront her own deficiencies (Cochran-Smith et al., 1999). It demanded not only additional effort but, more importantly, a willingness to take risks that resulted in misalignment between prior knowledge/experiences and new understandings/revised beliefs. In this sense, this experience has supported an emerging transformation in Wendy's evolving beliefs and practices toward praxis (Freire, 1995/1979, 1998/1969).

Our work intimates the importance of a teacher's ability to recognize and manage dilemmas in practice in the process of curricular revision. One question raised by this study is how to encourage other teacher education faculty engaged in similar diversity-focused curricular reform efforts to *recognize* (i.e., reflect upon and reframe their understanding) and then *act*, based on their new perspectives, in response to moments of disjuncture in their practice. Future research can attempt to distinguish between perspective transformation (i.e., challenging and reframing understandings) and transformation on teaching practice (i.e., action based on revised habits of mind) (Mezirow, 1991, 2000). Similarly, if coping with uncertainty and managing dilemmas is inherent to teaching, then we as teacher education professionals should carefully consider how to reflect this critical aspect of our practice in pre-service teacher education experiences.

The Shift toward Diversity as Norm

Through shared dialogue with a mentor, Wendy confronted her own issues around diversity and has begun to assume a broader stance in her conception of infusion; that is, her starting point in the revision process has shifted. Whereas earlier in the process Wendy was concerned about preparing her students *should* they have a bilingual learner in their future classrooms, now she recognizes that addressing and understanding issues of cultural and linguistic diversity are integral to learning to teach (Milner & Smithey, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). At the same time, Wendy learned from her experiences in this process that the work of curriculum development and revision toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education and pedagogy does not have a final destination but is, instead, ongoing and recursive.

Limitations

Although the authors engaged in systematic documentation and analysis of Wendy's experiences, perceptions, actions, and reflections regarding the process of implementing the revised curriculum, at no time was Wendy observed by Millie, her mentor, in the act of teaching the revised course. Thus, the evidence presented here is limited to Wendy's perception of what happened in this process. Future research might consider including a teaching observation and debriefing component (and

documentation of such) in order to provide an alternative perspective of the tensions that emerge at the classroom instruction level.

Conclusion

In this article, we highlight several points of disjuncture, or critical turning points, experienced by Wendy, an English educator, in a process of curricular transformation toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education practice. We describe the ways in which she grappled with contradictions that resulted at these points of disjuncture through conversation with a bilingual education mentor in the attempt to navigate the tensions through the incorporation of new understandings into her existing beliefs. In the process of deliberating how to achieve a comfortable balance between addressing bilingual learner issues and English/language arts content, how to mediate her own and her students' emotional discomfort with EL content, and how to admit self-doubt and face the resulting feelings of vulnerability, Wendy developed an understanding of bilingual learner issues, more generally, and an increasingly complex and critical understanding of how to infuse diversity topics in the secondary English methods classroom, more specifically. The work is far from over, however. Lingering questions remain unresolved, and new questions, tensions, and confusions have and will continue to emerge. These include consideration of how to broaden Wendy's knowledge of EL support strategies to include linguistic concerns, infuse this knowledge into the next iteration of the methods course, and maintain forward momentum and commitment in an emotionally and logistically demanding process.

NOTES

1. "English Learner" (EL) is the official federal designation for students who are learning English as a second language in the United States. To maintain consistency with published work, federal/state policies, etc., we use this term throughout the manuscript when citing other work that uses it. In our view, however, the term English Learner represents a deficit view of bilinguals as it specifically focuses on one language only (English) and not on students' linguistic strengths (i.e., knowledge of another language). Because we see these students' potential for developing bilingual and biliterate competencies, we adopt the term *emergent bilingual(s)* to more accurately describe their realities as individuals who speak a native language other than English and are in the process of acquiring English as an additional language (Garcia, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008).
2. While issues of diversity are addressed by two required program components (one urban placement, one diversity course) in this integrated BS/MA five-year program, we contend that this vision of diversity is limited, and the resulting "preparation" of pre-service teachers is not adequate to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse PreK–12 students in general and emergent bilinguals in particular.
3. Detailed project descriptions and outcomes are reported in Ross (1994), Meskill (2005), and Costa, McPhail, Smith, and Brisk (2005), respectively.

4. These readings included, for example: *Teaching Bilingual Students in Mainstream Classrooms* (Brisk, Dawson, Hartgering, MacDonald, & Zehr, 2002); *Addressing Linguistic Diversity from the Outset* (Commins & Miramontes, 2006); *Our Changing Classrooms, and Language Acquisition and Literature-Based Instruction*, both in Hadaway, Vardell, and Young (2001); *What Teachers Need to Know about Language* (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2003); *Bilingual students in the secondary classroom: A reference for practicum students at Boston College Lynch School of Education* (Morahan, 2003); *Concepts of language proficiency* (Ramírez, 1995); and *Strategies and resources for mainstream teachers of English language learners* (Reed & Railsback, 2003).

5. While anecdotal evidence suggests that the bilingual education mentor gained a better understanding of how to best support TE faculty in the process of professional development toward culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy through the collaborative process, this study does not attempt to describe her management of dilemmas in this process.

6. See Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

7. When discussing reading strategies (a topic typically addressed in an English methods class), Wendy and her students read and discussed the article, "What Reading Teachers Should Know about ESL Learners" (Drucker, 2003). Conversations around the teaching of grammar included the ideas of Sjolie (2006) as contained in his article, "Phrase and Clause Grammar Tactics for the ESL/ELL Writing Classroom," and addressed how what we think we know about grammar might not be true for emergent bilinguals. And the writing workshop model was introduced using Samway's (1992) "Writer's Workshop and Children Acquiring English as a Non-Native Language" and Ortiz's (2002) "The Mainstream English as a Second Language Learner's Rites of Passage: Using Process Writing Strategies."

REFERENCES

- BECK, C., FREESE, A., & KOSNICK, C. (2004). The preservice practicum: Learning through self-study in a professional setting. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1259–1293). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- BERRY, A. (2007a). *Tensions in teaching about teaching: Understanding practice as a teacher educator*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- BERRY, A. (2007b). Reconceptualizing teacher educator knowledge as tensions: Exploring the tension between valuing and reconstructing experience. *Studying Teacher Education*, 3, 117–134.
- BRISK, M. E., DAWSON, M., HARTGERING, M., MACDONALD, E., & ZEHR, L. (2002). Teaching bilingual students in mainstream classrooms. In Z. F. Beykont (Ed.), *The power of culture: Teaching across language difference* (pp. 89–120). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- BROOKFIELD, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- CARSON, T. R. (1997). Reflection and its resistances. In T. R. Carson & D. Sumara (Eds.), *Action research as a living practice* (pp. 77–91). New York: Peter Lang.
- CLANDININ, D. J. (1995). Still learning to teach. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers* (pp. 25–31). London: Falmer Press.
- COCHRAN-SMITH, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 5–28.

- COCHRAN-SMITH, M., ALBERT L., DIMATTIA P., FREEDMAN S., JACKSON R., MOONEY J., ET AL. (1999). Seeking social justice: A teacher education faculty's self-study. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 2, 229–253.
- COCHRAN-SMITH, M., & LYTLE, S. (2004). Practitioner inquiry, knowledge and university culture. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 601–650). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- COLE, A. L., & KNOWLES, J. G. (2000). *Researching teaching: Exploring teacher development through reflexive inquiry*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- COMMINS, N. L., & MIRAMONTES, O. B. (2005). *Linguistic diversity and teaching: Reflective teaching and the social conditions of schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- COMMINS, N. L., & MIRAMONTES, O. B. (2006). Addressing linguistic diversity from the outset. *Journal of Teacher Education* 57, 240–246.
- COSTA, J., MCPHAIL, G., SMITH, J., & BRISK, M. E. (2005). Faculty first: The challenge of infusing the teacher education curriculum with scholarship on English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56, 104–118.
- CUBAN, L. (1992). Managing dilemmas while building professional communities. *Educational Researcher*, 21, 4–11.
- DARLING-HAMMOND, L., CHUNG, R., & FRELLOW, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 286–302.
- DENZIN, N., & LINCOLN, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DE OLIVEIRA, L., & ATHANASES, S. Z. (2007). Graduates' reports of advocating for English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 202–215.
- DRUCKER, M. J. (2003). What reading teachers should know about ESL learners. *The Reading Teacher*, 57, 22–29.
- ENYEDY, N., GOLDBERG, J., & WELSH, K. M. (2005). Complex dilemmas of identity and practice. *Science Education*, 90, 68–93.
- ESCAMILLA, K., & COADY, M. (2001). Assessing the writing of Spanish-speaking students: Issues and suggestions. In S. R. Hurley & J. V. Tinajero (Eds.), *Literacy assessment of second language learners* (pp. 43–63). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- FREIRE, P. (1995/1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press. (Original work published 1970).
- FREIRE, P. (1998/1969). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum Press. (Original work published 1969).
- GARCIA, S. B., & GUERRA, P. L. (2005). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. *Education and Urban Society*, 36, 150–168.
- GARCIA, O., KLEIFGEN, J. A., & FALCHI, L. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. Equity matters: Research review no. 1*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- GLENN, W. J., & GORT, M. (2008). Discomfort, deficiency, dedication: Pre-service teachers voice their ELL-related concerns. *The English Leadership Quarterly*, 64(4), 9–13.
- GOODWIN, A. L. (2002). The case of one child: Making the shift from personal knowledge to professionally informed practice. *Teaching Education*, 13, 137–154.
- GORT, M., GLENN, W. J., & SETTLAGE, J. (2007, April). Teacher educators and their efforts to self-improve in the area of linguistic and cultural diversity: Al andar se hace camino. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- GORT, M., GLENN, W. J., & SETTLAGE, J. (*in press*). Toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education: The impact of a faculty learning community on two teacher educators. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Preparing teachers for linguistically diverse classrooms*:

- A resource for teacher educators*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- GRIMMETT, P. (1997). Transforming a didactic professor into a learner-focused teacher educator. In T. R. Carson & D. Sumara (Eds.), *Action research as a living practice* (pp. 121–136). New York: Peter Lang.
- GUBA, E. G., & LINCOLN, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- HADAWAY, N. L., VARDELL, S. M., & YOUNG, T. A. (2001). *Literature-based instruction with English language learners*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- HARGREAVES, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- HEATON, R., & LAMPERT, M. (1993). Learning to hear voices: Inventing a new pedagogy of teacher education. In D. K. Cohen, M. W. McLaughlin & J. Talbert (Eds.), *Teaching for understanding* (pp. 43–83). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- HOBAN, G. (1997). Learning about learning in the context of a science methods course. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about learning: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 133–149). London: Falmer Press.
- KATZ, L. G., & RATHS, J. (1992). Six dilemmas in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 376–385.
- KAWULICH, B. B. (2005, May). Participant observation as a data collection method. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, [On-line Journal], 6(2), Art. 43. Retrieved January 31, 2008, from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-05/05-2-43-e.htm>.
- KIDD, J. K., SANCHEZ, S. Y., & THORP, E. K. (2008). Defining moments: Developing culturally-responsive dispositions and teaching practices in early childhood preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 316–329.
- LAMPERT, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55, 178–194.
- LOUGHRAN, J. J. (1996). *Developing reflective practitioners: Learning about teaching and learning through modeling*. London: Falmer Press.
- LUCAS, T., & VILLEGAS, A. M. (2007, April). Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, Chicago, IL.
- LUCAS, T., VILLEGAS, A. M., & FREDSON-GONZALEZ, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59, 361–373.
- MACGILLIVRAY, L. (1997). Do what I say, not what I do: An instructor rethinks her own teaching and research. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 24, 469–488.
- MATTHEWMAN, S., BLIGHT, A., & DAVIES, C. (2004). What does multimodality mean for English? Creative tensions in teaching new texts and new literacies. *Education, Communication, & Information*, 4(1), 153–176.
- MENKEN, K., & ANTUNEZ, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient students*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education.
- MESKILL, C. (2005). Infusing English language learner issues throughout professional educator curricula: The training all teachers project. *Teachers College Record*, 107, 739–756.
- MEZIROW, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MEZIROW, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3–34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MILLS, J. (2001). Self construction through conversation and narrative in interviews. *Educational Review*, 53, 285–301.

- MILNER, H. R., & SMITHEY, M. (2003). How teacher educators created a course curriculum to challenge and enhance preservice teachers' thinking and experience with diversity. *Teaching Education, 14*, 293–305.
- MORAHAN, M. (2003). Bilingual students in the secondary classroom: A reference for practicum students at Boston College Lynch School of Education. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Lynch School of Education - Title III Project ALL, Office of Professional Practicum Experiences. Retrieved June 14, 2008, from <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/title-iii/meta-elements/pdf/fall03sec.pdf>
- NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS. (NCES). (2002). *Schools and staffing survey, 1999-2000: Overview of the data for public, private, public charter and Bureau of Indian Affairs elementary and secondary schools* (NCES 2002-313, Table 1.19, pp. 43–44). Washington, D.C.: NCES. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002313>
- NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (NCELA). (2007). *The growing numbers of limited English proficient students 1995-96 to 2005-06*. Washington, D.C.: NCELA. Retrieved January 15, 2008, from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/statedata/2005LEP/GrowingLEP_0506.pdf
- NICOL, C. (1997). Learning to teach prospective teachers to teach mathematics: The struggles of a beginning teacher educator. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion, and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 95–116). London: Falmer Press.
- NIETO, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 180–187.
- ORTIZ, V. (2002, March-April). The mainstream English as a second language learner's rites of passage: Using process writing strategies. *NABE News, 16*–25.
- PETERMAN, F. (1997). The lived curriculum of constructivist teacher education. In V. Richardson, (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building a world of new understanding* (pp. 154–163). London: Falmer Press.
- POPE, C. A. (1999). Reflection and refraction: A reflexive look at an evolving model for methods instruction. *English Education, 31*(3), 177–201.
- RAMÍREZ, A. G. (1995). Concepts of language proficiency. In A. G. Ramirez, *Creating contexts for second language acquisition: Theory and methods* (pp. 36–57). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- REED, B., & RAILSBACK, J. (2003). *Strategies and resources for mainstream teachers of English language learners*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- RODGERS, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record, 104*, 842–866.
- ROSS, P. (1994). Preparing teacher educators and prospective teachers to meet the challenge of diversity. In C. Kinzer, D. Leu, J. Peter, L. Ayre, & D. Frommer (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory, and practice. Forty-third yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- RUIZ-DE-VELASCO, J., FIX, M. E., & CLEWELL, B. C. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. Retrieved January 15, 2008, from <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/overlooked.pdf>
- SAMWAY, K. D. (1992). *When English language learners write: Connecting research to practice, K-8*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- SANTA ANA, O. (ED.). (2004). *Tongue-tied: The lives of multilingual children in public education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- SCHUCK, S., & RUSSEL, T. (2005). Self-study, critical friendship, and the complexities of teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education, 1*, 107–121.
- SENESE, J. C. (2002). Opposites attract: What

- I learnt about being a classroom teacher by being a teacher educator. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 43–55). London: Falmer Press.
- STOLIE, D. (2006). Phrase and clause grammar tactics for the ESL/ELL writing classroom. *English Journal*, 95(5), 35–40.
- SMAGORINSKY, P., COOK, L. S., MOORE, C., JACKSON, A. Y., & FRY, P. G. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55, 8–24.
- STRAUSS, A., & CORBIN, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- TIDWELL, D. (2002). A balancing act: Self-study in valuing the individual student. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 30–42). London: Falmer Press.
- TILLEMA, H. H., & KREMER-HAYON, L. (2002). “Practising what we preach”—teacher educators’ dilemmas in promoting self-regulated learning: A cross-case comparison. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 593–607.
- TILLEMA, H. H., & KREMER-HAYON, L. (2005). Facing dilemmas: Teacher educators’ ways of constructing a pedagogy of teacher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10, 203–217.
- UNITED STATES CENSUS BUREAU. (2000). American fact finder. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en
- VAVRUS, M. (2002). *Transforming the multicultural education of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- VILLEGAS, A. M., & LUCAS, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 20–32.
- WAXMAN, H. C., TÉLLEZ, K., & WALBERG, H. J. (2006). Future directions for improving teacher quality for English language learners. In K. Téllez & H. C. Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners* (pp. 189–195). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- WELLS, G. (2002). Inquiry as an orientation for learning, teaching and teacher education. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for life in the 21st century* (pp. 197–210). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- WERTSCH, J. V., & TOMA, C. (1995). Discourse and learning in the classroom: A sociocultural approach. In L. P. Steffe & J. Gale (Eds.), *Constructivism in education* (pp. 159–174). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- WHITE, B. C. (2002). Constructing constructivist teaching: Reflection as research. *Reflective Practice*, 3, 307–326.
- WINDSCHITL, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 131–175.
- WINTER, R. (2006). What do you do in a library method: Learn to say “shhhh!?” In L. M. Fitzgerald, M. L. Heston, and D. L. Tidwell (Eds.), *Collaboration and community: Pushing boundaries through self-study*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (pp. 272–275). Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa.
- WONG FILLMORE, L., & SNOW, C. (2003). What teachers need to know about language. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved June 14, 2008, from <http://faculty.tamu-commerce.edu/jthompson/Resources/FillmoreSnow2000.pdf>
- ZEICHNER, K. M. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 737–759). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.