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This study examined the ways in which a pair of Spanish/English dual language bilingual education preschool teachers—one teacher who was designated as the model of Spanish and the other teacher the model of English—enacted their bilingualism as they worked cohesively and simultaneously to work toward common instructional goals. Dual language bilingual education is an instructional model wherein bilingualism is promoted among all students regardless of their level of bilingual proficiency, and in which students are instructed a significant amount of the day in a language other than English (García, 2013). Methodologically, I drew on classroom video data, field notes, and other relevant artifacts collected weekly during shared reading activity in the focal classroom over the course of one academic year to document the interactions in which teachers engaged with each other and students. An initial pass of the data allowed me to explore and map out the ways that the teachers coordinated their practices by identifying the instructional targets and instructional strategies that characterized those practices. A subsequent pass of the data aided in characterizing the ways that the teachers drew on
their bilingualism within instances of coordinated practice to support their instructional goals.

Guided by a translanguaging framework (García, 2009a, 2009b), findings indicate that teachers not only made expected choices about their language practices (i.e., they maintained their designated language), but that other times they also made choices that departed from the expectations of the school’s language policy (e.g., at least one of the teachers used bilingual speech). As such, teachers drew on their own and each other’s bilingualism, manifested through both monolingual and bilingual individual speech and collaborative talk, and a mutual understanding of each language. Teachers’ use of dynamic bilingualism (e.g., drawing on their own and students’ full linguistic repertoires) supported the coordination of their instructional targets and instructional practices. These instances of coordinated practice show teachers taking on multiple discursive roles—ones that support meaning making between the two of them and ones that support meaning making for students. Engaging in, and therefore modeling, dynamic bilingualism provided students with an authentic bilingual experience and may support their meaning making in ways that languaging monolingually could not afford.
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CHAPTER ONE: CO-TEACHING IN A DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION CONTEXT

Introduction

Co-teaching (i.e., an instructional approach that involves two or more educators that work collaboratively to deliver instruction to a diverse group of students in the same space) represents an instructional delivery model by which to meet the unique learning needs of classrooms of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students (Friend & Cook, 2010), including emergent bilinguals. When two bilingual teachers work alongside each other in the same classroom within a dual language (DL) context (i.e., programs in which the goals include bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism, and emergent bilinguals\(^1\) of varying language proficiencies learn alongside each other [Baker, 2006]), they must coordinate different kinds of expertise if students—and emergent bilinguals in particular—are to learn rigorous academic content that reflects curriculum reforms and higher standards (Morocco & Solomon, 1999) as well as students’ ever-changing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Because DL programs integrate students with varying levels of bilingual proficiency, teachers must coordinate their practices in meaningful and authentic ways that allow students to not only understand new content and language, but also to engage in genuine practice of newly acquired language and negotiation of meaning.

\(^1\) I use the term *emergent bilingual* to refer to an individual who has varying levels of proficiency in one or more languages and who has the potential to learn another language due to exposure to and support from environments that provide opportunities to hear and practice each language (E. García, 1983; O. García, 2009a; Reyes, 2006).
A number of variations of co-teaching approaches, primarily derived from the special education inclusion literature, has been identified, including one-teach/one-assist (i.e., one teacher assumes the primary teaching responsibilities and the other teacher plays a support role to individuals as needed), station teaching (i.e., teachers provide individual support at various stations that are created), parallel teaching (i.e., teachers teach the same or similar content to different groups), alternative teaching (i.e., one teacher assumes the responsibility of a small group for specialized instruction), and team teaching (i.e., both teachers equally share instructional responsibilities and are equally involved in leading activities; Friend & Cook, 2010; Walther-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin, & Williams, 2000). Although DL programs traditionally have not been the focus of co-teaching research, many of its characteristics are applicable and have been observed in DL contexts. For example, some DL programs institute a co-teaching instructional approach and rely on one (or more) of the approaches listed above. In order to ensure some level of effective instruction (Friend & Cook, 2010), some degree of coordination is expected. However, despite a basic categorization of co-teaching variations not specific to the education of emergent bilinguals, there is still little known of what these co-teaching arrangements look like in action in DL contexts, but more specifically, how DL co-teachers draw on all of their own and their students’ linguistic resources when attempting to coordinate their instructional practices, make input comprehensible for students, and engage students in meaningful opportunities to practice their developing understanding of language and content.
Background of the Problem

Coordinated Practice

Drawing on the work of Roth, Tobin, Carambo, & Dalland (2002), I define coordinated practice as the act of two teachers working cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways. These practices may manifest themselves as a result of shared space and shared meaning-making resources. Because “[communication] requires the coordinated action of all the participants” (Clark & Brennan, 1991, p. 223), effective communication is an essential component of these practices. Such coordination must be grounded—“that we and our addressees mutually believe that they have understood what we meant well enough for current purposes” (Clark & Brennan, 1991, p. 223)—as it is crucial for keeping that coordination on track. Dynamic bilingualism—a model of bilingualism that reflects the non-linear, complex bilingual competence needed to operate effectively in the 21st century to maneuver the different contexts in which it develops and functions (Garcia, 2009b)—and instructional strategies may be two components of effectively grounding communication in an effort to coordinate practices.

It is important to understand how communication has been characterized in order to think about the ways that two teachers engage with students and each other. At its broadest point, communication has been described as either directive or transactional. Directive communication is a face-to-face transmission of information from the speaker to the listener, who indicates his receipt and comprehension of the message (Friend &
Cook, 2003). This type of communication concludes when the listener indicates (or when the speaker deduces) that the information has been received and understood. Providing instructions or explanations and giving lectures are common examples of engaging in directive communication.

Transactional communication, in contrast to directive communication, represents a bidirectional interaction during which both participants send and receive information by alternating the role of speaker and listener (Friend & Cook, 2003). The receiver must attempt to adopt the sender’s view and assist the sender in knowing whether the intended message was accurately communicated by informing the sender of what was comprehended along with his reactions to it. In order to clarify the message, the sender may modify, restate, or reinforce the original message. Shared meanings are created as a result of participants’ mutual influence in this complex and reciprocal process. In Clark & Brennan’s (1991) terms, joint projects (the enactment of work toward a collective purpose) lead to effective communication as a result of acknowledgements (ways of showing attention, including continuers and assessments, generally not intended to take a turn at talk), relevant next turns (answering/responding with the expected information), or continued attention (getting and keeping a partner’s attention).

This traditional view of effective communication involving either only two interlocutors or only one teacher and a group of students may not accurately characterize the ways that two co-teachers work collectively toward a common purpose (e.g., supporting students’ learning of a new word) with each other and students, however. Specifically, it is unlikely that the discourse structure of the focal classroom always shows a simple back-and-forth [linear] communication (e.g., that the interaction takes
place between only the two teachers). When two teachers work with students in the same physical space at the same time (referred to as *copresence* by Clark & Brennan, 1991), it may be that, for example, (1) Teacher A initiates, Teacher B takes a turn, and a student responds to one or both teachers; (2) Teacher A initiates, a student responds, and Teacher B responds; (3) Teacher A initiates, a student responds, Teacher B continues, and the student responds once more; (4) a student initiates, Teacher A engages, Teacher B adds; or, (5) a student initiates communication, Teacher A responds, the same student or another continues, and Teacher B participates.

Because teachers are cohesively and simultaneously working to build students’ knowledge of a concept in instances of coordinated practice, they must each ask themselves not only if they have understood the other’s message, but also if they believe the students will have understood the message and be able to respond to it. Thus, the potential discourse patterns above may be tied to the particular instructional goal(s) teachers are working toward as part of engaging children with texts, particularly since these goals should provide a compass for their instructional choices and, in the case of co-teachers, coordinated practice. Through the use of multiple [and complementary] instructional strategies, teachers can work toward constructing an initial message that is comprehensible and, subsequently, achieving effective two-way communication between themselves and students in support of students’ meaning making. For example, during a discussion oriented toward a particular instructional goal (e.g., the narrative features of a fictional text), one teacher may initiate the conversation through the use of an instructional strategy (e.g., by providing information or asking a question), and the other teacher may draw on the same or other instructional strategies (e.g., adding information,
answering the other teacher’s question, rephrasing the question, providing a definition, or providing a strategic translation of what the first teacher said/asked) in hopes of supporting students’ meaning making and subsequent participation in the discussion.

Beyond these possible patterns of discourse and the instructional goals and strategies associated with them lie the intricate ways each teacher uses language, specifically the way that she draws on her bilingualism to engage in and maintain effective communication. The next two sections focus on the normal and strategic ways that bilinguals use their full array of linguistic skills when communicating.

Translanguaging as Theory: Normative Language Practices of Bilinguals

Like monolinguals, bilinguals use numerous strategies for making meaning (e.g., style switching, voicing) in addition to drawing on their bilingual repertoire (i.e., knowledge of lexical, syntactic, morphological, and semantic similarities and differences between two or more languages; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2005). They do this by combining aspects of both languages to create a clear and coherent message. Examples of distinct manifestations of typical bilingual strategies for languaging include a Spanish-English emergent bilingual saying or writing, “Ese vestido es muy fancy,” showing her awareness of the nuanced meaning of the word in English that does not have an exact translation in Spanish; or demonstrating her receptive understanding of one language while expressing herself in another. Furthermore, a bilingual might listen to a story in one language and retell it in another (García, 2009a); communicate with friends and/or family using a combination of syntactic, semantic, and morphological features of two languages
(García & Kleifgen, 2010); or draw on his understanding of sound-symbol correspondence in Spanish to help spell irregularly-patterned words in English.

The integration of aspects of each language shows how bilinguals partake in dynamic bilingualism—the development of different language practices to varying degrees in order to interact with increasingly multilingual communities (García & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 42)—or translanguaging (“the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages in order to increase communicative potential” [García, 2009b, p. 140]), in order to construct meaning. Moreover, bilinguals translanguage to include and facilitate communication with others, but also to construct deeper understandings and make sense of their bilingual worlds (García, 2009a). This can be seen in one of Pattanayak’s (2003) students, “an Oriya boy, married to a Tamil, speaking English at home, [living] in Calcutta in Bengali surroundings, where the children are brought up by a Hindustani ayah and a Nepali Gurkha security man” (p. 129) and Mohanty’s (2006) descriptions of the multilingual nature in India, including blurring of language boundaries and fluidity in language identity. Bilingual language practices are different from that of two separate monolinguals, reflecting greater choices, a wider range of expression than monolinguals can separately draw on, and conveying linguistic knowledge and the cultural knowledge that influences language use (García, 2009a). Translanguaging thus becomes what García (2009b) has coined “the most important communicative tool in an increasingly multilingual world” (p. 147) and is a responsible practice offering conversational and educational opportunities to all.
Within a translanguaging perspective, languages are not seen as independent systems that people have, but as practices that people use (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Translanguaging thus highlights the readily observable practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of and be understood in their multilingual worlds. The practice of translanguaging includes, but goes beyond, codeswitching (i.e., the use of features of two languages within an utterance or conversation; Genesee, 2009). It is an extension of hybrid language use, a “systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process” (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Alvarez, 2001, p. 128) that is a normative bilingual language behavior. For example, studies of bilinguals’ out of school language practices (e.g., Heller, 1999; Zentella, 1997) show how they communicate by using all of the linguistic resources at their disposal, documenting various uses and forms of bilingual talk such as codeswitching and parallel conversations (i.e., a type of collaborative bilingual practice during which a pair of speakers coordinates the use of two languages so that each maintains the use of monolingual speech in a bilingual conversation; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Lee, Hill-Bonnet, & Gillispie, 2008; also referred to as parallel monolingualism [Heller, 1999] and dual monolingualism [Fitts, 2006]). When choosing to engage in parallel monolingualism, one interlocutor exhibits expressive proficiency in one language (e.g., Spanish) while demonstrating receptive proficiency in another language (e.g., English).

In classrooms, students have been observed to translanguage while engaging in various academic tasks. Through the strategic use of multiple languages, students can (1) acquire new information such as content, skills, strategies, and processes; (2) appropriate complex ideas and processes; and (3) enhance the complex cognitive, linguistic, and
literacy abilities that students need (Cummins, 2007; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001; Wei, 2009). For example, they may read a passage in one language and write a summary in another language, conduct a discussion in one language and read in another language, or write a draft of an essay first in one language and later translate it into another (García & Kleifgen, 2010). This is important to understand in academic settings because translanguaging shows the sophisticated ways in which bilinguals draw on all of their linguistic knowledge, enacting their agency as speakers engaged in complex linguistic practices that express their new realities (García, 2009a). In the next section, I discuss the role of translanguaging as an intentional pedagogic practice and specific instructional approaches in support of emergent bilinguals’ language development from a dynamic bilingual perspective.

**Translanguaging as Pedagogy**

Translanguaging is an important practice for both teaching and learning. Because all learners are engaged in a dynamic learning process, providing an appropriate level of assisted performance (i.e., scaffolding) supports the development of skills, including language. Since educating through translanguaging builds on the complex and multiple language practices of both students and teachers, teachers who understand translanguaging as a sense-making mechanism have the tools to provide an exigent and meaningful education for their students (García & Kleifgen, 2010). This may manifest itself, for example, in teachers’ modeling of private speech through think alouds, and supporting the development of meaning via the articulation of actions, connecting new
concepts to past learning, asking students what they think and how they problem-solve (Bodrova & Leong, 2007). In a bilingual academic context, teachers may draw on both their own and students’ knowledge and skills across all of their languages. To be effective with and support the natural interaction patterns of bilingual learners, teachers must, therefore, be responsive to the needs of their students, constantly adjusting their interactions, including multiple language use, appropriately.

In the case of co-teachers, instructional practices must be coordinated in ways that create appropriate support for working within the zone of proximal development (ZPD; the “distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” [Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86]) of the varying levels of bilingual proficiency of their students. Translanguaging provides a meaningful lens for describing and explaining the languaging practices of DL preschool co-teachers. Translanguaging allows teachers to create interactional spaces that cultivate children’s bilingual development (Lee et al., 2008), to expand language boundaries (Martin-Beltrán, 2010), to create multiple opportunities for language learning (Martin-Beltrán, 2010), to represent authentic situations that reflect the multilingual communities outside of the classroom (Levine, 2003), to transmit information (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), and to perform identities using the linguistic signs at a learner’s disposal (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), thus modeling for children ways to access all of their linguistic resources. Teachers can support children’s emerging bilingual competencies by engaging with them in scaffolded interactions that incorporate children’s experiences and prior knowledge. Because “translanguaging is indeed a
powerful mechanism to construct understandings, to include others, and to mediate understandings across language groups,” (García, 2009a, pp. 307-308), it allows teachers to take advantage of meaningful and relevant situations to work with students at their individual level of developing bilingual proficiency.

Teachers of emergent bilinguals enact translanguaging as pedagogy in a variety of ways, including presenting the main points of a lesson in one language while allowing students to interact in other languages, providing a written summary to students in one language before the teacher commences instructing in another, annotating written materials in one language or with translations, lecturing in one language while students take notes in another language; encouraging/allowing students to read in one language and write in another; or referring to material in one language and composing in the other (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Moreover, teachers may ask students to identify cognates and/or draw on their existing knowledge of the languages they currently use in an effort to learn yet another language, including transliteration by writing words in one a language and using the alphabet of another language (Al-Azami, Kenner, Ruby, & Gregory, 2010). As such, translanguaging utilizes the complex languaging practices of emergent bilinguals in authentic situations, not the imposed separation of languages that is typical in schools (García & Kleifgen, 2010).

**Statement of the Problem**

It is relatively impossible to reside in a bilingual community and communicate among bilinguals without translanguaging (García, 2009b). However, DL schools
typically adopt a language separation policy that restricts teachers’ language practices to sustained periods of monolingual instruction (e.g., separation of languages by subject, time of day, or teacher; Christian, 1996), even in the case of classes that are co-taught. This idea—based on a monolingual perspective of bilinguals—was initially introduced as a way to preserve a space/time of day dedicated solely to the development of the non-English language, which was often documented to be retained less and developed less after contact with English, sometimes leading to a loss of the home language (Wong Fillmore, 1991). It was thought that “By strictly separating the languages, the teacher avoids, it is argued, cross contamination, thus making it easier for the child to acquire a new linguistic system as he/she internalizes a given lesson” (Jacobson & Faltis, 1990, p. 4). As a result, students were to learn in environments that encouraged them to act as monolinguals, drawing on only one of their languages at a time. This understanding of bilinguals—that a bilingual is merely two monolinguals in one (Grosjean, 1989) and that providing students with monolingual instruction in two monolingual academic spaces will lead to balanced bilinguals—is an inappropriate conceptualization of approaching bilinguals’ language practices. In lieu of such a strict separation of languages in the classroom, it has been argued that translanguaging, if properly understood and appropriately applied, actually enhances the complex cognitive, linguistic, and literacy abilities that students need (Cummins, 2007; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001; Lewis, 2008; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996; Wei, 2009). Thus, that most DL classrooms function as monolingual environments while knowing that bilinguals engage in dynamic language practices (García, 2009a, 2009b; García & Kleifgen, 2010) stands in contrast to bilinguals’ natural language.
However, the language policy at the focal research site designates one co-teacher as the model of Spanish and the other [teacher] as the model of English, thereby differing from traditional DL classrooms documented in the literature (Baker, 2006; Christian, 1996; Crawford, 1999, dePalma, 2010; Pérez, 2004). Because both teachers typically participate [to some extent] in all activities while maintaining their designated language and each teacher is responsible for providing students with genuine experiences in her designated language, each classroom becomes a bilingual space where students regularly hear and use both languages.

Regardless of the language policy adopted by a DL program, if the academic “space does not include the children’s languaging, and if the teacher does not maximize communication using the children’s language practices, failure in communication is sure to occur” (García, 2009, p. 152). Thus, teachers must allow for flexible language use even within strict language policies. In the focal research site, given the one-teacher/one-language policy and the personnel organization, which calls for two teachers to always be present in the classroom, this may be accomplished in a number of ways.

While studies have typically focused on the ways that single teachers negotiate the language needs of their students, it is still unclear how co-teachers function as a unit to coordinate their practices in order to subsequently—as a team—co-construct meaning with students. That is, the co-teaching model adds another component—that of a second teacher. Furthermore, how DL co-teachers strategically align their practices, which includes the ways that they enact various languaging practices, has yet to be systematically examined.
Statement of Purpose

The intent of this study was to explore the ways that one DL preschool teacher pair engaged in coordinated practices during Spanish and English shared book readings. Moreover, it was my goal to better understand the complex ways in which the focal teacher pair enacted their bilingualism in order to achieve some level of instructional coordination. I chose shared book reading activities as my focal instructional context to investigate co-teachers’ enactment of bilingualism while engaging in coordinated practices, since these activities were primarily teacher-led (i.e., the teacher assumed the responsibility for constructing meaning through asking questions, soliciting responses, and evaluating those responses, thereby directing discussions; Almasi, 1995). Moreover, these activities occurred on daily basis, were language-rich, and academic in nature.

During book-related discussions, teachers asked various types of questions, encouraged students to share their related experiences, and connected text information with book illustrations (Klesius & Griffith, 1996). Teachers helped to expand and extend students’ language and literacy abilities by coordinating their practices in meaningful ways during these activities, such as responding to students’ linguistic needs (Price, Bradley, & Smith, 2012). This allows teachers to engage in responsive and supportive instructional practices (Price et al., 2012) by drawing on students’ emergent and dynamic bilingualism.
With these goals in mind, I investigated the following question:

How do co-teachers enact their bilingualism when they engage in coordinated practice during large group shared book readings in a DL preschool classroom?

**Significance of the Study**

The increasing number of bi-/multilingual households in the United States suggests a need for understanding instructional approaches that address the specialized learning needs of emergent bilinguals so that they are afforded an education that promotes linguistically and academically successful learners. Educators at all levels, including classroom teachers, school administrators, district administration, and other stakeholders, must have access to and familiarity with the most recent data concerning effective instructional practices for working with emergent bilinguals in academic settings. This study aims to do just that by building on the existing DL literature and providing insight into one teacher pair’s approach to supporting the bilingual and biliteracy development of emergent bilinguals. As such, educators involved in DL education will gain a deeper understanding of the ways DL [preschool] co-teachers may coordinate their instructional practices when working with students with varying levels of bilingual proficiency in ways that sustain and promote their bilingual, biliterate, and academic development.

Despite a growing corpus of studies showing the utility of teachers interacting with emergent bilingual students during shared book reading as a means of promoting
language and literacy development in English, there is little research illustrating how DL teacher pairs (i.e., co-teachers) coordinate their practices during shared book readings in classrooms where two languages are systematically and meaningfully utilized and promoted. This study aims to fill this gap in the literature in order to enhance the way that researchers understand the interactions that transpire in this unique bilingual setting. In so doing, I seek to highlight how DL preschool co-teachers draw on their bilingualism in an effort to coordinate their instructional practices for their students, thereby contributing to the translanguaging and classroom discourse literature—both theoretically and practically—by shedding light on the ways that DL co-teachers engage in coordinated practice by using all of their linguistic tools as resources for teaching and learning.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The goal of this study was to identify and describe how dual language (DL) co-teachers strategically aligned their practices, including the way that they enacted various languaging practices. This comprehensive critical literature review seeks to identify work that has been conducted in the areas of co-teachers’ coordinated practices, including the ways that DL teachers draw on their bilingualism in interactions with students and each other to achieve some level of coordination, present a systematic synthesis of relevant studies, and provide directions for future research. To that end, I adopted Boote & Beile’s (2005) literature review framework in order to begin with a discussion of selection criteria for each major research question, present a synthesis of the findings, and conclude with a synthesis of the current state of the field, including areas in need of further empirical research.

Method for Review

In order to determine studies that I found to be appropriate to review, I first defined a set of inclusion criteria. Articles that did not meet these criteria were excluded from review. In order to ensure an article’s academic rigor, each was required to be both a report of empirical research and peer reviewed. Pertinent articles focused on (1) teachers’ co-teaching practices and/or (2) teachers’ uses of two languages in their instruction of emergent bilinguals in interactions with each other or with students that support language learning and/or mediating academic content (Sayer, 2012). Due to the
breadth of coverage of this review, each focal area contains its own additional set of inclusion criteria.

Searches were conducted on Google Scholar, electronic databases, journal websites, and in the reference sections of relevant studies. For articles relating to research on the nature of teachers’ coordination of co-teaching practices, I conducted systematic searches in Google Scholar, ERIC (EBSCO), PsycARTICLES, and PsycINFO databases by entering the following combination of search terms: co-teaching, collaborative teaching, coordinated teaching, team teaching, bilingual, coordinate, collaborate, language, coordinated practice, coordinated talk, and instruction. This same procedure was followed on the journal websites for *TEACHING Exceptional Children, International Journal of Whole Schooling, Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, Learning Disabilities Research, Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, The Journal of Special Education, TESOL Journal, TESOL Quarterly*, and *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*. It was necessary that articles included a focus on co-teachers that were present at the same time and involved in the same activity (i.e., they could not be conducting parallel activities). I excluded articles regarding pre-service teachers due to possible qualitative differences in teaching styles. Because the focus of this research area is teachers’ collaborative co-teaching practices, I also excluded articles that focused on students’ perceptions of teachers’ co-teaching. After searching and applying the preceding criteria, a total of 9 articles was found.

For articles pertaining to research on teachers’ use of two languages during
interactions with each other and/or their students, I systematically searched for all studies that investigated teachers’ use of bilingual speech/bilingual practices in the classroom (i.e., studies that focused only on students’ use of bilingual speech were excluded).

Because there were very few studies of co-teachers that contained this information (i.e., four), I expanded my search to include articles that investigated how one teacher drew on his/her bilingualism during interactions with students. Next, I included only studies that focused on instruction of students who were either learning through two languages (e.g., dual language bilingual education, transitional bilingual education programs) or learning a second language (e.g., English as a Second Language, English as a Foreign Language). As such, I included all possible studies conducted with teachers of emergent bilinguals. I chose to allow for a flexible student age range (i.e., Pre-K-16) within a school or school-like environment, so as to capture teachers’ bilingual interactive practices at all academic levels. However, I excluded studies involving atypically developing students, since children with language impairment or language delay were not the focus of this portion of the review and because teachers in special education/exceptional settings may engage in instructional/interactive strategies that are unique from those employed by teachers of typically developing emergent bilingual children, thus possibly affecting the comparability of studies.

Using the ERIC (EBSCO), PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar databases, I entered a combination of search terms, including: bilingual pedagogy(ies), 2 translanguaging, 3 codeswitch (also code-switch and code switch), dual language, SLA. 5

2 Strategic use of both languages in the same instructional context for a variety of purposes.
3 The language practices of bilinguals when viewed as users themselves. That is, translanguaging encompasses the “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (italics in original; García, 2009a, p. 45).
ESL\(^6\), EFL\(^7\), parallel conversation\(^8\), tandem talk\(^9\), language use, teacher, interaction, bilingual, coordinated, co-construct, instruction, and language use. I subsequently entered the same combinations into the website search tool for Taylor & Francis, SAGE, Routledge, and Elsevier. Finally, the same procedure was conducted using the website search tool for the following journals: *Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Research Journal, International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, TESOL Quarterly, Reading Research Quarterly, Journal of Literacy Research, Early Childhood Research Quarterly, Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, Language and Education, Linguistics and Education, Reading in the Teaching of English, and The Modern Language Journal*. After applying the inclusion criteria, a total of 41 articles was found.

**Synthesis of Findings**

Below I synthesize the findings of relevant studies in two main sections: (1) concepts related to teachers’ coordinated co-teaching practices (i.e., what they look like, including roles of each teacher; what co-teaching allows teachers to accomplish that perhaps independent teaching could not; how co-teachers actually coordinate their practices when working to co-construct meaning between each other and with students),

\(^4\) Use features of two languages within an utterance or conversation (Genesee, 2009).
\(^5\) The sequential acquisition of bilingualism (Baker, 2006). That is, a child first learns a language and later becomes proficient in another language.
\(^6\) A program that traditionally establishes an English-only instructional policy, and use of English is supported in the surrounding community.
\(^7\) A program that traditionally establishes an English-only instructional policy, but use of English is not typically supported in the surrounding community.
\(^8\) A type of collaborative bilingual practice where a pair of speakers coordinates the use of two languages so that each maintains the use of monolingual speech in a bilingual conversation (Lee et al., 2008).
\(^9\) A specialized version of parallel conversation in which their speech overlaps just enough so that if a member of their audience only speaks Spanish or English they will sufficiently understand what is being said. One must comprehend both English and Spanish to understand the interaction in its entirety (Lee et al., 2008).
and (2) how teachers draw on their bilingualism when interacting with each other or with students.

**An Overview of Teachers’ Coordinated Co-Teaching Practices**

Most of the relevant studies to the examination of teachers’ co-teaching practices come from the special education inclusion literature due to the recent push for students to be educated in the least restrictive environment (IDEA, 2004; NCLB, 2001). Studies included elementary, middle, and high school settings, and data were collected primarily through participant observation, interviews, and researcher participation. Data were analyzed using content analysis, the constant comparative method, and grounded theory and later interpreted through the lenses of the dialectical relationship between agency and structure or an ecological systems perspective.

The study of co-teaching has been comprised primarily of three topics: (a) teachers’ roles and relationships; (b) issues related to program logistics; and (c) the impact of co-teaching on student learning, behavior, and perceptions (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). Given the focus of the present study—how DL co-teachers’ draw on their bilingualism when engaging in coordinated practices—I focus on the first of these three major topics. In traditional co-teaching, teachers’ primary concern is to present the content more fully and/or accurately, or to correct some error or omission in earlier parts of the lesson (Roth et al., 2002). Prior research shows that co-teachers can achieve that goal when participants “(a) are making physical and metaphorical space for one another and are taking the space provided by the other; (b) are
making available meaning-making resources for one another and are using the resources made available by the other; and (c) are acting seamlessly in time so that their actions not only are coordinated but also provide multiple, synergistically acting, meaning-making resources to be accessed and appropriated by students and co-teaching colleagues” (Roth et al., 2002, p. 683). These exemplary characteristics of co-teaching have been manifested through various models identified in the literature.

Friend et al. (2010, p. 12), Morocco and Aguilar (2002), and Weiss and Lloyd (2002) provide six models for co-teaching: one-teach/one-observe, one-teach/one-assist, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching. Because the one-teach/one-observe, station teaching (i.e., teachers provide individual support at various stations that are created), parallel teaching (i.e., teachers teach the same or similar content to different groups), and alternative teaching (i.e., one teacher assumes responsibility of a small group for specialized instruction) models highlight either only one of the two teachers teaching at a time (i.e., one-teach/one-observe) or both teachers teaching separately (i.e., station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching) and therefore preclude a lack of coordinated practices, this review focuses only one the one-teach/one-assist (i.e., one teacher assumes the primary teaching responsibilities and the other teacher plays a support role to the class or individuals as needed) and team teaching (i.e., both teachers equally share the instructional responsibilities and are equally involved in leading activities) models.

One-Teach/One-Assist. A broad range of practices is represented in the literature given this co-teaching model in which there is a clear “lead” teacher and support teacher. For example, some support teachers play a more subordinate role, clapping or raising
hand(s), chiming in when the lead teacher pauses (Forbes & Billet, 2012), clarifying or explaining content in ways that support other learning styles (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002; Forbes & Billet, 2012), and asking questions of the lead teacher (Forbes & Billet, 2012). Support teachers who take a more active role also assist the lead teacher in various ways, including acting as a native language scaffold (Carless, 2006), establishing and fostering an environment hospitable to language learning (Carless, 2006), adding variety or change of pace (Flanagan & Ralston, 1983), clarifying the other teacher’s questions (Flanagan & Ralston, 1983), encouraging student questions (Flanagan & Ralston, 1983), alerting the other teacher to students’ input (Flanagan & Ralston, 1983), taking up the comments of the lead teacher (e.g., the teacher in the support role models what lead teacher has just said; Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), producing and using the same resources (e.g., use graphic organizers created by other teacher; Roth et al., 2007), clarifying directions (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), and providing students with feedback (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002). Because it is the support teacher’s responsibility to participate as instructionally necessary (e.g., when students appear to need some form of remediation), the onus is initially on her to achieve some level of coordination during instruction. However, following her input, the lead teacher may choose to interact in a way that achieves the same—or greater—coordination.

**Team-teaching.** In contrast, during team-teaching, it appears to be both teachers’ responsibility to work at coordinating their practices. Examples of coordinated co-teaching practices in which teachers assume a more equal role include using/exchanging non-verbal signs between each other (Murawski & Dieker, 2008), sharing responsibility for daily tasks/routine (Conderman, 2011), validating each other’s contributions
(Conderman, 2011), accommodating the other teacher’s preferences and strengths of specific material (Cramer & Nevin, 2006), allowing each teacher to make momentary decisions about teaching (Conderman, 2011), alternating setting up an activity (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), providing each other relevant information (e.g., add to a point made by other teacher; Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), and building on visual representations (e.g., illustrations, graphic organizers; Roth et al., 2005).

Finally, whether part of the one-teach/one-assist or team-teaching model, teachers coordinate their co-teaching practices to motivate and manage students (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), assist students [providing think alouds and repeating instructions] (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), prompt students to draw on background knowledge and experiences to build understanding (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), and model their own background knowledge for students (Rice et al., 2007).

Benefits of Co-Teaching. When viewed from a sociocultural perspective\(^\text{10}\) (i.e., co-construction of knowledge), there are a number of distinct benefits when teachers coordinate their practices. By complementing each other by drawing on each other’s strengths (Carless, 2006), discussing and expressing differing viewpoints and compromising (Carless, 2006; Flanagan & Ralston, 1983), creating a positive learning environment (Dieker, 2001), valuing all students (Dieker, 2001), holding and enforcing high expectations for both behavior and academics (Dieker, 2001), and bringing a multicultural perspective (Bahamonde & Friend, 1999), teachers are able to effectively engage in meaningful interactions with students in order to meet them at their developing

\(^{10}\) A fundamental concept of sociocultural theory is that the human mind is mediated. That is, humans use both literal and symbolic tools to act on, mediate, and regulate the world and their relationships with others and with themselves, thereby changing the nature of those relationships. Language is one of the symbolic tools to which sociocultural theory refers (Lantolf, 2000).
instructional and linguistic proficiency levels.

The following section focuses on the ways that teachers have drawn on both their own and students’ bilingualism to engage in classroom interactions.

**Drawing on Dynamic Bilingualism during Instructional Interactions**

The scope of these studies ranged from the macro (e.g., how hybrid language practices help to create bilingual spaces in schools; Creese & Blackledge, 2011) to the micro (e.g., the specific functions of teachers’ bilingual speech; Arthur, 2006). In order to appropriately capture and interpret each phenomenon, researchers often drew from more than one major category (e.g., teachers’ attitude toward CS and mediation of academic content; Conteh, 2007).

Studies occurred in multiple countries, and school settings included DL schools (Gort & Pontier, 2013; Lee et al., 2008), transitional bilingual education\(^\text{11}\) (Sayer, 2012), complementary schools\(^\text{12}\) (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Martin et al., 1999), content and language integrated learning\(^\text{13}\) (Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012), one split between a complementary school and a general education/monolingual (i.e., non-bilingual) school (Conteh, 2007), and bilingual schools (i.e., no definition provided for “bilingual”; Jaffe, 2007; Saldaña & Méndez-Negrete, 2005) and ranged from pre-Kindergarten to university level. Ethnographic methods were employed for data

\(^{11}\)Transitional bilingual education includes both early exit bilingual education and late exit bilingual education. In early exit programs, both of the students’ languages are used to some degree, but the goal is for students to acquire English as quickly as possible and enter a mainstream (i.e., English-only) classroom. In late exit programs, the goal is still English acquisition, but both of the students’ languages are supported for a longer period of time (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010).

\(^{12}\)Also known as “heritage language,” “community language,” and “supplementary” schools in the United Kingdom. They are non-statutory schools run by their local communities for the benefit of students learning the language typically associated with their ethnic heritage (Creese & Blackledge, 2011).

\(^{13}\)An umbrella term encompassing programs that teach academic content through a foreign language (Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012).
collection, manifested through audio or video recorded interviews, participant observation, field notes, and participant-completed questionnaires. Analyses included microethnography (Gort & Pontier, 2013), linguistic ethnography (Creese & Blackledge, 2011), grounded theory (Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012; Saldaña & Méndez-Negrete, 2005), a language ecology perspective (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), discourse analysis (e.g., Auleear Owodally, 2012; Lin, 2006), conversation analysis (e.g., Qian et al., 2009; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005), sociolinguistic analysis (Lee et al., 2008), or a combination of deductive and inductive reasoning (e.g., Forman, 2012; Liu et al., 2004; Raschka, 2009). Although these approaches to data analysis support a developing understanding of each distinct phenomenon under study, several may be grouped together. Most of the analytical methods used in these studies (i.e., linguistic ethnography, discourse analysis, conversation analysis) are subsumed by sociolinguistics, which describes the effect of society (which includes cultural norms, expectations, and context) on language use (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2008). Somewhat similarly, microethnography, building on sociolinguistic ethnography, combines attention to how language and other systems of communication are used when constructing language and literacy events with attention to social, cultural, and political processes (Bloome et al., 2005). Linguistic ethnography, discourse analysis, and conversation analysis stem from the broader fields of socio- and applied linguistics; to that end, linguistic ethnography focuses on the particular forms of language used in specific cultural settings (Creese, 2008), discourse analysis hones in on what people actually do [in classrooms] by focusing on their interactions (Bloome et al., 2008), and conversation analysis investigates narrower language-based interactions (without examining, for example,
written texts, as may be the case in discourse analysis; Schlegloff, 2007). A language ecology perspective allows researchers to carefully consider the effect of each social layer on language use (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Finally, whereas the above approaches to data analysis often rely on existing theoretical frameworks as a starting point for coding and subsequent analysis, grounded theory examines events by creating a set of initial codes “grounded” in the data themselves (i.e., without referring to existing frameworks), grouping those codes according to similarities to form categories and later families to make them more workable (i.e., to begin to make sense of them), and lastly postulating a theory surrounding the phenomenon of study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Each analysis allowed researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the naturally occurring language choices teachers made when engaged with students for a variety of purposes.

Studies that identified their theoretical frameworks drew from sociocultural (Vygotsky, 1978) and social interaction (John-Steiner, Panofsky, & Smith, 1994) theory, translanguaging and other bilingual perspectives, Cummins’ (2000) theory of interdependence/common underlying proficiency, Krashen’s (1982) input hypothesis, Bourdieu’s (1977) symbolic domination, and Gee’s (2001) Discourse theory, providing different perspectives for researchers to see the ways in which teachers used two languages during instructional interactions. While sociocultural theory, social interactionism, Discourse theory, and symbolic domination are not associated with second language acquisition or emergent bilingualism, translanguaging, interdependence theory, and the input hypothesis all provide perspectives of how bilinguals acquire and use more than one language. According to sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978),
learning is socially mediated through interactions between individuals. As an extension of sociocultural theory, social interactionism (John-Steiner et al., 1994) considers the specific role of language as a cultural tool used for mediation in interactions between and among participants. These perspectives take into account the social and cultural contexts in which people engage (e.g., community, school, classroom) and the various layers in which language is situated in an effort to examine participants’ interactions. Krashen’s (1985) notion of comprehensible input contends that interactions between language users must involve understandable information in order to allow each participant access to new material/information, typically provided by a more-proficient peer or adult (i.e., teacher). For emergent bilinguals, comprehensible input may manifest itself in the form of existing knowledge/experiences in one of the familiar languages. Cummins’ (2000) interdependence hypothesis encourages educators and researchers alike to draw on what students bring to the classroom as they learn new language and content, as the skills that were already learned in different languages inhabit the same part of the brain and reinforce each other at the basic level while differing in surface features, thereby facilitating a ready transfer to other languages when students are provided with the appropriate support.

Discourse theory, symbolic domination, and translanguaging—when considered together—present a unique perspective on how language is used and viewed, particularly in classrooms. Discourse theory provides a tool for investigating discourse and social practice that highlights the interrelationships among language, language learning, social identity, and social context (Knobel, 1999). Dominant discourses are those Discourses (e.g., baseball, organic chemistry, geometry; often learned outside of the home) that are
associated with social roles of status and privilege, and are thus accompanied by the associated benefits and social goods of such roles. Non-dominant Discourses involve membership and belonging within a particular social network but are not often accompanied by any wider benefits or social goods. One form of Discourse is that used by bilinguals in both social and academic settings is translanguageing. As a theoretical lens, translanguageing views the fluid language use of bilinguals as a natural and normative behavior, thereby helping researchers understand how bilinguals—both teachers and students—engage in use of multiple languages in the same context in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds (García, 2009). This form of communication among bilinguals has not been valued traditionally—particularly in formal learning and/or professional contexts, making it what Gee would refer to as a non-dominant Discourse. Symbolic domination (Bourdieu, 1977) provides a framework for understanding Gee’s notion of dominant and non-dominant Discourses by explaining that certain cultural knowledge (referred to as “cultural capital”), which includes ways of using language (e.g., using appropriate academic speech in a science class), is valued by the socially powerful, thus necessitating knowledge of and fluency in specific manners of interacting in order to be [academically] successful.

In regards to phenomena of study, the majority of studies reviewed focused on the ways in which teachers enacted dynamic bilingualism (Canagarajah, 1995; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Kang, 2008; Qian et al., 2009; Rasschka et al., 2009) and the functions of their enactment of dynamic bilingualism (Ariffin & Husin, 2011; Arthur, 1996; Auleear Owodally, 2012; Brice et al., 1998; Canagarajah, 1995; Conteh, 2007; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Forman, 2012; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Jaffe, 2007; Kang, 2008;
Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Kim & Elder, 2005; Liu et al., 2004; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Martin, 1999; Martin et al., 2006; McGlynn & Martin, 2009; Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012; Probyn, 2009; Qian et al., 2009; Raschka et al., 2009; Tien, 2009; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Setati et al., 2002; Vanichakorn, 2009). I provide a detailed synthesis of these phenomena in the following subsections.

**Ways in which teachers enacted dynamic bilingualism.** When interacting with students, teachers drew on their dynamic bilingualism (i.e., translanguaged) during instruction in various ways (Canagarajah, 1995; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Kang, 2008; Qian et al., 2009; Raschka et al., 2009). Traditionally, a triadic pattern (Lemke, 1990)—or IRE (i.e., initiate, respond, evaluate; Mehan, 1979)—was used to engage in interactions. Specifically, some teachers codeswitched across utterances, within clauses or phrases inside a single utterance, or used particles, discourse markers, and backchanneling cues (i.e., conversation fillers; Canagarajah, 1995) while others maintained their use of the target language due to the presence of a second teacher, with whom they engaged in parallel bilingual conversations (i.e., a type of bilingual talk wherein each person has at least receptive proficiency of both languages, productive proficiency in at least one, and each speaks one of the languages during conversation; Gort & Pontier, 2013). When working alongside another teacher, co-teachers used parity words such as “we” and “our” (Conderman, 2011), alternated conversational turns (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), repeated phrases and employed the same gestures with students (Roth et al., 2005), engaged in co-generative dialogue (e.g., picked up a sentence where the other teacher left off; Roth et al., 2005), employed multimodal resources available (e.g., bilingualism) and alternated between everyday language and specialized language (Evnitskaya & Morton, 2011).
provided sentence starters, rephrased student utterances, repeated teacher questions, asked open-ended and closed questions, reduced the linguistic demand of a response (e.g., open-ended question to yes/no question), elicited student explanations and descriptions, summarized student responses, used synonyms, provided suggestions, asked for students’ opinions, translated key vocabulary, used suggestive tags (e.g., “Right?”; Kibler, 2011), sought factual information (Muller & Beardsmoore, 2004), and codeswitched to explain (Reyes, 2008) and to provide definitions (Tsai & García, 2000).

**Functions for which teachers enacted dynamic bilingualism.** Across all studies, teachers drew on their own and students’ bilingualism during instruction for a variety of pedagogical and non-pedagogical functions (Ariffin & Husin, 2011; Arthur, 1996; Auleear Owodally, 2012; Brice et al., 1998; Canagarajah, 1995; Conteh, 2007; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Forman, 2012; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Jaffe, 2007; Kang, 2008; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Kim & Elder, 2005; Liu et al., 2004; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Martin, 1999; Martin et al., 2006; McGlynn & Martin, 2009; Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012; Probyn, 2009; Qian et al., 2009; Raschka et al., 2009; Tien, 2009; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Setati et al., 2002; Vanichakorn, 2009). These functions served three overarching purposes: content development, language (and literacy) development, and sociocultural integration.

*Fostering content development.* There were several noted pedagogical functions of teachers’ dynamic bilingualism during instruction (whether explained as L1, CS, or translanguaging), including introducing new words, translating material, repeating material, checking for understanding, clarifying, modeling, correcting, providing new information, highlighting material, and providing instructions. When teachers engaged in
parallel talk (and other practices during which teachers fostered a bilingual environment, but they themselves maintained monolingual target language speech), they drew on their students’ bilingualism to ask to help translate material (often referred to as bilingual label quests; Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Lee et al., 2008; Martin, 1999).

*Fostering language development.* When teachers engaged in bilingual practices, they also sought to provide support for students’ language development by explaining linguistic forms, introducing new words, elaborating, summarizing, and, in cases of teachers’ parallel talk, purposefully modeling monolingual use of one of the classroom languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2011). Several studies showed how teachers purposefully modeled authentic ways of languaging bilingually (Conteh, 2007; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Martin et al., 2006; Sayer, 2012). Teachers in Conteh (2007) and Sayer (2012) were adamant about the need to provide students with not only models that reflected community language use, but also a method of making sense of their bilingual worlds.

*Fostering sociocultural integration.* Teachers’ bilingual practices served to integrate sociocultural experiences by drawing on students’ affective states (Auleear Owodally, 2012), engaging in linguistically and culturally relevant management practices (Canagarajah, 1995; Kang; 2008; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Kim & Elder, 2005; McGlynn & Martin, 2009; Raschka et al., 2009; Tien, 2009), prompting learners to engage in conversations, building solidarity among students (Canagarajah, 1995; Kang, 2008; Lin, 1996; Qian et al., 2009; Thomson & Stakhnevich, 2010), exploiting students’ previous learning experiences, performing identity acts (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Sayer, 2012), and accomplishing lessons through bilingual collaboration and negotiation.
(Creese, 2004; Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Forman, 2007; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Martin, 1999; Probyn, 2009; Raschka, 2009; Saldaña & Méndez-Negrete, 2005; Sayer, 2012; Tien, 2009). Moreover, by engaging in parallel talk, teachers allowed students to respond in the language in which they were most comfortable (Gort & Pontier, 2013; Lee et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2006), inviting them to draw on all of their linguistic resources (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Jaffé, 2007; Forman, 2007; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Martin et al., 2006; Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012; Sayer, 2012). Teachers themselves also modeled and engaged in tandem talk (a feature of bilingual interactions; Creese & Blackledge, 2011; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Lee et al., 2008), in addition to encouraging students to do the same. By drawing on students’ emergent bilingualism and strategically mixing languages, teachers reflected their knowledge of the social and linguistic complexity of their communities (Auleear Owodally, 2012; Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Saldaña & Méndez-Negrete, 2005; Sayer, 2012). Thus, teachers were able to invite student participation and engage students in various activities as a result of enacting bilingual practices (Auleear Owodally, 2012; Creese, 2004; Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; de Mejía, 1998; Kang, 2008; Probyn, 2009; Sayer, 2012), allowing students to operate at rich cognitive and cultural levels (Forman, 2007).

**State of the Field**

Although the studies selected for review independently advanced our knowledge of co-teachers’ coordinated practices or the ways that teachers draw on their own and students’ bilingualism in classroom interactions, there is currently little knowledge of
what these co-teaching arrangements look like in action or how teachers negotiate the demands of the subject matter and their students’ needs (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002). Furthermore, there is little existing research on the ways that DL teachers use language—especially their bilingualism—in their coordinated practices while co-teaching. Knowing that enacting dynamic bilingualism during instruction can function as a valuable tool for meaning making (de Mejía, 1998); help students see the relationships between languages (Jaffé, 2007); meet the actual competencies of the students (Jaffé, 2007); and assist in identity performance, lesson accomplishment, and student confidence (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) presents a call to the field for more rigorous research that can be subsequently translated into practice.

There were several limitations to these studies, most of them methodological. Because researchers have the responsibility of publishing replicable studies, it is imperative that specific details for methodological procedure be carefully described, especially in qualitative studies, which comprised the majority of this review. Many studies were lacking a clear description of the unit of analysis; a rationale for particular methods of analysis; frameworks used to generate codes; appendices documenting codes, definitions, and examples; and an explanation for how inter-rater reliability, data triangulation, or other methods of transferability and trustworthiness were achieved. Furthermore, several studies did not differentiate between either functions of monolingual talk and bilingual talk or whether the stated CS and related function were realized by the teacher or a student, a critical piece of information. Although many researchers interviewed participants, there were several more who stated a need for interviews in order to appropriately present teachers’ perspectives (Kim & Elder, 2005;
Liu et al., 2004; Qian et al., 2009). Finally, data collection must include prolonged engagement to ensure an authentic sampling of co-teachers’ coordinated practices and use of language, a criterion that was not met in many studies (Arthur, 1996; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Probyn, 2009; Raschka et al., 2009).

Additionally, most research to date has overlooked the critical language development stages of early childhood and focused largely on an age group of learners that has already established proficiency in at least one language (as compared to same-age peers using measures identified by school systems) and is learning another (while sometimes also learning content). Although a few studies have been conducted with teachers of pre-kindergarten students (Auleear Owodally, 2012; Gort & Pontier, 2013), they are the exception, leaving a dearth of knowledge surrounding the ways that teachers of young emergent bilinguals draw on all of their linguistic resources when engaging in coordinated practices in the classroom, particularly in support of language and content learning. Future research in this area should build on what has been done, qualitatively characterizing early childhood teachers’ use of two languages. Findings would be expected to inform our understanding of the opportunities that emergent bilingual learners have in their early academic careers to hear and to engage with two languages, thereby contributing to our knowledge of bilingual pedagogies at such an early stage of learning, as well as eventually investigating possible outcomes or affordances of these practices if longitudinal studies were conducted.

Given the growing population of emergent bilingual learners both in the United States and worldwide, empirical studies investigating (co-)teachers’ use of bilingualism during coordinated practices in contexts where children are learning through two
languages are critical. Findings can be expected to provide further insight into the ways and functions for which teachers make use of emergent bilinguals’ languages and coordinate their practices in so doing, and can simultaneously inform future educators’ practices and researchers’ methodological approaches to studying the intersection of co-teachers’ coordinated practices and this distinctive and normative feature of bilinguals’ speech that may be present in academic settings. In response to the dearth of knowledge surrounding how DL preschool co-teachers draw on their bilingualism in an effort to coordinate their instructional practices for their students, this study sought to document and describe those very practices.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to describe the nature and utility of two dual language preschool co-teachers’ coordinated practices (i.e., the act of two teachers working cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways; Roth et al., 2002) during shared reading activities in English and Spanish and to document the ways in which teachers drew on their bilingualism to achieve a level of coordination in support of their emergent bilingual students’ language and content learning. A first pass of the data was conducted to explore and map out the ways that the teachers coordinated their practices by identifying the instructional targets and instructional strategies that characterized those practices. I then engaged in a second pass of the data to describe the ways that the teachers made use of the two languages of the classroom within instances of coordinated practice.

The following question guided this research:

How do co-teachers enact their bilingualism when they engage in coordinated practice during large group shared book readings in a DL preschool classroom?

14 Although, as explained in chapter 2, this term can be used to describe a range of instructional approaches (i.e., those found in Friend et al., 2010; Morocco & Aguilar, 2002; Weiss & Lloyd, 2002), I use this term to describe two DL preschool teachers who work in the same classroom and share instructional responsibilities by collaborating on the same instructional activity. The particular way in which these responsibilities are shared is detailed below. While they only represent one approach to co-teaching, I choose to refer to them as co-teachers in order to highlight the practices in which they engage, not any particular method of co-teaching (e.g., one-teach/one-observe).
This chapter presents the methodological framework for my study. I first provide an overview of the research design, with specific attention to case study research, and follow with detailed descriptions of the research settings, participants, and the data collection, coding, and analysis procedures.

**Research Design**

“The world is very complex. There are no simple explanations for things. Rather events are the result of multiple factors coming together and interacting in complex and often unanticipated ways” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 8).

Qualitative research seeks to explore and construct the inner experience of participants and to determine how meanings are formed through and in culture, providing an opportunity to connect with participants on a human level (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). As such, the researcher collects multiple forms of data to present various perspectives of the phenomenon under study and acts as the instrument of analysis to gain insight and interpret the meaning of the information (Creswell, 2007). Qualitative researchers, therefore, typically represent a post-positivistic worldview, one in which there exists not one definitive reality, but rather several unique perspectives that can be co-constructed (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). Inquiry may be deductive, relying on testable hypotheses and existing theories, or inductive, allowing for new theories grounded in data (Charmaz, 2006). This study used a combination of the two, drawing on the existing literature for traditional co-teaching practices and teachers’ bilingual languaging practices during classroom interactions and moving towards grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) when the data suggested additional coding
categories and patterns. I therefore used a case study approach and the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), engaging in a coordinated dance between the data and emerging categories, themes, and patterns to guide my coding and analysis procedures in support of my research question. This process made explicit what may have been understood as tacit meanings and realities (Charmaz, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

**Case Study Research**

As Dyson and Ginishi (2005) posit, “We appropriate words from a shared linguistic repertoire to name and narrate our experiences. In this way, language is both a repository of cultural meanings and a medium for the production of meaning in everyday life” (p. 5). It is within this paradigm that I situate my study.

Case study is a useful and appropriate qualitative approach for this study given its focus on a bounded system (i.e., case) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of data (e.g., video recordings, observations, and field notes) and description of the case and case-based themes (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2003). Case study allows researchers to gain a deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon by combining “close analysis of fine details of behavior and meaning in everyday social interaction with analysis of the wider societal context” (Erickson, 1986, p. 120). It is through the physical setting and social activities that take place within my “case”—English and Spanish shared book reading activities in a dual language preschool classroom—that I investigated the nature and utility of one co-teachers’ coordinated
practice and documented, analyzed, and interpreted the ways that they enacted their bilingualism when engaging in coordinated practices. In line with case study approach, my goal was not to generalize my findings but to understand the complexity of the case through an analysis of themes (Creswell, 2007). Through analysis of patterns and development of naturalistic generalizations (i.e., generalizations that allow others to learn from the case either for themselves or to apply to a population of cases; Creswell, 2007) I developed a deep understanding of this one case, helping to expand our understanding of the ways in which co-teachers coordinate their practices and to build a knowledge base for the ways that DL bilingual education preschool co-teachers enact their bilingualism to coordinate their instructional practices during English and Spanish shared book readings when co-teaching with a partner.

**Research Setting**

The data collected for this study are part of a larger corpus of data from a multiyear study that sought to explore the natural bilingual oral language and emerging literacy practices of children in a DL bilingual education preschool program, and the instructional practices that supported these children’s dual language development across typically-occurring, early childhood, literacy-related activities (e.g., circle time, story time, and pretend play). The study took place in an additive Spanish/English bilingual preschool program in a multilingual and multicultural community in the southeastern

---

15 An additive bilingual program is one in which development of two languages is supported at school regardless of whether students come to school using one or more languages. This program differs distinctly from subtractive bilingual programs in which the instructional language (usually the majority language,
United States. At the onset of the study, in the summer of 2009, the school was in its second year of operation and was in the process of refining its dual language approach. Therefore, the school’s primary language goal was to expose children to authentic experiences in each of the target languages, Spanish and English, which were representative of the languages reflected in the surrounding community. The school operates year-round, including a summer program that reflects the goals and schedule of the academic year, and serves approximately 115 children from six weeks to five years old. Each of the four preschool classrooms has two teachers and an average of 17 students, who represent a variety of cultural, home language, and socioeconomic backgrounds. The school offers several cost options including tuition based on an annual income scale (25% of families pay this rate), full tuition (25% of families pay this rate), and tuition support from county, state, and federal subsidies (e.g., Head Start, Early Head Start, Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten; 50% of families pay this rate).

The school’s language policy states that each teacher is to model monolingual use of one of the target languages, Spanish or English. As such, the teachers adopted a one-teacher/one-language approach, and each teacher took turns leading the week’s large group activities, since the target language alternated on a weekly basis. However, because both teachers are present throughout the day, are expected to maintain their designated language, and participate in activities to varying extents, both languages are often used concurrently, creating a bilingual instructional context in the classroom. Despite teachers’ generally (productive) monolingual use of their designated language, they demonstrate which in the case of the U.S., is English) is privileged at school at the expense of the home language (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010; Lambert, 1974).
receptive bilingual skills when interacting with students and colleagues who address them in their non-designated language.

Data for this study come from shared book reading activities collected during the 2011-2012 academic year in one of the preschool classrooms. Shared reading occurred daily, led by the teacher whose designated language reflected the designated language of the week (i.e., the Spanish language model led the activity on Spanish weeks) with support from the other teacher. Although the teachers generally followed the school-adopted Opening the World of Learning (OWL) curriculum and used the accompanying suggested books, teachers occasionally chose books that were not part of the curriculum in order to support the current unit of study (e.g., travel). Books that were not part of the curriculum were from the school’s library.

During the activity, the students sat in an open area of the classroom in a circle facing inward so that all participants, including the teachers, could see one another. Teachers consistently chose standard-sized, fictional picture books to read and supported the activity and its interactions through the use of illustrations. Teachers typically interacted with students through questioning, commenting, and responding to students’ inquiries, practices that encouraged student participation and supported comprehension. Each teacher alternated roles as lead teacher and support teacher. When leading the activity, the teacher was responsible for introducing the book, reading the book aloud, asking questions that served to both build students’ background knowledge and check their understanding, fielding student questions, responding to student comments, and concluding the activity. The partner teacher typically participated in the activity by checking for understanding, providing strategic translations, and helping build
background knowledge. Each shared book reading activity lasted approximately 15 minutes.

Participants

The focal classroom consisted of a multi-age group of 17 students, ranging from 3;3 - 4;11 at the beginning of data collection in September 2011. Ten students were expected to progress to kindergarten following the 2011-2012 academic year, while seven would remain in the classroom for one more year. Students came from homes where parents/guardians spoke Spanish (6), English (2), and a combination of English and Spanish (9). Sixteen students came from Latino cultural backgrounds representing Argentina, Cuba, Curacao\textsuperscript{16}, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, and Venezuela. One student was identified as white from families with European heritage. Table 1 provides an overview of this demographic information for all children.

Table 1. Student demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Home Language/s</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aidan</td>
<td>4;1</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Hispanic/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>4;2</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Hispanic/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlyn</td>
<td>4;6</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Hispanic/U.S. and Peru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16} Although natives of Curacao typically identify as Dutch, the information obtained from the school showed that this family identified as Latino.
Angelina  4;5  Spanish  Hispanic/Curacao  
Noah  3;11  Spanish  Hispanic/Argentina  
Aaron  4;10  Spanish  Hispanic/Venezuela  
Gabriella  4;2  Spanish  Hispanic/Cuba  
Brad  4;11  English/Spanish  Hispanic/U.S. and Peru  
Manuel  4;8  English  Hispanic/Cuba  
Melisa  4;3  Spanish  Hispanic/Cuba  
Elsa  3;11  English  White/U.S and Hungary  
Violet  3;7  English/Spanish  Hispanic/Cuba  
Kenny  3;3  English/Spanish  Hispanic/Nicaragua  
Nina  4;9  English/Spanish  Hispanic/Cuba  
Joaquin  3;6  English/Spanish  Hispanic/Cuba  
Valery  3;7  Spanish  Hispanic/Honduras  
Dilan  3;10  English/Spanish  Hispanic/Dominican Republic  

Teacher participants included two native Spanish-speaking Latina females who were bilingual in Spanish and English. The Spanish model teacher, a native of Nicaragua who had 10 years of experience teaching pre-Kindergarten in her 16 years in the United States, was 30 years old at the time of data collection and had earned an associate of arts
degree in early childhood education from a local community college. The English model teacher had three years of experience teaching pre-Kindergarten and kindergarten in her seven years in the United States after arriving from Ecuador. She was 25 years old and had earned a Bachelor of Science degree in early childhood education from a local state university.

**Data Collection**

As part of the larger study, a data collection team of three doctoral students conducted non-participant observations of literacy-related activities in the four preschool classrooms. We spent approximately three hours in each classroom each week using digital video recordings and field notes to systematically capture the teacher-child interactions, teachers’ and children’s language use, and children’s participation in focal classroom activities as naturalistically as possible. As part of our non-participant role, we situated a tripod with the camera perched atop off to the side of the activity, but always facing the teacher leading the activity. We remained in the background and did not create any distractions for teachers or students. At the conclusion of each shared reading activity, photographs were taken of each page of the book. Over the course of the 2011-2012 academic year, we recorded a total of 132 shared book reading activities (66 Spanish/66 English) across the four classrooms.
Data Preparation

Case selection. A pilot study indicated that, although all four teacher pairs engaged in coordinated practices to varying extents, the focal teacher pair enacted these practices much more frequently and for a greater variety of purposes. Additionally, both of the focal teachers were proficient bilinguals who showed comfort and facility translanguaging. Given my choice of focal participants, this teacher pair presented a unique case that was ideal for understanding DL bilingual education preschool co-teachers’ coordinated practices. Of the 132 total read alouds, 24 (13 Spanish, 11 English) were conducted in the focal classroom, and 12 (6 Spanish, 6 English) involved both of the focal teachers.

Unit of analysis. I first defined the unit of analysis as a thematically bound (i.e., same conversational topic, without interruptions) instance of coordinated practice involving both classroom teachers. I was specifically interested in teachers’ child-directed coordinated practices centering around story-relevant instruction. In order to increase trustworthiness, I eliminated read alouds where teachers relied on either a recording or wordless picture books due to potential qualitative differences in lesson delivery. Because I was interested in investigating the ways that teachers coordinated their practices based on similar readings, I chose to exclude recordings of books since there was no reading on the part of either teacher, and wordless picture books since the teacher was not reading per se. Although I believe that the teachers could have drawn on story-relevant instruction in these two cases, it was not my immediate interest to discern any potential differences. In the remaining videos, in collaboration with other trained graduate students in language and literacy who were familiar with the larger project, I
took an initial pass at the data, identifying all instances of teachers’ coordinated practices. Next, I indicated whether teachers’ coordinated practices were academic in scope (i.e., practices that were language- or book-related) or not, excluding instances that were not academic in nature (i.e., related to behavior management, general activity orientation, or organization). I transcribed verbatim all teacher and child talk within identified units of analysis that represented instances of coordinated practice and integrated all extralinguistic interactional features (e.g., gestures).

**Data Analysis**

I used Atlas.ti, a qualitative analysis software program, to conduct a line-by-line microanalysis (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005) to describe what was occurring between teachers during these interactions. I first characterized their interaction styles by investigating the specific discursive patterns of teacher interaction in which the teachers worked cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways. This characterization revealed two broad categories: Leader/supporter interactions and balanced interactions. The ways that teachers enacted their roles within each category of interaction (e.g., clarify, confirm, repeat, make a statement, ask a question) contributed to my emergent understanding of the nature of their coordinated practices. This initial pass at the data allowed me to then uncover the particular instructional targets and instructional strategies on which teachers drew to guide their work toward a common purpose, the second step in my analysis.
Teachers’ language use during instances of coordinated practice. My next step of documentation included understanding how bilingualism supported teachers’ coordinated practices. I engaged in another pass of the data focusing on the ways in which teachers drew on their bilingualism as a resource for supporting their interactions as well as children’s learning. I first noted whether teachers (as a pair) engaged in monolingual or bilingual interaction. If the pair was observed to interact in and through one common language, I noted whether the language was the activity’s target language or non-target language; in most cases, this paralleled the language of the text. If the pair integrated the use of both languages, resulting in bilingual interaction, I noted whether this alternation was the result of parallel monolingualism (i.e., each teacher maintaining her designated language during interaction) or bilingual speech by one or both teachers. All coding was checked by a bilingual graduate student in language and literacy learning who was familiar with the larger project and this particular analysis, and any disagreements were reconciled through conversation. This process yielded an inter-rater reliability of 91% (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Figure 1 provides a visual representation of this coding process.

Instructional targets and instructional strategies. In order to describe and define the instructional intention behind the teachers’ instances of coordinated practices, I then coded for both instructional targets and instructional strategies. I borrow the construct of instructional targets, the particular language and literacy skills that are central to children’s language and literacy development and which capture the content-related focus of teachers’ book-related talk during read alouds, from McGinty, Pettit, Gosse, Pentimonti, & Justice’s (2011) Explicit Language and Literacy Instruction
Techniques (ELLIT) measure. Instructional targets included four domains, including phonological awareness, print knowledge, vocabulary, and narrative. McGinty et al. describe phonological awareness as a representation of children’s growing ability to reflect on sounds or sound parts of words, including rhyme, syllables, and phonemes. Print knowledge includes concepts about print, such as knowing names and functions of book parts, organization and directionality of print, that print carries meaning, and the purpose of the act of reading/writing. Students’ knowledge of particular words such as concrete/abstract nouns, verbs, adjectives/adverbs, and prepositions represent vocabulary. The narrative targets are characterized by how children understand the elements of narrative macrostructure in relation to narrative stories such as character/setting identification and character action/story events. Instructional strategies represent different ways that teachers may support children’s learning (McGinty et al., 2011) and include Orient/Identify, Define/Elaborate, Generalize, and Analyze/Reason.

Each languaging practice was cross-referenced with the discourse/interactional styles and instructional targets and instructional strategies of teachers’ coordinated practices found in the all passes of the data to search for patterns related to how teachers enacted their bilingualism to support their coordinated practices. The confluence of these practices—discourse, including language choice, and instructional targets and strategies—ultimately supported the analysis of teachers’ coordinated practices.
Validity and Reliability

In qualitative research, the terms validity and reliability are conceptualized differently than in quantitative research. Although qualitative researchers—and constructionists in particular—acknowledge the existence of an objective world independent of our experience of it, it is generally agreed that it does not have any inherent meaning (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). Rather, it is believed that meaning is a function of engagement with the world and that meaning is therefore not discovered but constituted or constructed in interaction with objective (although not inherently meaningful) reality. As a result, meaning can be constructed differently as a function of the perspective taken by a culture, a social formation, or an individual person. Hence,
knowledge and meaning are always partial and limited by perspectives (i.e., known from some but not all perspectives). For this reason, there are a variety of meanings that can be ascribed to any object or process, any of which could be reasonable and functional depending on the perspective from which they are viewed or known (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). I have, therefore, engaged in the process of data triangulation, drawing on multiple data sources, including participant observation, field notes, and relevant artifacts, to increase the trustworthiness of this study.

Because qualitative researchers present knowledge and/or meaning from a particular perspective, they bear not only the responsibility of representing the multitude of voices (e.g., data triangulation) that emerge in their studies, but also of recognizing how they are positioned within the culture they are studying. Generally, this concept is described in terms of emic (insider) and etic (outsider) perspectives, but Harry & Rippey (2009) borrow the terms being in, with, and for the research. Being in the research involves becoming immersed “in understanding the views of another, without judgment or advice” (Harry & Rippey, 2009, p. 21); it is the most removed position that can be taken. Being with the research adds the researcher’s perspective, moving toward a shared understanding (Fontana & Frey, 2005). Finally, being for the research requires advocating for the participant(s). However, before even beginning to move along this “being” continuum, I must question who I am, a characteristic of critical ethnographers (Foley & Valenzuela, 2005). I must think critically, carefully considering the perspective that I bring to my research. Although some researchers are privileged enough to be members—insiders—of the groups they study, many of us are not; we remain outsiders, although to varying extents. When qualitative researchers write their reports, they have an
ethical responsibility to identify their perspective and how, if at all, it coincided with that of their participants.

Charmaz (2006) and Blumer (1969) suggest acknowledging background assumptions and disciplinary perspectives (i.e., sensitizing concepts) when beginning a study. By explicitly recognizing how my point of view, belief systems, and personal motivations may influence my interpretation of data, I can develop well-informed subjectivity (Peshkin, 1988) through acknowledgement of these effects rather than attempt to ignore or conceal them. Therefore, I originally asked myself how bilingual preschool teachers might work together in an effort to support children’s development of bilingual proficiency within an academic setting that promoted the development of bilingualism. As Charmaz (2006) recommends, I used this interest and my existing theoretical knowledge of bilingual language acquisition as a “point of departure to form…questions, to look at data, to listen to [what is said], and to think analytically about the data” (italics in original, p. 17) rather than limiting my ideas to what I already knew.

Over the course of the study, I cultivated a solid relationship with both of the teachers in the focal classroom by being a consistent face in their classroom, taking an interest in their concerns, and assisting them in small ways, such as participating in a non-research study-related literacy activity with a student, cleaning and drying colored pencils after they had been submerged in running water, and tying students’ sneakers. Ultimately, I believe it was my role as “peripheral member researcher” (Adler & Adler, 1987) that—if nothing else—gave the students the impression that I was someone safe, someone who might understand, someone who could partake in their joy. This status is akin to a combination of Harry and Rippey’s (2009) being in and with the research. This
was evidenced when the students were comfortable enough to approach me, wanting to share their work. Similarly, both classroom teachers, but especially the Spanish model, grew accustomed to my presence in their classroom and seemed to view me as trustworthy as evidenced by their regular questions about my personal life (my daughter was born during data collection) and updates about what was happening in the classroom (e.g., going on a field trip, an accident in the classroom, an upcoming special event at the school).

Despite a feeling of being welcome in the classroom, I was always aware that I was still an outsider, someone who was looking in and someone who did not share all of the same experiences as the class, particularly personal experiences. I am a white male who grew up in a small, relatively rural town in New Jersey where there were few bilinguals or emergent bilinguals. I am the son of a psychotherapist with two Masters degrees and a mother who is a middle school music educator and choir director. I was raised as an upper-middle class child who [formerly] believed that “normal” included speaking and hearing only English, going on annual summer vacations, and being part of a family with two parental figures. I have since been fortunate enough to have several culturally and linguistically diverse experiences, including becoming a Spanish/English bilingual, a result mostly due to living in Madrid, Spain for an academic year during my undergraduate studies. Currently, I am a doctoral candidate in teaching and learning, focusing on language and literacy development, whose variety of experiences with languages and cultures different from my own have included teaching second and third grade at two dual language bilingual education schools in Texas and Florida, working with middle school students and their families to prepare them for academically rigorous
high school and college programs, actively participating in research with emergent bilingual preschool children, and beginning to raise my own daughter bilingually using the one-parent/one-language (OPOL) method.

These experiences were the initial catalyst for my interest in teachers’ instructional practices when working with emergent bilingual students, but it is my prolonged engagement in this research project that has solidified my dedication to rigorously investigating it. I believe that children learn languages when they are exposed to quality, authentic experiences in each language and when they have meaningful opportunities to interact in each language. In academic settings, I understand this to mean that teachers bear the responsibility of appropriately scaffolding interactions with students, strategically building on their funds of knowledge (i.e., the cultural and linguistic experiences that they bring to school) so that they are introduced to and can build on the type of language that is expected and valued in schools. I believe that preschool is an opportune time to co-construct this knowledge and associated language.

**Limitations of the Study**

Case study design provides a number of advantages and strengths, but there are also several limitations to this approach. This case study is intended to shed light on the ways that dual language preschool co-teachers engage in coordinated practices, including how they draw on their own and students’ bilingualism to achieve that coordination. The purpose of the study is not to make broad generalizations but to systematically document and describe the naturally occurring experiences of this very specialized group of
participants. Thus, no generalizations or cause-and-effect relationships are drawn from the results. Although findings do not represent larger samples or populations, results can deepen our collective understanding of teachers’ coordinated practices in dual language bilingual education early childhood settings, including translanguaging, helping to inform researchers and practitioners of similar situations (Erickson, 1986; Stake, 1985). Furthermore, case studies are intended to present a perspective of subjective matters, thereby drawing criticism for potential issues of reliability and external validity (Hamel, 1993). Researcher biases must therefore be checked in order to avoid misrepresentation of emerging themes and eventual outcomes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Despite a rigorous investigation of the ways that co-teachers interact to coordinate their practices between each other and with students, this study design only allowed for an analysis of the ways in which teachers engaged in those interactions without systematically investigating what role students played. As such, I only marginally took into account how students may influence teachers’ participation in coordinated practices or the role that their bilingualism played in those instances. This decision is justified through the knowledge that an initial understanding of teachers’ participation in instances of coordinated practice provides a knowledge base for subsequently understanding how students fit into the picture.

Finally, the scope of this study did not include teacher voices or reflections regarding their coordinated practices. This insight would allow for another layer of data triangulation and enhance our growing understanding of the ways that dual language bilingual education co-teachers engage in the focal phenomenon.
CHAPTER FOUR: TEACHERS’ ENACTMENT OF BILINGUALISM IN SUPPORT OF COORDINATED PRACTICE

In this chapter, I present the findings related to the research question: *How do co-teachers enact their bilingualism when they engage in coordinated practice during large group shared book readings in a DL bilingual education preschool classroom?* The findings are organized by the ways in which teachers enacted their bilingualism during instances of coordinated practice (i.e., the act of two teachers working cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways). Using this organizational scheme, I focus on the intersection of teachers’ languaging practices when drawing on the differing instructional targets and instructional strategies used to support teachers’ coordination. Specifically, I discuss how teachers’ use of various instructional targets related to the use of instructional strategies, and the role of teachers’ languaging in supporting their coordinated practice. I highlight how teachers’ instructional strategies often built on one another, either by drawing on the same instructional strategy or by adopting one that was complementary, all while categorizing the co-teaching roles that teachers assumed through their work in coordinating their instructional practices.

**Overview of Findings**

The focal teacher pair engaged in coordinated practice when reading books in English as well as when reading books in Spanish. Throughout all instances of
coordinated practice, teachers drew on their own and each other’s bilingualism, manifested through both monolingual and bilingual individual and collaborative talk and a mutual understanding of each language. That is, there were instances of coordinated practice in which teachers used only one of the two classroom languages (e.g., both teachers used Spanish exclusively), instances when each teacher maintained her designated language in parallel monolingual interaction (Heller, 1999), and others in which one or both teachers used bilingual speech (e.g., codeswitched). This meant that sometimes teachers made languaging choices that aligned with their program-based language designation, while other times they made choices that departed from such (i.e., at least one of the teachers used bilingual speech or monolingual speech in her non-designated language). With this structure in mind, I present the findings from a collaborative perspective, first looking at teachers’ joint speech as monolingual or bilingual. I subsequently highlight the ways in which each individual teacher also made particular choices about her languaging practices in her instructional work toward a particular instructional target. As such, I shed light on the intricacies of the ways that teachers’ drew on their bilingualism during instances of coordinated practices.

While enacting their bilingualism in numerous ways, teachers assumed one of two broad roles—leader or supporter—in order to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways. Several factors distinguished the roles (i.e., leader or supporter) that teachers assumed during shared books readings, including the discursive structure of interaction, including the ways that teachers drew on their bilingualism; the language in which the book was read; the instructional targets of the interaction; and the particular instructional strategies that were used.
Throughout read alouds of books read in Spanish, teachers adopted and adhered to clear roles of leader and supporter. Specifically, during a given instance of coordinated practice, typically the Spanish model enacted the role of leader and the English model the role of supporter, roles that remained static during each instance. However, upon closer investigation, teachers assumed complementary roles despite a typical leader/supporter overall relationship. For example, teachers were commonly observed to enact a seeker/provider relationship when the instructional language was English. These roles were characterized by questions and requests for information (seeker) and ways of presenting that information either for the teachers themselves or for the students (provider). Moreover, the seeker role was repeatedly enacted by the teacher whose designated language was the instructional language (e.g., the Spanish model was the seeker when the instructional language was Spanish). The ways in which teachers drew on their bilingualism and the specific instructional strategies used varied depending on these relationships pairs, and aided teachers in coordinating their practices during read alouds. There were also instances of coordinated practice during which teachers assumed co-leader roles. That is, each teacher contributed to the interaction in ways that were characteristic of equally sharing the instructional responsibilities for supporting meaning making when working toward a common purpose. In these cases, their contributions were similar in both quantity and quality.

Teachers were very focused in their selection of instructional targets as evidenced through their choice to constantly address the targets of vocabulary and story development regardless of the language of instruction. Although instances of coordinated practice addressed similar instructional targets, when books were read in English,
Interactions were generally more extended, showcased teachers either enacting similar discursive roles or exercising greater flexibility in assuming numerous roles, and involved a greater number and range of instructional strategies. Instances of coordinated practice were typically longer when students provided evidence of not understanding what was being told to or asked of them (e.g., an inappropriate response). However, when there was no indication of comprehension or miscomprehension (e.g., students did not respond to a question or students did not respond to a teacher’s statement), teachers did not attempt to engage students around that instructional target further through the use of additional instructional strategies or discourse roles. In any case, when teachers engaged in bilingual interaction (i.e., the teachers either enacted parallel monolingualism or at least one of the teachers chose to use bilingual speech), they often drew on translation as an instructional strategy.

Because the classroom context was always bilingual (i.e., there was always a teacher who modeled Spanish and one who modeled English that regularly interacted in the same activity and, thus, enacted dynamic bilingualism, and who worked with students with varying levels of bilingual proficiency), I have characterized the following sections according to the ways in which teachers engaged in authentic bilingual practices while coordinating their instructional practices.

**Bilingual Co-Teachers Drawing on One Language to Support Coordinated Practice**

The two teachers enacted their bilingualism through coordinated monolingual talk when both teachers only spoke in one of the two classroom languages (i.e., monolingual
English or monolingual Spanish). Despite monolingual talk, the context of the read aloud was still bilingual in that the teacher speaking her non-designated language (e.g., the English model using monolingual Spanish speech) showed/modelled proficiency in an additional language. In these instances of coordinated practice, the teachers showed that they were bilinguals drawing on their collective bilingualism to make meaning but choosing to use monolingual speech (in one of their languages) to engage with a bilingual interlocutor who shared her languages.

Instances of coordinated practice during which both teachers chose to engage in collective monolingual speech (i.e., both teachers spoke only one of the classroom languages) were observed when books were read in Spanish and when books were read in English. Individually, this meant that one of the teachers chose to depart from her designated language (e.g., the English model spoke in monolingual Spanish throughout an instance of coordinated practice). As such, there were instances of coordinated practice that took place entirely in Spanish and others that occurred entirely in English, although the teachers coordinated their instructional practices in unique ways depending on the target language, including a focus on the instructional target of vocabulary.

**Drawing on Monolingual Spanish to Coordinate Practice**

**Instructional targets.** Teachers were observed to coordinate their language choices to monolingual Spanish to reflect a focus on language, specifically vocabulary development, as was typical across instances of coordinated practice. This meant that,
individually, the English model chose to depart from her designated language to coordinate instruction with the Spanish model.

**Instructional strategies.** Using monolingual Spanish, she either provided a semantically-related word in monolingual Spanish for the Spanish model or affirmed a student’s response in monolingual Spanish when her partner read books in Spanish. In both cases, the English model’s participation in Spanish simultaneously showcased her receptive proficiency (i.e., she understood what was said in order to respond appropriately) as well as her expressive abilities (i.e., she provided a word to support students’ meaning making) in Spanish.

**Co-teaching relationship.** These instances were characterized by a simple question/answer exchange between only the two teachers. This exchange typified a type of seeker/provider relationship in which one teacher sought information—most often through questions—while the other served as the source of that information.

For example, during a reading of *Quinito día y noche* (Cumpiano, 2008), in order to support the students’ vocabulary building through understanding and acting out of various antonym pairs, the Spanish model demonstrated opposites (subir/bajar *[up/down]*) by standing up and sitting down, and inviting students to do the same, which served to reinforce relevant vocabulary.

1  SpM  [asked of EngM] ¿Cuál era la otra palabra? [i.e., another pair of words]

(What was the other word?)
This excerpt exemplifies how the teachers acted together, working toward the same instructional target (i.e., vocabulary) and using complementary instructional strategies (i.e., the Spanish model’s questions and the English model’s provision of an appropriate response in the activity’s target language, Spanish) while drawing productively on only Spanish throughout the entire instance of coordinated practice. The Spanish model first asked the English model to recall information (line 1), and the English model provided an appropriate answer (line 2) in Spanish, keeping the line of questioning on track without any pauses. This was made possible by drawing on her bilingualism—understanding the Spanish model’s question in Spanish and responding accurately in monolingual Spanish, the target instructional language in this activity. This exchange then served as a model for
the Spanish teacher’s next question (line 4), which is answered appropriately by a student (line 5).

**Drawing on Monolingual English to Coordinate Practice**

Teachers were observed to engage in coordinated monolingual English interactions only when the focal book was read in English.

**Instructional targets.** In these instances of coordinated practice, the Spanish model departed from her designated language to support the English model’s pronunciation of a word in English and the related development of students’ understanding of the word itself, and to target students’ growing understanding of story events.

**Instructional strategies.** While coordinating their languaging practices to monolingual English and addressing the instructional targets listed above, teachers provided a pronunciation of a word, explained relevant information, and rephrased each other’s contributions.

**Co-teaching relationship.** As was the case when teachers chose to use monolingual Spanish to coordinate their practices, teachers were observed to enact a seeker/provider relationship as they coordinated their practices using monolingual English. In this case, however, the roles were reversed. That is, the English model assumed the role of seeker, and the Spanish model assumed the role of provider.
In the two excerpts below, from a reading of *The Little Mouse, the Red Ripe Strawberry, and the Big Hungry Bear* (Wood & Wood, 1984), teachers worked collaboratively to support students’ acquisition of new vocabulary. The first instance of coordinated practice shows the teachers drawing on monolingual English to settle on an accurate pronunciation of the word *guarding*.

1 EngM So let’s see… [turns the page and gasps] … or who is “gwarding” it>. [She is reading “guarding” but pronounces it “gwarding”]

2 SpM <Oh oh> [said in the way one would say “uh oh”, almost as if to call attention to what she’s seeing now that EngM reveals the new page].

3 EngM Oh look! [She pauses] Guarding? [She’s still looking at the word on the page].

4 SpM Guarding.

5 EngM Guarding.

6 SpM <Guarding>.

7 EngM a<Guarding>. bGuarding.

This initial portion of the interaction was enacted entirely in English, to model for children a focal word’s pronunciation in English. The English model first stumbled on the word *guarding* (line 1) and subsequently asked for (i.e., sought) verification that she had pronounced the word accurately (line 3), evidence of her awareness that her message must be comprehensible for the other participants to appropriately receive the
information she was attempting to communicate. The Spanish model provided a pronunciation for the focal word (line 4), which was repeated by the English model (line 5), and then uttered simultaneously by both teachers (lines 6 and 7a) before the English model stated the word once more (line 7b), signaling her satisfaction that this pronunciation would be comprehensible for herself, the Spanish model, and the students.

The Spanish model teacher also used monolingual English to explain/rephrase when the English model asked questions while reading books in English. The Spanish model’s use of monolingual English supported a collaborative focus on story events as the Spanish model rephrased some of the English model’s utterances, providing greater opportunities for students to make meaning of the events transpiring in the story by hearing information presented in various ways. This dynamic highlighted a seeker/clarifier relationship when productively drawing on monolingual English. Below, during the same reading of *The Little Mouse, the Red Ripe Strawberry, and the Big Hungry Bear* (Wood & Wood, 1984) the English model asked a “Why” question, challenging the students to consider the cause (i.e., the character knew he would have to share) that led to a particular result (i.e., so he cut the strawberry in half).

1 EngM Oh, so he’s cutting the strawberry in *<two>* , in half.

2 SpM *<Two halves>*.

3 EngM That’s right. We have one strawberry and we’re cutting it in half. That’s right.

4 Stu1 Makes two best friends.

5 EngM Why do you have to cut it in half?
Because the bear wants to eat one and the mouse wants to eat one. They’re both eating one.

<showing interest in what Stu2 just said>

That could be an idea.

They’re <sharing>.

<Because> the mouse can have half and the bear can have another one, and the other half.

That would be sharing [says to student sitting next to her].

Together, through their use of monolingual English and incremental additions to each other’s utterances, the teachers attempted to support students’ understanding of the events in the story, thereby coordinating their practice. The English model set the stage by summarizing what had just occurred in the book (line 1). The Spanish model then provided a morphological variation of the word half (line 2; halves), both clarifying and confirming the English model’s first utterance. After establishing that the strawberry was cut in half—affirming the Spanish model’s utterance (line 3)—and listening to the first student’s contribution (line 4), the English model asked a question that required students to identify the cause (line 5) for the strawberry having been cut in half. Stu2 provided an appropriate response (line 6), and the Spanish model used a discourse marker (line 7; Mmmm) to show her interest and desire to hear more. The English model also confirmed Stu2’s contribution (line 8), to which the Spanish model added information, naming the action (line 9; sharing) provided by Stu2 (line 6). The English model then built on the
Spanish model’s utterance, explaining how the two characters could share (line 10), which is confirmed by the Spanish model in her final utterance (line 11).

**Bilingual Co-Teachers Drawing on Two Languages to Support Coordinated Practice**

Throughout instances of coordinated practice, teachers drew both collectively and individually on bilingual speech. In some cases, each teacher used a different language to coordinate practice, which led to collective bilingual speech, while in other cases, at least one teacher produced bilingual speech (i.e., codeswitched) in her work toward an instructional target. The teachers were observed to coordinate their practices by drawing on translation as an instructional strategy while most commonly addressing the instructional target of story events regardless of the language of instruction.

**Coordinating Instructional Targets and Strategies through Parallel Monolingual Speech in Designated Languages**

When both teachers maintained their designated language, a languaging practice only observed when books were read in Spanish, they engaged in parallel monolingualism (Heller, 1999), or a linguistic practice in which two speakers effectively communicate in what are commonly recognized as two autonomous languages.

**Instructional targets.** While each teacher chose to use monolingual speech to address a particular instructional target during these instances of coordinated practice,
they collectively produced bilingual speech. Moreover, although each teacher spoke monolingually, she interacted bilingually, modeling her receptive proficiency in her non-designated language (e.g., the Spanish model listening to and comprehending monolingual English talk) and her expressive proficiency in her designated language (e.g., the English model engaging in monolingual English talk). Teachers were observed enacting this form of collective bilingualism while focusing on (1) characteristic events and typical attributes and (2) story events.

**Instructional strategies.** The teachers were observed to ask questions and translate each other’s contributions regardless of the instructional target(s) being addressed. However, teachers also highlighted student participation and asked related key questions that maintained the flow of the interaction when addressing the instructional targets of characteristic events and typical attributes, and also provided explanations for students when addressing the instructional target of story events.

**Co-teaching relationships.** While collaboratively addressing the instructional target of characteristic events and typical attributes while enacting parallel monolingualism, the teachers enacted a relationship in which the Spanish model assumed the role of seeker and the English model the role of facilitator. However, when addressing the instructional target of story events, both teachers assumed seeker and clarifier roles.

In the example below from *El granjero Simón*, the teachers collaboratively addressed the instructional target of typical attributes by highlighting student participation, translating, and asking relevant questions to support students’ meaning-
making. The Spanish model led a discussion of the necessary elements for plants to grow, and students responded in both Spanish and English.

1. SpM ¿Qué necesitan las semillas [slight pause] para crecer? [she puts one finger in the air]
   
   *(What do the seeds need to grow?)*

2. Stu1 Agua.
   
   *(Water.)*

3. SpM [holding finger up 2 fingers in air] *Agua.* ¿Qué más?
   
   *(Water. What else?)*

4. Stu2 Sun!

5. SpM *El sol, o luz.* [adds one more finger to make 3] ¿Qué más?
   
   *(The sun, or light. What else?)*

6. Stu1 Dirt.

7. SpM *Tierra.* Y lo más importante… [SpM now has 4 fingers in the air]
   
   *(Dirt. And the most important…)*


9. Stu3 Space!

10. EngM Space [SpM begins to talk at same time].

11. SpM *Espacio.* Porque si las semillas no tienen espacio, ¿qué va a pasar? ¿Van a crecer?

   *(Space. Because if the seeds don’t have space, what will happen? Will they grow?)*
12  Stu3  No.

13  SpM  Se quedan ahí [points downward with hand]. Y el tallo se queda y no crece más.

(They stay like they are. The stem stays and doesn't grow any more.)

14  Stu4  Breathe. And breathe.

15  EngM  [points towards Manuel] aOh, that’s right! bHow can they breathe [if they’re too close to each other]?

16  SpM  [now also pointing in affirmation at Stu4] ¡El aire! ¡Nos faltó eso! El aire es importante, porque si el aire no seca la semilla, el agua se queda ahí y se va a ahogar. La semilla no crece.

(Air! We forgot air! The air is important, because if the air doesn’t dry the seeds, the water will stay and drown the seed. The seed won’t grow.)

[SpM returns to reading.]

The teachers’ drawing productively on their respective designated languages supported a bilingual space for interaction. The Spanish model began the interaction by asking what plants need to grow (line 1) and followed each student utterance by first repeating their appropriate answer (lines 3a, 5a, 7a) and then asking for other possible answers (lines 3b, 5b, 7b). On two occasions (lines 5a, 7a), the Spanish model translated students’ contributions, expanding students’ bilingual vocabulary. Although Stu2’s second appropriate contribution went unnoticed (line 8), both teachers acknowledged and affirmed Stu3’s utterance (line 9). The English model used monolingual English (line 10)
and the Spanish model used Spanish (line 11), which served as a translation (line 11a) and extension of Stu3’s utterance/original thought and request to explain a cause and effect relationship (line 11b). Following Stu3’s inappropriate response to the Spanish model’s questions, the Spanish model provided the explanation to the cause and effect relationship (line 13). Stu4 added an incomplete thought (line 14) to which the English model confirmed his response (line 15a) in English and then asked a rhetorical question (line 15b) that supported both Stu4’s contribution and the Spanish model’s previous question and response regarding a cause and effect relationship. The Spanish model responded by taking up and expanding (line 16) the explanation that the English model had begun to construct.

In another example, this time from Moonbear’s Shadow (Asch, 2000; “read” in Spanish although written in English), the class engaged in a conversation of story events regarding the position of a character’s shadow, given the location of the sun. Both teachers interacted with the students by asking questions, translating each other, and providing explanations to address the instructional target of story events.

1  SpM    [Reading] “Y el osito no veía su sombra por ninguna parte.”

(“The little bear didn’t see his shadow anywhere.”)

2  Stu1   And it’s gonna be there [pointing to the bear].

3  SpM    ¿Su sombra se fue?

(His shadow went away?)

4  EngM   Why?
¿Sí? [She looks at the book, then exclaims] Mira, ¡solución al problema!

Yeah? Look, solution to the problem!

No!

Si, porque ya no hay sombra.

Yes, because there’s no shadow now.

Look, there is no shadow [while pointing towards the book to direct Stu2’s attention].

Ya su sombra se fue.

His shadow already went away.

It’s going to be here.

Where?

El sol está encima de él. El sol está encima de él. Ya su sombra se fue.

The sun is over him. His shadow already went away.

Throughout the interaction, the English model maintained her use of monolingual English and the Spanish model maintained her use of monolingual Spanish. Each teacher began with a question (lines 3 and 4), translated each other’s contributions (lines 7, 8, 9), and the Spanish model concluded with an explanation (line 12).
In addition to drawing on their collective bilingualism via parallel monolingualism, there were also instances of coordinated practice in which one or both teachers codeswitched, producing bilingual speech. The next section details these practices.

**Coordinating Instructional Targets and Strategies through Codeswitching**

Each teacher engaged in bilingual speech (i.e., codeswitched) both across and within instances of coordinated practice. One some occasions, only the Spanish model used bilingual speech, while on other occasions, only the English model used bilingual speech. There were also times when both teachers produced bilingual speech to interact with each other and the students. The instructional targets that teachers addressed and strategies that supported them distinguished these languaging practices.

**One teacher’s bilingual speech to support coordinated practice.** In addition to the previous two types of monolingual productive language (i.e., an entirely monolingual instance of coordinated practice, or one of parallel monolingualism), there were instances of teachers’ coordinated practice during which only one teacher codeswitched, both when books were read in Spanish and when books were read in English. As was the case with parallel monolingualism, throughout this languaging practice (bilingual speech), each teacher drew on translation as an instructional strategy to address a number of instructional targets, most notably story events.

**Coordinating practice through the English model’s bilingual speech.** The English model was observed to engage in the use of bilingual speech only once when the
Spanish model was reading a book in Spanish and several times as she read a book in English. I first detail the findings related to the instance of coordinated practice observed when the instructional language was Spanish and subsequently do so when the instructional language was English.

**Instructional target, strategies, and co-teaching relationship when the book was read in Spanish.** The English model was observed once to choose to use bilingual speech to support the instructional target of vocabulary when the book was read in Spanish, which provided students with an opportunity to hear a definition presented bilingually. The English model drew on bilingual speech to reinforce, translate, and define key vocabulary as both teachers addressed the instructional target of vocabulary. The Spanish model assumed the role of seeker and the English model assumed the role of confirmer, which meant that the Spanish model provided information for the students, while the English model reinforced the Spanish model’s contributions (using bilingual speech).

In the example below, the Spanish model read a page where a ball bounced off a tree and returned to the character that rolled it. While the Spanish model was reading, the English model set up a wooden block and a ball in the middle of the read aloud circle. The excerpt begins after the Spanish model finished reading and focused on supporting the students’ vocabulary acquisition.

1    **SpM**    La pelota rebota. Así va a ser cuando tropieza con algo, la pelota va a devolverse. Mira.

*(The ball bounces. That’s what happens when it runs into something: the ball is going to come back. Watch.)*
[She demonstrates by rolling a small ball against a wooden block.]

2  SpM  Rebotó. ¿Viste?

(It bounced. Did you see?)

[She does it again.]

3  SpM  Rebota. Que se revuelve.

(It bounces. It comes back.)

4  EngM  aRebotar. bWhen it goes back. [EngM flicks her pen to the side to show the direction of the ball.]

Through a strategic use of bilingualism and drawing on similar instructional strategies, the teachers coordinated their practice to reflect their focus on vocabulary acquisition. The Spanish model provided several morphological variations of the verb (line 1 [rebota], line 2 [rebotó]), physically showed students what the action looked like (after lines 1 and 2), and provided a definition (line 1 [is going to come back] and 3 [It comes back]). The English model then reinforced the focal vocabulary word by repeating it (line 4a) and subsequently codeswitching to translate the definition (line 4b) as she provided another visual representation for the students. The English model’s provision of another morphological variation of the focal word and definition in English— instructional strategies and discourse practices that aligned with the pattern first presented by the Spanish model—provided students with further opportunity for meaning making.

*Instructional target, strategies, and co-teaching relationship when the book was read in English.* Similarly drawing on codeswitching to support the instructional target of story events while reading in English, it was a commonly observed practice for the English model to ask students to make an inference, clarify student statements, draw
student attention to the book and its illustrations, make connections to other books, and translate her own and the Spanish model’s contributions to the conversation. In these instances of coordinated practice, both the English model and Spanish model assumed the role of seeker, primarily asking students to make connections and provide information. The example below shows the teachers engaging the students in a task that the focal book showcased: trying to move a pile of books by blowing on it.

1 EngM Push it so it will roll.

2 SpM [Refers to another book that they’ve read recently (Mapache solito)] ¿Se acuerda entonces de…de…de Mapache? ¿Qué pasó con lo de Mapache?

(Do you remember Mapache? What happened with Mapache?)

3 EngM What happened?

4 SpM O ¿de Óscar y el grillo? ¿Se movía la pelota o empujaba la pelota?

(Or Oscar and the Cricket? Did the ball move or was it pushed?)

5 EngM Do you remember?

6 SpM a¿Qué pasaba con la de la pelota? b¿Se movía sola o una empujada?

(What happened with the ball? Did it move on its own or was it pushed?)

7 Stu1 La empujada XX se empuja.

(The push [indistinguishable] is pushed.)

8 EngM Good.

9 SpM Se mueve [nodding].
(It moves.)

10 EngM aThat’s right. bCuando se empuja, se empuja [she meant to say se mueve].

(When it’s pushed, it’s pushed.)

11 SpM Se mueve.

(It moves.)

Throughout the interaction, each teacher sought information by questioning students and challenging them to make connections to prior learning to support their understanding of the story’s events. After the English model asked a student to push the cylindrical block on the floor to mimic an event from the focal book (line 1), the Spanish model asked students to make a connection, recalling a similar event from other books that the class has read (line 2). The two teachers—with the English model codeswitching—asked a series of closed (lines 4, 5, 6b) and open-ended (lines 3, 6a) questions to scaffold students’ understanding of events that had transpired across several texts. The English model took up language used by the Spanish model and a student to explain a cause and effect relationship and to build students’ background knowledge (line 10b). This point is particularly important, because the English model’s use of bilingual speech provided an accurate syntactic structure in Spanish for Stu1, who was making a connection guided originally by the Spanish model’s monolingual Spanish questions, and the rest of the class while simultaneously maintaining the flow of the interaction.

**Coordinating practice through the Spanish model’s bilingual speech.** The Spanish model was also observed to engage in the use of bilingual speech once she read a book in Spanish and multiple times when the English model read a book in English.
Instructional target, strategies, and co-teaching relationship when the book was read in Spanish. Similar to the English model, the Spanish model chose to draw on bilingual speech as teachers were working toward the instructional target of story events when reading in Spanish. In this case, observed only once, the teachers coordinated their practices by assuming the roles of seeker and clarifier-confirm, as the Spanish model led the interaction by asking for information, and the English model first questioned students to better understand their contribution and then confirmed student responses. In the following example from Moonbear’s Shadow (Asch, 2000; “read” in Spanish although written in English), the bear in the book was trying to catch his shadow with a fishing pole, but he aimed towards the sun, not the shadow. The Spanish model asked questions to guide students’ understanding of story events, particularly how the position of the bear’s shadow relied on the location of the sun.

1  SpM  ¿La sombra estaba en frente del osito?
   (Was the shadow in front of the bear?)

2  Stu1  Sí.
   (Yes.)

3  SpM  ¿O detrás del osito?
   (Or behind the bear?)

4  Stu2  Detrás del osito.
   (Behind the bear.)

5  SpM  ¿Por qué?
   (Why?)

[Stu3 stands up and points at the top corner of the page. Stu3 points out that the sun is in
front of him (i.e., he cannot catch the shadow when he’s aiming at the sun)].

6 Stu3 XX del osito.

   (indistinguishable] the bear’s.)

7 EngM Why, [Stu3]?

8 Stu3 The sun is here [points where sun is located in illustration].

9 SpM Porque el sol está en frente del osito. Si el sol está detrás, tu

   sombra se va a proyectar en frente. Pero si el sol está delante, en

   frente de ti, la sombra se va proyectar atrás. O se va reflejar atrás.

   (Because the sun is in front of the bear. If the sun is behind [you],

   your shadow will be in front of you. But if the sol is in front [of

   you], the shadow will be behind. Or it will be reflected behind

   you.)

10 EngM aSo [Stu3] was right. bBecause of the sun.

11 SpM Because of the sun.

The teachers worked cohesively, with the Spanish model asking information-seeking

questions, the English model asking students to clarify their responses, and both teachers

confirming a student’s accurate response, the Spanish model doing so by departing from

her designated language. After the Spanish model received conflicting answers (lines 2

and 4) to her first two questions (lines 1 and 3), she first attempted to build background

knowledge by targeting the story’s events with instructional strategies including asking

the students to explain a cause and effect relationship (lines 5). Stu3 replied with a

gesture and an utterance, but because the utterance was mostly indistinguishable (line 6),

the English model asked the student to clarify her response (line 7). Stu3’s response was
appropriate, but only partially complete (line 8), and the Spanish model subsequently provided a full explanation of the cause and effect relationship for the students (line 9) in Spanish. In listening to the Spanish model’s explanation for the position of the bear’s shadow, the English model affirmed Stu3’s successful meaning making (line 10a) in English and added a translation of the cause of the position of the shadow (line 10b). The Spanish model’s final utterance (line 11) in English served as a repetition of the English model’s previous monolingual English utterance (line 10), confirming the accuracy of the utterance.

*Instructional target, strategies, and co-teaching relationship when the book was read in English.* In addition to drawing on bilingual speech once when a book was read in Spanish, the Spanish model commonly chose to draw on bilingual speech as teachers were working toward the instructional targets of phonological awareness, vocabulary, and story events when the English model read one of the focal books in English. The Spanish model contributed to supporting these collaborative instructional targets by providing a definition (in Spanish) of the vocabulary word and a subsequent pronunciation (in English). In the read aloud of *The Little Mouse, the Red Ripe Strawberry, and the Big Hungry Bear* (Wood & Wood, 1984), after the teachers had confirmed with one another the standard U.S. English pronunciation of the word *guarding*, they continued to target vocabulary and story events by asking several questions about the mouse’s actions. In the excerpt below, the teachers react to the students’ responses related to the meaning of the word *guarding*. They drew on different instructional strategies, and the Spanish model used codeswitching, to enact a provider/provider relationship.
Es como <guardar, como guardiando>.

(It’s like to guard, like guarding.)

<Who is, yeah>, who is… guarding is who watch- someone that is watching. For example, the mouse is like [pauses] taking care, taking care of the strawberries, you see, he’s taking care.

He locked it.

Yes, he locked it and said “let me… guarding…[she looks at SpM] guarding, guarding.

Guarding, guarding [SpM nods her head as they repeat it together]

[reading the page in the book] “Guard it.”

He locked it, he locked it in the in the cage?

He’s protecting. He’s making sure that no one is going to take the strawberries.

By flexibly drawing on her bilingual speech, the Spanish model accomplished a number of tasks, providing information to both the English model and students. Both teachers provided a definition (lines 18, 19a, 25a) and used a character’s actions from the book to supply a textual example (lines 19b, 20, 25b) to support students’ understanding of cause and effect relationships occurring in the story that had the potential to build their understanding of the focal word guarding. Additionally, when the Spanish model
provided a definition (line 18), she strategically (although implicitly) highlighted the word’s cognate status (i.e., guard/guardar) by translating it to Spanish, providing an opportunity for students to make cross-linguistic connections. In the English model’s next turn (line 19), she then loosely translated what the Spanish model had said. Later, the English model again checks her pronunciation of guarding (line 21), and the Spanish model accompanied her attempts (line 22), providing the pronunciation again in English to serve as a model both for the English model and for the students.

**Coordinating practice through both teachers’ use of bilingual speech.** Only once did both teachers draw on bilingual speech within the same instance of coordinated practice. They did so to address the collaborative instructional target of vocabulary development by focusing on a character’s actions, again using translation as an instructional strategy. Following the above instance of coordinated practice, both teachers engaged in the use of bilingual speech. The English model took up the idea of how the mouse was guarding his strawberry instead of what exactly guarding was. Thus, her focus changed to the items present in the illustration on the page in the book, thumbtacks that were carefully placed all around the strawberry.

In the excerpt below, the teachers worked together to support students’ understanding of another key vocabulary word, tachuelas (thumbtacks), in order to ultimately support their awareness of the mouse’s behavior and choice he made at the conclusion of the story. Through a typically observed seeker (English model)/provider (Spanish model) relationship when the instructional language was English and a series of
complementary instructional strategies and use of bilingual speech, the teachers attempted to support students’ understanding of *tachuelas*.

1. **EngM** If you get closer, you will see something.

2. **Stu1** There’s going to be a bear.

3. **EngM** ¿Cómo se dice tachuelas?

   *(How do you say tacks?)*

4. **SpM** X tachuelas para allí.

   *([indistinguishable] tacks over there.)*

   [SpM leaves circle.]

5. **EngM** Esto [she points to the picture in the book of the thumbtack]. But if you get closer, you will see something. He is putting something on the floor.

   *(This.)*

6. **Stu3** Oh, I know what’s that. A building.

   [SpM returns to circle and opens a small box up, from which EngM takes a thumbtack.]

7. **SpM** *a*[to EngM] Thumbtacks. [to students] These are thumbtacks. *b*En español, tachuelas.

   *(In Spanish, thumbtacks.)*
8 Stu1 Let’s see. [He sits up and peers closer to what the teachers are holding]

9 Stu3 Be careful, they’re pinchy! Be careful!

10 EngM Look. Yes.

11 Stu3 Be careful!

12 EngM These are called thumbtacks. Let me show you. [She takes a thumbtack and holds it out for children to see, going around the read-aloud circle]

Throughout the interaction, each teacher modeled her comprehension of the other’s oral language and ability to communicate bilingually to draw on a number of instructional strategies to support students’ understanding of a potentially new word. The English model first drew students’ attention to the illustration (line 1) and then asked the class, including the Spanish model, to label (line 3; ¿Cómo se dice tachuelas? [How do you say tacks?]) after receiving an inappropriate response from a student (line 2; while there is mention of a bear throughout the story, the bear is never depicted in the illustrations). The Spanish model’s response (line 4) and departure from the circle showed that she had made a connection, even though she did not yet provide information to appropriately respond to the English model’s question. The English model again prompted students to use the illustrations (line 5), but another student responded with an inappropriate answer (line 6). The Spanish model returned and provided a real-life tachuela (i.e., a text-to-world connection/realia) and key bilingually (line 7; These are thumbtacks. En español, tachuelas.). Although the English model was officially responsible for teaching through
English, she modeled her bilingualism by asking for a translation of the focal word *tachuelas* in Spanish. The appropriate responses from Stu3 (lines 9 and 11) showed that connections were being made. The English model then took up these appropriate responses (lines 10 and 12).

**Conclusion**

This chapter documented the ways that the focal teacher pair enacted collective and individual bilingualism as they engaged in instances of coordinated practice during large group shared book readings. Findings show that the language choices teachers made supported their instructional practices toward a particular instructional target (although particularly vocabulary and story events). These choices were then supported through the use of numerous instructional strategies, most commonly translation.

Within a model of collective bilingualism, teachers made individual choices regarding whether to use monolingual or bilingual speech. That is, there were instances of coordinated practice in which one teacher maintained her designated language and the other teacher departed from her target language, resulting in a monolingual interaction; and instances during which each teacher produced only monolingual speech in her designated language, or one or both teachers used bilingual speech, resulting in bilingual interaction. When the instructional language was English, teachers often assumed the roles of seeker and provider, with the teacher whose designated language was the instructional language taking on the seeker role.
Teachers chose to draw on monolingual Spanish to work collaboratively toward the instructional target of vocabulary only when books were read in Spanish. As such, the English model departed from her designated language and used monolingual Spanish to provide a semantically-related word for the Spanish model or to affirm a student’s response. Teachers engaged in monolingual English interactions when the focal book was read in English in support of students’ vocabulary acquisition and developing understanding of story events.

Teachers were observed to engage in parallel monolingualism (Heller, 1999) while coordinating practices around characteristic events and typical attributes by drawing attention to student participation and asking key questions, and story events through questions translation and explanations when books were read in Spanish.

Each teacher chose to use bilingual speech when books were read in English and when books were read in Spanish. The English model only produced bilingual speech once to coordinate practice around vocabulary when the Spanish model read a book in Spanish. However, she used bilingual speech more often when she read the focal book in English when coordinating practice with the Spanish model around story events. The Spanish model was also observed to produce bilingual speech only once to address story events as she read a focal book in Spanish. She enacted bilingual speech during multiple instances of coordinated practice when one of the focal books was read in English to coordinate practice with the English model around the instructional targets of phonological awareness, vocabulary, and story events. Finally, both teachers chose to use bilingual speech on one occasion to work collaboratively to support students in their vocabulary development.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

In the previous chapter, I presented findings that evidenced how the two teachers in this study drew on their bilingualism in various ways that supported their coordination of instructional targets through the use of numerous instructional strategies. In this chapter, I ask why these findings matter and how they enhance our thinking about teachers’ translanguage practices, both as researchers and as classroom teachers.

Because “[communication] requires the coordinated action of all the participants” (Clark & Brennan, 1991, p. 223), and because coordinated practice requires working cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways, co-teachers must not only believe that they have expressed themselves in a comprehensible manner, but they must also receive that same message from the others with whom they are engaged in conversation/instruction (Clark & Brennan, 1991; Friend & Cook, 2010). With monolinguals, this may occur as a result of particular discourse markers, such as uh huh, mhm, yeah, ok, and alright (Bangerter & Clark, 2003), that alert interlocutors to subtle agreements or changes in direction of the conversation. Furthermore, monolinguals engaging in conversation may ask questions to clarify, modify, restate, or reinforce the original message; provide extra information; or define words/phrases, to name a few practices known to support effective communication. However, the ante is upped when bilinguals interact. “[The languages of bilinguals] do not exist in different worlds, or even domains[,] they function as part of an entire linguistic repertoire, in interrelationship, to make meaning” (García, 2013, p. 111). Thus, when bilinguals interact, their linguistic repertoire allows for the enactment of the
same practices mentioned above in the same ways that monolinguals do and for an arguably more sophisticated set of practices, which includes drawing on both languages in dynamic ways (García, 2009a, 2009b, 2013; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2005). Consequently, in order to begin to jointly make meaning in a bilingual academic context wherein there is a pair of co-teachers and a group of students (e.g., the DL bilingual education preschool classroom in this study), it is imperative that teachers draw on all of the [linguistic] resources at their disposal as well as that of the students, a practice that may be accomplished through translanguaging.

Hence, the central goal of this study was to explore the ways that a pair of DL bilingual education preschool co-teachers drew on their bilingualism as they coordinated their instructional practices during large group shared book readings. This chapter draws on the connected notions of effective communication (Clark & Brennan, 1991) and effective collaborative classroom practices (Friend & Cook, 2003, 2010), and translanguaging (García 2009a, 2009b, 2013; García & Kleifgen, 2010) to understand and interpret the findings of this study.

Bilinguals translangua to include and facilitate communication with others, but also to construct deeper understandings and make sense of their bilingual worlds (García, 2009a). In this study, due to the simultaneous use of Spanish and English, both teachers were always translanguaging. “Translanguaging…refers not simply to a shift between two languages, but to the use of complex discursive practices that cannot be assigned to one or another code” (García, 2013, p. 112). To enact a translanguaging pedagogy means to flexibly incorporate students’ languaging practices in order to develop new understandings and new language practices, which include academic language practices
(García, 2013). As recent research has shown (e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Martínez, 2010; Palmer & Martinez, 2013), for teachers of emergent bilinguals, this means that they must not only be aware of the way that their students language, but also that they themselves must encourage and/or participate in those languaging practices.

The call to encourage and/or participate in the languaging practices of bilinguals and emergent bilinguals necessitates an ideological reframing of language as a noun to language as a verb. This reconceptualization of language shows that bilinguals do language (García, 2013)—that they engage in dynamic practices that draw on their linguistic resources in ways that monolinguals cannot. García (2009a, 2009b, 2013) proposes this shift in an effort to position teachers (and researchers) to recognize the complexity with which bilinguals use their languages. For example, recall from chapter 1 that bilinguals may read a text in one language and discuss it in another, brainstorm ideas in one language and record them in another, or engage in a conversation wherein one interlocutor chooses to use monolingual speech from one of her languages and the other interlocutor chooses to use monolingual speech from the other language (i.e., parallel monolingualism; Heller, 1999). Moreover, the ways in which bilinguals draw on their bilingualism are always changing. As students develop bilingual proficiency, they are expected to language in different ways in order to make meaning when interacting (i.e., speaking and listening) with their fellow interlocutors. While it is impossible to say whether the teachers in this study could articulate this paradigm shift, their languaging practices showed a pedagogy that drew on bilingualism in intricate and meaningful ways in order to address a common instructional target. The documentation of this teacher pair’s practices in this study adds to our collective knowledge of teachers’ instructional
practices by highlighting the ways that co-teachers translanguage in order to coordinate their practices both between each other and for students.

**Translanguaging for Pedagogical Purposes: Teachers’ Use of Bilingualism to Coordinate Instructional Targets and Practices**

The presence of both teachers in the classroom, and their coordinated practices, added to the way that previous studies have examined the discourse of teacher-student interactions by showing that the work of both teachers drawing on their bilingualism in coordinating their instructional practices may have enhanced their ability to support meaning making for students. That is, only one teacher may not have been able to support students’ meaning making as effectively as two. Whereas one teacher must rely on only herself (and occasionally input from students) to determine whether she is creating comprehensible messages, actually being understood, and understanding students’ responses, two teachers can rely on each other for these tasks. In this study, each teacher was not only attempting to make herself understood to the other teacher or to the students; she was also charged with making communication—and interactions—effective (1) between teachers, (2) between herself and the students, and (3) among all of the students, the other teacher, and herself. Although previous studies have explored the ways that two participants have engaged in effective communication (e.g., from a discursive perspective as in Bangerter & Clark, 2003, and Clark & Brennan, 1991) or one teacher and multiple students engaged in effective communication (e.g., a scaffolding perspective as in dePalma, 2010; Pérez, 2004; Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson,
2013), the present study investigated the ways in which two teachers supported each other’s efforts in coordinating their practices between each other and with students. Having two teachers work collaboratively created a type of triangular discourse structure, one in which the teachers first made themselves understood to each other to, in turn, make themselves understood to the students. After a message was received by students—in the result of a joint message from both teachers or a message from only one teacher—the teachers had to work together to understand the students’ response(s).

Moreover, teachers engaged in practices that are characteristic of effective communication (e.g., asking clarification questions of each other and of students, providing additional information, rephrasing questions and statements, and confirming student responses) in an effort to appropriately support students’ meaning making for a common purpose (e.g., to acquire new vocabulary). These practices included drawing on their own and students’ bilingualism. Findings show that teachers’ strategic use of translanguaging practices was characteristic of the ways that teachers have been documented to enact dynamic bilingualism while engaging in effective communication, a critical aspect of coordinating practices (i.e., engaging in joint projects; Clark & Brennan, 1991). Examples include alternating conversational turns (Morocco & Aguilar, 2002), repeating phrases and employing the same gestures with students (Roth et al., 2005), translating key vocabulary, using suggestive tags (e.g., “Right?”; Kibler, 2011), seeking factual information (Muller & Beardsmoore, 2004), and using bilingual speech to explain (Reyes, 2008) and to provide definitions (Tsai & García, 2000). Translanguaging, in its multiple manifestations, proved to facilitate conversation between co-teachers and among the teachers and the students while simultaneously working to support students’ meaning
making. For example, the teachers were observed to seek information from each other by asking questions. When this occurred, the teacher providing the requested information departed from her designated language. Without the presence of a second teacher who understood both instructional languages, the first teacher may have experienced a breakdown in communication, possibly hampering her ability to create a comprehensible message to students. There were also instances when one teacher clarified student input (e.g., a response to a teacher question) for the other teacher by serving as a type of mediator while drawing on her bilingualism. Because there were two teachers present, and because both teachers were bilinguals, they were able to engage in interactions in either/both language/s with each other and the students. There were still other instances of coordinated practice during which one teacher attempted to engage students (e.g., she asked a question or gave an indirect command), a student provided a response, and the second teacher asked the student to clarify her statement. One can assume that if a teacher could not make meaning from a student’s response that there were students who experienced the same difficulty. In a classroom with only one teacher, she may have understood the students’ response, missing an opportunity to ask the student to clarify her utterance for other students. This study shows that the presence of two bilingual teachers may support multiple comprehension checks (if the student’s message is not clear, at least one of the teachers will likely ask for clarification), made possible through the comprehension (listening to student input) and production (asking for clarification) of two languages.

Beyond teachers’ translanguaging contributing to effective communication, a component of coordinating their practices, teachers’ use of dynamic bilingualism (i.e.,
drawing on their own and students’ full linguistic repertoires) supported the coordination of their instructional targets and instructional practices. These instances of coordinated practice show teachers taking on multiple discursive roles—ones that support meaning making between the two of them and ones that support meaning making for students, further evidence that translanguaging in the classroom is a way of making sense of content and learning language (Sayer, 2012).

Engaging in, and therefore modeling, dynamic bilingualism as a pair provided students with an authentic bilingual experience and may support their meaning making in ways that languaging monolingually could not afford. Whereas previous research has shown how one teacher engaged in bilingual practices during instruction, these findings show how two (co)teachers drew on bilingualism to address specific instructional targets while using complementary instructional strategies enabled the coordination observed in the focal read aloud activities, a new perspective in the study of co-teaching.

Teachers’ languaging choices included both monolingual and bilingual speech. The two teachers enacted their bilingualism through collective monolingual talk when both teachers chose to only speak one of the two classroom languages (e.g., monolingual English or monolingual Spanish). However, despite monolingual talk, the context of the read aloud was still bilingual in that the teacher speaking her non-designated language (e.g., the English model using monolingual Spanish) modeled proficiency in an additional language by comprehending and producing it. Teachers’ production of collective monolingual speech modeled for students that bilinguals occasionally language monolingually, especially in academic contexts, as has been previously documented (e.g., Arthur, 1996; Auleear Owodally, 2012; Kang, 2008; Martin et al., 2006; McGlynn &
Martin, 2009; Probyn, 2009). This specific type of languaging provided students with a model whereby they could learn that certain contexts require the use of only one of their languages.

Teachers’ collaborative use of monolingual Spanish occurred only when the focal book was read in Spanish, and teachers’ choice to draw collaboratively on monolingual English was observed only when the focal book was read in English. It is noteworthy that teachers were observed to engage in collective monolingual languaging practices only in the activity’s target language. It may be that teachers repeatedly chose this type of languaging (i.e., enacting their collective monolingualism) to address vocabulary in the activity’s focal instructional language in order provide the monolingual context typically represented in dual language settings (Christian, 1996). Although such a strategy may be used to reinforce a potentially new key term in the activity’s target language, teachers may miss an opportunity to use bilingual speech (either collective or individual) to draw on students’ bilingualism, pointing out cognates and providing bilingual definitions and examples.

Teachers engaged in collective bilingual interactions in several ways. First, there were instances in which teachers maintained their designated language, creating instances of parallel monolingualism (Heller, 1999). Second, either the Spanish model or the English model produced bilingual speech. Finally, there was one instance in which both teachers drew on their bilingualism by choosing to use bilingual speech. In each of these languaging practices, teachers drew primarily on translation as an instructional strategy, showing that they took advantage of the bilingual context that their flexible language use allowed.
The finding that teachers translated each other’s contributions is of particular interest given our understanding of translation as a contested instructional method (Legaretta, 1979; Phillipson, 1992). Traditionally, and especially in the foreign language literature, translation has been viewed negatively. There are at least three reasons for this view of translation in the academic setting: (1) the hegemonic political priorities of those in power, (2) a monolingual deficit perspective of translation as interference in acquiring the target language, and (3) an association of translation in general with concurrent translation, a practice in which teachers present material in two languages using sentence-by-sentence translation.

In many cases, the target language (i.e., English in the United States in the case of ESL classrooms and in other countries as a foreign or colonial language) has been viewed as best taught monlingually (Christian, 1996; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Phillipson, 1992). This argument is aligned with the misconception (Grosjean, 2010) that the more students are exposed to the target language, the more quickly they will learn it (with little to no attention to any other language skills the students bring with them to the classroom). Signs of transfer are treated as a type of interference, a hindrance to efficiently acquiring a new language. The focus is the second language, a perspective that does not recognize or encourage students to draw on any or all of their linguistic experiences. Instead, the use of translation is seen as retarding the transition to and an imposition of the development of thinking in the target language. Thus students must be forced to use the target language (Baker, 2006; Martin-Jones, 2000). However, neither the grammar translation approach to foreign language instruction nor the concurrent translation method have been shown to be effective (Crawford, 1999; Legaretta, 1979), because as many educators have
expressed, if students are exposed to concurrent translation, they may wait to hear the language that they use proficiently (i.e., the non-target language) and tune out the other language (i.e., the target language), precluding effective acquisition of the target language (Baker, 2006).

In the past twenty years, however, research has shown many positive uses of translation in academic settings (Rivera, 1990; Shamash, 1990). Contrary to past belief, drawing on bilingual practices, including strategic translation, often facilitates the process of adding to one’s bilingual proficiency. This study adds to our knowledge of translation as an instructional strategy by highlighting its use when two DL bilingual education co-teachers do so to coordinate their practices.

Similarly aligned with a positive orientation of translating as a instructional strategy, in the case of the two teachers in this study, parallel monolingualism, representative of translanguaging, served to provide students with an authentic opportunity to experience, participate in, and feel validated drawing on their bilingual resources. Whereas previous literature has shown single teachers translanguaging (e.g., Worthy et al., 2013), this study illustrates how two teachers can maintain their designated language and model bilingual behavior. As such, they enacted a collective bilingualism—what I believe to be a more appropriate term when viewed from a translanguaging perspective. Teachers were observed to engage in collective bilingualism while coordinating practices around characteristic events and typical attributes by drawing attention to student participation and asking key questions; and around story events through questions, translation, and explanations when books were read in Spanish. Although each teacher spoke monolingually in her designated language, she interacted
bilingually, modeling her receptive proficiency in her non-designated language (e.g., the Spanish model listening to and comprehending monolingual English talk) and her expressive proficiency in her designated language (e.g., the English model engaging in monolingual English talk). As such, each teacher drew on her bilingualism to both make sense of the other teacher’s talk (and often student talk) and to be understood when speaking, key characteristics of coordinating their practices and translanguaging (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). The teachers’ translanguaging modeled authentic bilingual behavior and served as a pedagogical tool in support of students’ meaning making (García & Kleifgen, 2010; Gort & Pontier, 2013).

Each teacher chose to use bilingual speech both across and within instances of coordinated practice. That both the English model and the Spanish model only used bilingual speech once each when the focal book was read in Spanish shows that teachers relied more on other enactments of bilingualism to coordinate their practices. However, it is important to note that the mere practice of producing bilingual speech when books were read in Spanish showed students that it is possible—and useful—to use bilingual speech regardless of the target language arbitrarily imposed on an activity. Even if one were to speculate that instances of coordinated practice were longer when books were read in English due to a greater need to support students in meaning-making, teachers still drew on a number of instructional strategies while simultaneously drawing on their production of bilingual speech to coordinate practice around both vocabulary and story events, highlighting the importance of translanguaging. There was only one instance of coordinated practice when both teachers used bilingual speech to express themselves to each other and to the students, which also occurred when the focal book was read in
English. Because we know that “translanguaging…focuses on the complex languaging practices of bilinguals in actual communicative settings, and not on the use of language codes whose distinctness is monitored by the standardizing agencies of nation-states such as languages academies, grammar books, and, of course, schools,” (García & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 45), regardless of the particular way in which teachers enacted their bilingualism or the language in which the focal book was read, they modeled appropriate uses of translanguaging, both as pedagogy and a communicative skill (García & Kleifgen, 2010). That is, teachers’ dynamic bilingualism (e.g., modeling collective monolingual exchanges, engaging in parallel monolingualism/collective bilingualism, and producing bilingual speech) reflected the normal nature of languaging bilingually as documented in non-academic contexts (e.g., Heller, 1999; Zentella, 1997) and academic contexts (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Lee et al., 2008; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Sayer, 2012), and it supported collaboratively addressing a particular instructional target while being guided by complementary instructional strategies. This finding extends our knowledge of translanguaging beyond a categorization of functions (Sayer, 2012) by showing its utility as related to instructional targets and strategies (McGinty et al., 2011) in a bilingual co-teaching academic setting. This new knowledge of the intersection of this teacher pair’s languaging practices with instructional targets and strategies opens a new avenue by which we can begin to consider the same and other dynamic languaging practices [of teacher pairs] when working with emergent bilingual students.

I now turn to a discussion of how these findings might inform teachers’ practices and future research.
Implications

The results of this study inform the field with regard to ways in which two teachers work cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways, including drawing on their own and students’ bilingualism. These findings are unique in that coordinated practice has not been theorized in the same way it is in this study, and previous findings related to teachers’ collaborative practices have not analyzed the discursive nature of those practices or investigated the role that dynamic bilingualism played in supporting the coordination of teachers’ instructional practices. I therefore suggest several key implications for teachers’ instructional practices regarding the ways in which they might attempt to work strategically to align their efforts for building students’ knowledge toward a particular concept, and for future research.

Implications for Practice

“Schools must build transglossic spaces where students’ multiple language practices are acknowledged and used” (García, 2013, p. 116). The ways in which teachers drew on their bilingualism to coordinate practices in this study reflect documented languaging practices of emergent bilinguals (e.g., those noted in Martínez, 2010, and García 2013). Furthermore, teachers’ use of dynamic bilingualism (by drawing on their own and students’ full linguistic repertoires) supported the coordination of their instructional practices. Teachers in DL bilingual education settings should thus take note of the ways in which these two teachers enacted their bilingualism. Engaging in, and
therefore modeling, dynamic bilingualism provides students with an authentic bilingual experience and may support their meaning making in ways that languaging monolingually could not afford. Even DL bilingual education teachers who operate under a language separation policy such that each teacher is expected to strictly maintain her target language can—and should—enact dynamic bilingualism, which could involve practices similar to those found in this study.

This study showed the teachers’ tendency to draw on translation, a known but contested pedagogical tool (García & Kleifgen, 2010; Gort & Pontier, 2013), as an instructional strategy when engaging in bilingual interactions. This study expands our understanding of translation as an instructional tool by highlighting it as a strategic way of coordinating practices, particularly when DL bilingual education co-teachers address the instructional targets of vocabulary and story events. Teachers should be mindful, though, of how they choose to translate each other’s contributions. Specifically, teachers were never observed to engage in concurrent translation, nor is it advised that future lessons draw on this method. Teachers did use translation to extend a teacher’s or student’s contribution to a book-based conversation, provided a focal vocabulary word bilingually, and clarified a teacher’s or student’s contribution, providing students with multiple opportunities to make meaning. Thus, it is critical that co-teachers engage in the use of complementary instructional strategies, including dynamic bilingualism, to coordinate their practices. While previous research (e.g., Friend & Cook, 2003) has documented how the enactment of several co-teaching arrangements has supported cooperative teacher relationships and classroom environments, this study shows how specific instructional strategies were used in conjunction with one another. Thus, beyond
envisioning an ideal power relationship between co-teachers, it is imperative to consider the specific ways in which co-teachers can [purposefully] cohesively and simultaneously build students’ knowledge of a concept, including drawing on their entire linguistic repertoire. This requires teachers to be aware of the instructional targets that are the focus of their instruction and, subsequently, the instructional strategies that guide their work towards those targets. Although this study did not include a focus on teachers’ planning, it is known to be a critical component of collaboration (Friend & Cook, 2003), and co-teachers should consider the ways that their instructional strategies can complement one another during that time. Additional training for teachers in DL bilingual education settings should be encouraged to train them in read aloud practices that are appropriate for coordinating practices, especially with the use of dynamic bilingualism.

Although teachers engaged in multiple language practices that modeled the useful and normal nature of translanguaging and led to coordinated practices by means of addressing a common instructional target supported by complementary instructional strategies, there were opportunities that were not taken advantage of. For example, why is it that teachers were rarely observed to engage in bilingual speech when addressing instructional targets as books were read in Spanish? For teachers to exploit their ability to language in unique and strategic ways when books are read not only in English but also in Spanish might allow for further opportunities for students to engage in meaning making. It is thus critical that teachers in bilingual settings strategically leverage the ways that they draw on their own and the students’ bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, 2011; Martinez, 2010; Sayer, 2012), especially in the case of DL bilingual education co-teachers. Moreover, coordinating their practices for a greater variety of instructional
targets would allow for the possibility of more meaning making on the students’ part. While this study showed that teachers focused predominately on vocabulary and story events as instructional targets, it may be important for them to think explicitly about ways to coordinate practices around other instructional targets.

Implications for Future Research

The results of this study also suggest various implications for future research regarding co-teachers’ coordinated practices. In regard to the finding that teachers only engaged in collective monolingual Spanish when books were read in Spanish and in collective monolingual English when books were read in English, it may be that the content of the books that were read in Spanish was not as challenging/abstract as that of those read in English and teachers therefore did not choose to draw on their bilingualism as often as they did when books were read in English. A content and linguistic analysis of the focal books may shed light on the relationship between style, content, linguistic complexity, and language of each book, and the choices teachers made regarding their languaging practices. It could also be that teachers perceived a high level of student comprehension when books were read in Spanish, given that instances of coordinated practice when books were read in English were observed to be more extended often due to a lack of student understanding. In line with this postulation, it is important that future research specifically documents the effectiveness of teachers’ coordinated practices, and notes how teachers’ use of varying instructional strategies and dynamic bilingualism contributes to achieving their instructional goal(s). Systematically investigating the
effectiveness of teachers’ coordinated practices would address a limitation of the current study.

The inclusion of a focus on teachers’ intentionality and awareness of coordinating their practices to help understand why specific instructional targets and strategies were observed more than others would strengthen our understanding of these practices. Although this study investigated DL bilingual education co-teachers’ on-the-spot coordination, future studies should explore the ways in which DL bilingual education co-teachers collaborate before implementing a lesson—in addition to during the lesson—to purposefully and strategically draw on both of their languages in an effort to model dynamic bilingualism for their students. Insight into the planning practices of these teachers would add to the co-teaching literature that highlights effective collaborative teaching relationships (e.g., Friend & Cook, 2003). Furthermore, teacher interviews would provide a critical source of data that could enhance our understanding of why teachers make particular choices regarding their languaging practices.

This study highlighted ways in which two teachers drew on each other’s and students’ bilingualism through the use of multiple instructional strategies to coordinate their practices. Adding a component that brings an explicit focus to the languaging practices of students in relation to those enacted by teachers would enable researchers to gain a deeper understanding of how responsive teachers’ coordinated practice is to student needs. This layer would add to our knowledge of the discursive patterns of DL bilingual education co-teachers.
Conclusion

Teachers who understand translanguaging as a sense-making mechanism have the tools to provide an exigent and meaningful education for their students (García & Kleifgen, 2010). This study provided evidence that the focal teacher pair coordinated their practices in meaningful and authentic ways that allowed students to not only understand new content and language, but also to engage in genuine practice of newly acquired language and negotiation of meaning. As such, they enacted and promoted translanguaging as a normal and strategic way of languaging while coordinating instructional practices. The findings of this study show that teachers drew on multiple languaging practices as evidenced through the enactment of various methods of translanguaging, including codeswitching, parallel monolingualism/collective bilingualism, and monolingual conversations within a bilingual context (i.e., the teachers communicated using only one language, but this practice drew on at least one of the teachers’ bilingualism given that her designated language was not the one being spoken at the time). As a result, students were implicitly taught that bilinguals draw on any and all of their linguistic resources to make themselves understood and to make sense of their multilingual worlds (García, 2009a). It is my hope that this study serves as another piece of evidence for how co-teachers function as a unit to coordinate their practices in order to subsequently co-construct meaning with students by highlighting how the sophisticated ways in which the teachers drew on their bilingualism allow for both effective communication and support students’ meaning-making while working cohesively and simultaneously to build students’ knowledge of a concept by approaching it in multiple ways.
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