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ABSTRACT

Anti-bilingual education policies and monolingual agendas, while contrary to science, are prevalent in education, and the U.S. body politic. Over 2,500,000 California public school students speak a home language other than English, and are exposed to inequitable, alienating, and disenfranchising learning environments, due to a fundamental misunderstanding of how bilingualism works, and of bilingual pedagogy. The research synthesized herein has been critically reviewed and represents the prevailing state of consensus within the discipline of bilingual education. Utilizing a comprehensive review of related scholarship, a bilingual pedagogy field manual has been created for secondary teachers, featuring best language and content education practices, strategies, and techniques, to foster the biliteracy of California’s emergent bilingual student population.
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CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to provide a bilingual pedagogy field manual for secondary teachers, featuring best language practices, strategies, and techniques, to foster the biliteracy of California’s emergent bilingual student population.

Background. Prior to any attempt to deliver equity and inclusion to language minority populations in California K-12 public school, a general understanding of modern American history and jurisprudence is required, to fully contextualize the emergent bilingual experience. Starting in the late 15th century, the Western Hemisphere was a major convergence zone and a nexus for cultural encounter and interaction between European, Native American, and African populations. Despite the world becoming more interconnected and globalized during the European Age of Exploration, the Americas experienced a radical reduction in cultural and linguistic diversity through exploitation, as well as the imposition of power, and cultural dominion (Castellanos & Leggio, 1983). The record of conquest, genocide, slavery, racism, and discrimination is well documented and undisputable (Zinn, 2013), but must be recognized by contemporary educational thought, as a pattern of disenfranchisement persists in our present time and maintains inequitable implications on emergent bilinguals in the classroom.

Considering the profound multilingual origins of the U.S., the current and common place debate between English-only and bilingual education advocates is enlightening. According to Haugen (1969), the U.S. was the greatest epicenter for
multilingualism in recorded history. For example, during the middle of the 17th century, Manhattan was home to at least 18 distinct languages, in addition to the several hundred Native American languages spoken across N. America alone (Castellanos & Leggio, 1983). Notwithstanding, the ascendancy of the British Empire, and the U.S. as dominant superpowers cemented English as the de-facto official world language, at the expense of minority language speakers (Dicker, 1996). Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu calls this phenomenon language *standardization*, which is only possible “by suppressing nonstandard variants … symbolic domination … exclude[ing] or incalculat[ing] … those who speak” other languages” (Hanks, 2005, p. 75). Therefore, language minority populations are coerced to assimilate and adopt the dominant culture and language, as a matter of access to resources and services, social acceptance, and survival (Hanks, 2005).

Native American, Italian, Jewish, and German language restrictions during the early history of the U.S are prime examples of what Bourdieu refers to as language *standardization, authorization, legitimation*, and a developing *linguistic habitus* in the U.S. (Hanks, 2005). For instance, simultaneous with the ascendency of the United States, a deliberate agenda was enacted to expunge the cultural and linguistic practices of Native Americans (Crawford, 1990; Dicker, 1996), based on the rationale that indigenous languages were inferior, and bilingualism repressed cognition, and intellectualism (Dicker, 1996). At the start of the 20th century, a new wave of immigration triggered “the Americanization campaign” and an assault on the language practices of “Italians, Jews, and Slavs” (Crawford, 1990, pp. 16 - 17). Additionally, the German American community was an integral part of the fabric of the early U.S., but the German language was slowly eradicated by rising anti-German xenophobia, and resultant legislation; and
this trend spilled over to other languages after WWI (Dicker, 1996). Although these
discriminatory policies may seem to be events of a distant past, monolingual language
agendas persist in the present time, and impose inequity on emergent bilinguals.

The struggle for bilingual education. One recent attempt to prohibit the
multilingual practices of the American people was the case of the English-only
movement, starting early in the 1980’s, a response to an influx of immigration and
California Senator S.I. Hayakawa was on the vanguard of the English-only crusade,
submitting legislation to amend the U.S. Constitution to cement an official national
language: English (Adams & Brink, 1990; Dickers, 1996; Crawford 1990). Although the
federal campaign failed multiple times, Senator Hayakawa mobilized support for the
English-only campaign, and formed US English, a formidable lobbying firm that initiated
a nationwide, multipronged assault on bilingualism and bilingual education (Adams &
Brink, 1990; Dicker, 1996; Crawford 1990). While the federal campaign failed, US
English fared much better at the state level, and catalyzed a cascade of English-only
victories; as of 1990, over 15 states had enacted English-only laws, including “Arizona,
Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky,
Mississippi, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and
Virginia” (Adams & Brink, 1990, p. 3). These English-only victories were only the
beginning of a total political war against bilingual education, that would persist for
decades.

Several landmark civil rights victories starting in the 1940’s frame the context for
the English-only backlash in the 1980’s. One such case was the *Mendez v Westminster*
proceeding, a civil rights victory ending school segregation in California, a product of over a century of Latino American discrimination (Bermudez, 2017). The next major civil rights domino to fall was the seminal Brown v. Board of Education ruling in 1954, outlawing school segregation nationwide. Subsequently, the 1964 civil rights act was signed into law, which proclaimed that “[n]o person in the United States, shall on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (Civil Rights Act, sec. 601, 1964). Therefore, the Civil Rights Act was a major turning point for the “educational rights of language minority students in the United States” (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, p. 36).

Following these major civil rights breakthroughs, was the first re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1968, which included Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was the first time in the history of the U.S., that federal legislation was passed “to provide language-minoritized students with an equal opportunity for an education” (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, p. 37). Title VII of the Bilingual Education Act (1968) decreed:

In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance or local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

(Sec. 702)
The Bilingual Education Act was followed by the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (1974), mandating “appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs” (20 USC Sec.1703(f)). In addition, included in the re-authorization of the Bilingual Education Act in 1974, was the inclusion of eligibility of all proficiency levels, and establishing a key definition for bilingual education, which stipulated home-language instruction (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). After the enactment and re-authorization of the Bilingual Education Act, federal policy was established, affording the right for emergent bilinguals to use, and be taught in their home language (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018).

Although the Bilingual Authorization Act paved the way for equitable instruction for emergent bilinguals, it was also a harbinger for a bilingual backlash in the 1980’s (Hakuta, 2011). A precursor to this struggle were the Lau Remedies, which were the result of the Lau v Nichols supreme court ruling, establishing a formidable legal precedent against the English-only agenda, by proclaiming that sink or swim English-only immersion educational practices “make[s] a mockery of public education” (Lau v Nichols, 1974; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, Hakuta, 2011). Despite this major blow to the monolingual agenda, the court only provided ambiguous guidance for the executive branch and districts to follow, which are known as the Lau Remedies of 1975, providing general instruction for how to categorize and support emergent bilinguals and establishing specific bilingual education programs at the elementary and secondary level (Hakuta, 2011; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Nonetheless, the Lau Remedies were rolled back by the Reagan Administration in 1981, while the 5th Circuit affirmed them in that same year, with the Castaneda v Pickard determination, and extending the ruling to
mandate appropriate action, based on evidence-based pedagogy (Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981; Hakuta, 2011; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). A brief review of the evolution of language rights provides the necessary context to understand the escalation of the English-only movement in the 1980’s and the 1990’s.

Paralleling the political attacks of the 1980’s, bilingual education came under scholarly fire, as authoritative studies, audits, and reviews focused on fiscal accountability and the question of efficacy. Several reviews raised concerns about more than a quarter of a century of considerable investment into bilingual education programs, without any definitive evidence proving the efficacy of bilingual instruction (Porter, 1990; Rossell, & Baker, 1996; August, & Hakuta, 1997; Amselle, 1998) According to the ALEC study conducted in 1992, a projected 12 billion dollars would be allocated to special language programs in 1993, and is accompanied by many other reviews that raise alarm regarding accountability (Porter, 1990). Likewise, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences completed a meta-analysis of the scholarship on bilingual education and concluded “we do not yet know whether there will be long-term advantages or disadvantages to initial literacy instruction in the primary language versus English, given a very high-quality program of known effectiveness in both cases” (August, & Hakuta, 1997, p. 177) Furthermore, a 1990-1992 study named Meeting the Challenge of Language Diversity. An Evaluation of California Programs for Pupils with Limited Proficiency in English concluded that it was impossible to assess bilingual education effectively, as a result of systemically flawed assessment practices statewide (Porter, 1990, 274). The unflattering nature of these findings regarding the accountability
of bilingual education underlines important context for understanding the bilingual backlash evident in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, a decade later.

The *US English* attacks on bilingual education in the 80’s was not only effective but created a modus operandi for English-only advocates in the 1990’s, utilizing state referendums and the popular vote to impose language restrictions on the bilingual community (Adams & Brink, 1990). Bilingual education experienced significant defeats starting in 1998, with California passing Proposition 227, which mandated English-only instruction for language minority students (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Measures like Proposition 227 passed in Arizona in 2000 and in Massachusetts in 2002, as well as the pro-English NCLB legislation passed in 2002, signaling a revolt against bilingual education (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). It was not until 2016 and 2017 that California and Massachusetts took a stand for bilingual education, as well as several states adopting the promising *Seal of Biliteracy* program (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Although these are important progressions for the benefit of language-minority populations, history demonstrates that the political landscape surrounding bilingual education is volatile, and the struggle for language equity is fought in multiple theatres and is an ongoing process.

**Need.** According to the California Department of Education (2020), English learners comprise approximately 19% of all California K-12 public school students. More than 2,500,000 California public school students “speak a language other than English in their homes,” which constitutes over 41% of total student population (California Department of Education, 2020). However, according to Cummins (2000), most teachers inadequately teach and support emergent bilingual students, resulting in tangible harm: interpersonally and scholastically. Authoritative advocates for emergent bilinguals have
raised alarm about the prevalence of mainstream teachers who are unaware of the many issues that are important to the bilingual community, of the value and importance of bilingualism and home language practices, of the bilingual identity, and who unwittingly disenfranchise emergent bilingual students through the inequitable practices and messages they promote in the classroom (Cummins, 2000). Moreover, teacher/student interaction is the most implicative factor shaping the academic futures of emergent bilingual students (Cummins, 2000). Based on the massive numbers of underserved emergent bilingual students in California, a strong exigency and logical basis exists for the proactive remediation of such injustices, and for the protection of the civil rights of millions of vulnerable children.

The need to provide language-minority populations with educational equity has been established by a strong foundation of federal legislation, legal precedent, and jurisprudence. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title VII of the Bilingual Education Act, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, the *Lau v. Nichols* and *Castaneda v Pickard* rulings all speak to an exigency for language-minority students to receive *appropriate action, new and imaginative programs, and affirmative steps* from K-12 public schools to receive equal educational opportunity. Additionally, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1968 was reauthorized in 2015 as Every Student Succeeds Act (2015), Title III mandating:

1. to help ensure that English learners, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency, and develop high levels of academic achievement in English;
2. to assist all English learners, including immigrant children and youth, to achieve at high levels in academic subjects so that all English learners can meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children are expected to meet;

3. to assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principles, and other school leaders, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools in establishing, implementing, and sustaining effective language instruction educational programs designed to assist in teaching English learners, including immigrant children and youth;

4. to assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, state educational agencies, and local educational agencies to develop and enhance their capacity to provide effective instructional programs designed to prepare English learners, including immigrant children and youth, to enter all English instructional setting;

5. to promote parental, family, and community participation in language instruction educational programs for the parents, families, and communities of English learners. (Section 3102, 129 STAT. 1954)

These policies provide a clear mandate for educational agencies, leaders, and teachers to implement evidence-based bilingual methodology in the classroom, and the need for a bilingual pedagogy field manual to support emergent bilinguals access an equal and equitable education.

The need for bilingual pedagogy and equitable educational practices for emergent bilinguals in the classroom is clear, but the discourse surrounding bilingualism also motivates decisive action. According to Cummins (2000), “[b]ilingual children are truly
caught in the crossfire ... Xenophobic discourse is broadcast into every classroom and constitutes the primary means through which coercive relations of power are enacted … constrict[ing] … identity … and the opportunities for learning that culturally and linguistically diverse students experience” (p. 4). Cummins (2000) sheds light on the xenophobic discourses surrounding bilingualism:

Bilingualism shuts doors. It nourishes self-ghettoization, and ghettoization nourishes racial antagonism. … using some language other than English dooms people to second class citizenship in American Society. … Monolingual education opens doors to the larger world. … Institutionalized bilingualism remains another source of the fragmentation of America, another threat to the dream of ‘one people’. (p. 4)

Schlesinger’s comments are not only a stark invocation of the exploitive practices of early-American history, but they are also a reminder, that these inequitable and monocultural forces endure in the present day. These attitudes, which are unfortunately endemic to the American body politic, oppress the educational opportunities of language minority populations, stigmatizing, alienating, and disenfranchising the bilingual identity. Implementing science-based bilingual methodology is mandated and necessary, is an extension and appendage of the body of landmark civil rights legislation achieved in the U.S.; and more than a need, but a moral imperative for educators and stakeholders to fulfill.
Methodology

Target Population

Based on the argument that teachers influence the academic success or failure of emergent bilingual students more than any other factor (Cummins, 2000), the primary target population for this bilingual pedagogy field manual is California secondary school educators.

Content

The bilingual pedagogy field manual for secondary teachers is designed to provide important knowledge to reinforce the capabilities of secondary teachers, and their ability to support language-minority students in the classroom. The field manual is divided into 5 major sections. The first section is geared to orient the reader regarding bilingual pedagogy, providing insight on important background, key terms, and fundamental implications. The second section equips the secondary school teacher with a strong theoretical basis for the conceptualization and implementation of bilingual pedagogy. The third section provides a general understanding of ineffective practices and their implications on the student experience. The fourth section provides equitable and evidence-based best practices, to provide general guidance for teachers. The last section provides specific evidence-based strategies and models for teaching emergent bilingual students and supporting the development of biliteracy. The content herein was synthesized from peer-reviewed scholarship, and authoritative sources of the highest prestige and ethos within the discourse of bilingual education, pedagogy, and methodology, and will be overviewed in chapter two.
Format

This bilingual pedagogy field manual for secondary school educators is an embodiment of federal and judicial mandates, theoretical frameworks and constructs of bilingual pedagogy, as well as best language practices for emergent bilinguals, including peer-reviewed literature, research, and studies.

Scope

Assumptions

The assumption that secondary teachers are willing and able to understand the research synthesized for this project was made. I have also assumed that I have been able to ascertain the current consensus in the discipline.

Limitations

This project was limited by time constraints imposed by the duration of the academic term, and complications due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, I am limited by my current understanding of the research, and restrained within the existing corpus, as I am not conducting any research for this project: only basic research.

Delimitations

The Bilingual Pedagogy Field Manual was limited to secondary school teachers.
CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Chapter two synthesizes and summarizes meta-discursive peer-reviewed scholarship and literature to overview bilingual pedagogy. Included is a discussion on the evolution of the theoretical framework for bilingual education, bilingual pedagogy, and best language education practices for emergent bilingual students. More specifically, topics such as the benefits of bilingualism, interlinguistic transfer, contrastive analysis, criticisms of bilingual pedagogy, language proficiency, sociocultural learning theory, and scaffolding instruction will be critically evaluated and discussed. Furthermore, a brief review of the of relevant scholarship on equitable and inequitable language practices will be provided.

Theoretical Framework

Benefits of Bilingualism


Cummins (1976) synthesized important preliminary findings and reported on a growing body of research that demonstrated that bilingual people benefit from facilitated communication skills: verbal, and non-verbal faculties. In addition, researchers in the early 1970’s found that bilingualism enables cognitive flexibility (Cummins, 1976). Subsequent research determined that there was a direct relationship between developing bilingualism at an early age and divergent thinking abilities, including older children who
received bilingual instruction as well (Cummins 1976). This new body of research was in stark contrast to scholarship arguing that bilinguals experience a cognitive hindrance, which erroneously based methodologies on I.Q., and did not consider socio-political factors, inequitable bilingual learning environments, gender, or language proficiency (Peal & Lambert, 1962; Cummins, 1976).

Despite research that demonstrated that bilingualism was a serious cognitive, psychological, and social deficit (Cummins, 1976; Hakuta, 1989; Hakuta, 2011) Cummins (1976) proposed his threshold hypothesis, which postulated that bilinguals need to satisfy a linguistic threshold in the target language to avoid cognitive interference and be able to access the benefits of bilingualism. Jim Cummins based his hypothesis on the landmark study conducted by Peal and Lambert, who studied bilinguals that overcame the bilingual threshold, or as Cummins puts it, reaching a linguistic balance between first and second language (Cummins, 1976). Peal & Lambert (1962) debunked previous deficit-based results and found that bilinguals who overcame the threshold demonstrated superior conceptualization abilities, reasoning, problem solving, and linguistic aptitude, in comparison to monolinguals. Peal and Lambert’s finding were peer reviewed and corroborated by Cummins and Gulutsan (1974 a) and they reported analogous conclusions (Cummins, 1976). Consequent studies continued to discover benefits of bilingualism, finding that bilingualism facilitates “concept formation, classification, creativity, analogical reasoning, and visual-spatial skills” (Diaz & Klinger, 1991, p. 167). Balkan (1970) reinforced the executive functioning findings of Peal & Lambert (1962) and highlighted the benefits of acquiring bilingualism at an early age (Balkan, 1970; Cummins, 1976). Lastly, Cummins (1976) extended his synthesis to
include a series of other studies that establish a corpus of consistent research, supporting the benefits of bilingualism, including facilitated code switching, logical and rational thinking, and evidence that bilingual instruction can help students overcome the linguistic threshold needed in order to reap cognitive benefits. These studies were fundamental for the de-stigmatization of bilingual children and bilingualism, legitimized bilingual education, and provided a platform for a burgeoning new field energized by the bilingual education act of 1968.

While Cummins (1976, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1991) threshold hypothesis was the beginning of a paradigm shift away from deficit-based perceptions, and provided a platform for bilingual education, it still maintained the idea that bilingualism could be cognitively disadvantageous, if not developed beyond a threshold of proficiency (Daller & Ongun, 2018). On the other hand, others argue that bilingualism fosters cognitive advantages regardless of reaching a threshold in proficiency (Diaz, 1985; Diaz & Klinger, 1991; Bialystok & Majumder, 1998). These findings are reinforced by Bialystok and Martin (2004), who conclude that bilinguals’ negotiation of two languages stimulates a variety of cognitive and non-cognitive assets. Although Bialystok and Majumder (1998) and Bialystok and Martin (2004) argue against the landmark threshold hypothesis by concluding that bilinguals experience cognitive benefits regardless of reaching a degree of language proficiency, their conclusions solidify the spirit of the Cummins (1981) by affirming the cognitive advantages of bilingualism (Daller & Ongun, 2018).

Theoretical Constructs of Bilingual Pedagogy

Scholars have developed and reinforced the foundational studies that broke ground in the 1960’s and 1970’s and have established the legitimacy of bilingualism,
bilingual education, and bilingual methodology. The argument that bilingual people benefit from facilitated cognition has been unequivocally validated by a cumulous of reviews that reinforce the discipline (Diaz & Klinger, 1991; Hakuta, 2011; Garcia & Kleifgen). August & Hakuta (1997) provided a comprehensive review of the scholarship, commissioned by the National Research Council, and affirmed the benefits of bilingualism regardless of reaching a threshold of proficiency, and provided a strong rationale for bilingual education. Furthermore, Garcia and Kleifgen (2018) report the state of the current consensus regarding the benefits of multilingualism and reaffirm that modern science has proven the cognitive facilitation and executive functioning arguments of bilingual education researchers. In fact, Bialystok (2011) asserts that bilingualism may insulate against Alzheimer’s, and that bilingualism super charges neurological pathways, fusing cognitive and linguistic circuits together, allowing for elevated cognition, mental processing, and adaptability. Krizman et al. (2012) contribute a fascinating and valuable analysis of the aural sophistication of bilinguals, comparing the gifts of bilingual people to those of musicians, and confirming that bilinguals enjoy an extra-ordinary ability to process sound, focus, and memorize. Garcia and Kleifgen (2018) report on additional research showcasing a portfolio of related benefits such as increased brain plasticity, a greater mastery of how language works, perceiving and interpreting verbal and non-verbal cues, and analytical and innovative thinking. The preceding research concerned with the benefits of bilingualism provides overwhelming evidence for improved cognition, a range of related benefits, a strong foundation of legitimacy, and a robust defense against monolingual pressures.
Criticisms of bilingual pedagogy. The overwhelming body of evidence regarding the cognitive benefits of bilingualism provoked much research contradicting the argument for a bilingual advantage and are more in alignment with the bilingual deficit consensus of the early 20th century. Gathercole et al. (2014) contend that the initial burden of bilingualism on an individual results in a linguistic delay in comparison to monolinguals. They argue against the bilingual advantage as it relates to executive functioning and cognition, as their experiments showed a monolingual advantage (Gathercole et al., 2014) In addition, Gathercole et al. (2014) emphasize placing research that argues for a bilingual advantage under a microscope, and considering the participant population more carefully, as a result of their inability to replicate previous findings. An array of other fairly recent studies raise similar concerns, an effort to delegitimize the rationale for bilingual education in American public school (Morton & Harper, 2007; Namazi & Thordardottir, 2010; Hilchey & Klein, 2011; Paap & Greenberg, 2013; Paap & Sawi, 2014; Costa et al. 2009, Antón et al., 2014; Duñabeitia et al., 2015; Paap et al., 2015; Valian, 2015). While Gathercole et al. (2014) appears to be an authoritative call to scrutinize bilingual education research, they misappropriate Adesope et al. (2010)—a comprehensive review on the matter—into their argument. Despite Adesope (2010) observation that published studies in all discourses are susceptible to impartiality in favor of groundbreaking findings and their conclusion that publication bias did not adversely affect their review, Gathercole et al. (2014) erroneously conflated Adesope (2010) conclusions to support their thesis. Moreover, Adesope (2010), after conducting a thorough meta-analysis of the cognitive benefits of bilingualism, found that “bilingualism is positively associated with a range of cognitive benefits,” such as “metalinguistic and
metacognitive awareness … abstract and symbolic representation, attentional control, and problem solving … allow[ing] bilinguals to develop skills that extend into other domains” (p. 229). Gathercole et al. (2014) failed to place Adesope et al. (2010) in the appropriate context, failed to mention Adesope et al. (2010) pro-bilingual results, while misappropriating and conflating them, which places their research and motives under suspicion.

De Bruin et al. (2015) also investigated the publication subjectivity of bilingual education scholarship and call the bilingual advantage argument into question as well. The results of their meta-analysis did demonstrate publication bias, as studies supporting the benefits of bilingualism were published disproportionately compared to literature with inconclusive findings and concluded that scholarship calling the bilingual advantage into scrutiny were generally set aside (De Bruin et al., 2015). In contrast to Gathercole at al. (2014), De Bruin et al. (2015) accurately interpreted Adesope et al. (2010) conclusion regarding the inconsequentiality of publication bias in their study. Conversely, De Bruin et al. (2015) strongly disagree with Adesope et al. (2010) and assert that publication bias can indeed place meta-analyses into question. While De Cat et al. (2015) also oppose the bilingual advantage consensus and several studies highlighting a range of neurological and cognitive benefits of bilingualism, they cite Adesope (2010) to support their conclusion that current studies on the topic are inconclusive. However, De Cat et al. (2018) present a critical review of both arguments, and ultimately, their study reinforces a bilingual advantage and “identify the critical threshold of bilingual experience from which an advantage can be observed at group level” (p. 119).
Despite the dissenting voices arguing against a bilingual advantage, there appears to be a logical explanation for the inconsistency of the results highlighted by opponents of the bilingual advantage corpus. Daller and Ongun (2018) explain that studies focused on demonstrating a bilingual advantage or disadvantage are incomparable because “there are too many independent variables, and that therefore different studies cannot be compared” (p. 677). Thordardottir (2011) and Luk and Bialystok (2013) similarly opine, that as a result of a wide variance of variables among diverse language minority populations, studies are irreconcilable. Correspondingly, Luk (2015) affirms the incomparability of these studies, without controlling for socio-political and socio-linguistic factors, such as the sequence and context surrounding the development of bilingualism, frequency of home and target language production, and the satisfaction of a threshold in the target language. Although there is a viable rebuttal against studies calling bilingual education research into questions, Daller and Ongun (2018) confirm that there is not a consensus in the current scholarship. Notwithstanding, Daller and Ongun (2018) study affirms the cognitive advantage of bilingualism, and further legitimatize the theoretical basis for bilingual education, and home language instruction when they explain that home language instruction has a direct correlation with amplified cognition and speech.

Despite the overwhelming body of evidence regarding the efficacy and advantages of bilingualism, the theoretical rationale supporting bilingual education remains vulnerable to attack and delegitimization. In an influential study in 1996, Rossell and Baker (1996) concluded that “no consistent research support for transitional bilingual education as a superior instructional practice for improving the English language
achievement of limited English proficient children” (p. 19). Astonishingly, Rossell and Baker (1996) characterize bilingual education scholarship with blatantly stigmatizing language, using the phrase, fugitive literature, criticizing early pro-bilingualism scholarship due to their assertion that such research was methodologically flawed and dominated by politics and ideology. Rossell and Baker (1996) weaponize several studies conducted in the 1970’s and 1980’s that reinforce their argument that bilingual pedagogy was based on spurious research, and attack bilingual education pedagogues, claiming that they are unethical, that they research in bad faith, are intellectually dishonest, and simply push the bilingual education narrative to confirm their own agendas. Rossell and Baker (1996) escalated scrutiny against pro-bilingual education research when they claimed that Cummins (1978) linguistic interdependence hypothesis is pseudo-science, despite forming the established paradigm in the discipline. Perhaps most conclusively, Rossell and Baker (1996) state that after well over a thousand reviews exceeding a decade, evidence supporting linguistic transfer and bilingual pedagogy is non-existent.

In a compelling take down of Rossell and Baker (1996), Cummins (1999) carefully dissects their arguments, and demonstrates unequivocally, that their study was conducted in bad faith. Cummins (1999) calls Baker (1992) into question for drawing two completely contradictory conclusions from the El Paso Independent School District (1987) study, at different points in time. In 1992 Baker concluded, “there is evidence that the extensive bilingual education program worked better than the typical bilingual education program … Like El Paso, the results of the San Diego study argue for more bilingual education programs, not fewer, (p. 6). In spite of this conclusion, in 1998, Baker using the same study, reversed course and claims the same bilingual education program
that yielded positive results were detrimental to learning English (Cummins, 1999; Baker, 1998). In addition, Cummins (1999) completely dismantles Rossell and Baker (1996) conclusions, as they based their English-only argument on multilingual programs. In a startling reminder to maintain a healthy epistemic stance, Cummins (1999) clinically interprets Rossell and Baker (1996) data correctly for them and unpacks Rossell and Baker (1996) pattern of misinterpreting studies and drawing erroneous conclusions.

Cummins (1999), is an important analysis shedding light on the context of Prop 227, and the flip-flopping of Rossell and Baker (1996), a study that fueled the English-only victories of the late 1990’s. A rebuttal to the politically charged and inflammatory remarks used by Rossell and Baker (1996), Cummins (1999) labels their inconsistencies as equivocation, vacillation, and engaging in intellectual dishonesty; and encouraging stakeholders to critically challenge such research that harms language minority students, by inflaming the majority body politic into sustaining a monocultural. Rolstad et al. (2005) also debunk Rossell and Baker (1996), when they state “[i]t seems clear from the current study and from previous meta-analyses (Greene, 1998; Willig, 1985) that bilingual education is superior to English-only approaches in increasing measures of students’ academic achievement in English and in the native language,” and that “[i]n view of these results, current policies implemented in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, which ban or greatly discourage the use of the native language for instructional purposes, cannot be justified” (p. 590). More importantly, Cummins (1999) emphasizes a moral imperative for scholars, leaders, and journalists to challenge bad faith discourses that seek to oppress language minority children, a pattern that is well documented in the U.S.
Transfer. In addition to the threshold hypothesis, Cummins (1979, 1981) established and developed the theoretical pillars for bilingual education, coining the concepts of linguistic interdependence and common underlying proficiency. Linguistic interdependence describes the phenomenon, by which skills and content knowledge mobilize between languages, improving linguistic ability and learning (Cummins, 1979, 1981). Common underlying proficiency argues that language is connected to a common fund of ability, allowing for knowledge and language skills to be transferred back and forth between home language (L1) and target language (L2), including non-language skills (Cummins, 1981, Goodrich, & Lonigan, 2017; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018).

Moreover, dozens of studies between the late 1970’s and the 1990’s have affirmed the transferability of skills between languages (Verhoeven, 1994, p. 387; Greene, 1998; Rolstad et al, 2005) One such study was Ramirez et al. (1991), who conducted a 5-year longitudinal study showing that intensive home language instruction was superior for fostering English language proficiency, compared to time on task and English based pedagogies. Ramirez et al. (1991) conclusion was corroborated more recently by Macswan and Rolstad (2005), as they found that home language instruction was an integral part for English language development as well. Despite the empirical evidence supporting L1/L2 facilitation, Cummins (1976, 1979, 1981) has endured decades of intense criticism and establishing landmark theoretical frameworks legitimizing bilingualism; a shift towards equitable educational practices for language minorities.

Although Macswan and Rolstad (2005) and Rolstad et al. (2005) affirm the weakness of the Rossell and Baker (1996) meta-analysis, and corroborate the spirit of Cummins’ linguistic interdependence theory, they deviate from Cummins when they
state, “the facilitation effect is a natural consequence of mental architecture, as understood in the modern cognitive neurosciences, and a fundamental characteristic of the brain itself” (Macswan & Rolstad, 2005, p. 238). Interestingly, Macswan and Rolstad (2014) assert that the threshold hypothesis should be abandoned in favor of an updated theoretical construct. Macswan and Rolstad (2014) go further, asserting that transfer should only be viewed symbolically, and that their facilitation theory should replace the Cummins’ framework, because bilingualism, taps into a common basin of faculties.

Macswan and Rolstad (2005, 2014) is supported by Riches and Genesee (2006), when they also found that knowledge and literacy does not transfer, but languages have access to a common source of instruments. Although Macswan and Rolstad (2005, 2014) and Riches and Genesee (2006) push the scholarship forward, they in large part, corroborate the essence of the theoretical frameworks put into place by Cummins (1976, 1979, 1981), and more specifically, affirm Cummins’ common underlying proficiency.

A response to the criticisms of Rivera (1984), Genesee (1984) Troike (1984), and Wald (1984) about Cummins (1981) failure to account for socio-political contextual factors, Hornberger (2003) presents a Continua of Biliteracy which not only “identifies the major social, linguistic, political, and psychological issues that surround the development of biliteracy,” but it also supports the argument for “positive transfer across literacies” (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, p. 55). Likewise, Hornberger (2005) asserts that bilingual people benefit from learning environments that activate the full spectrum of assets that they possess, while discouraging inequitable English-only approaches. A preponderance of recent scholarship provides robust evidence supporting the efficacy of instruction in the mother tongue, as many bilingual researchers have come to a consensus
about the essential importance of K-12 schooling in the home language, which has the most influence on English acquisition (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, Thomas & Collier, 2017; Riches & Genesee, 2006). Although greater transfer potential has been noted between languages that share linguistic relationships, linguistic interdependence has been established among unrelated languages, such as English and Chinese (Cummins, 2005; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018).

Contrastive Analysis. Interestingly, Fries (1945) and Lado (1957) laid the foundations for the research and theoretical breakthroughs of the early 1960’s and 1970’s, establishing the contrastive analysis hypothesis (Thomas, 2008). The contrastive analyses framework compared similarities and differences between mother tongue (L1) and second language (L2), positive and negative transfer, and postulated that second language learners would experience a facilitation effect in areas where languages share commonalities, but interference within the spaces where languages differ (Thomas, 2008). Thomas (2008) revealed striking similarities between Cummins (1976, 1979, 1981) landmark hypotheses and Fries (1945) and Lado (1957) contrastive analysis. Lado (1957) invoked Cummins theories when he stated, “individuals tend to transfer forms and meanings' (p. 2); 'the grammatical structure of the native language tends to be transferred' (p. 58); 'the learner tends to transfer the habits of his native language' (p. 58)” (as cited in Thomas, 2008, p. 12). According to Thomas (2008), while researchers agree about the behaviorist and structuralist origins of early language education, she argues that contrastive analysis is deeply rooted in contemporary language education but divorced from contemporary theory due to its stigmatization and behaviorist connections. Although contrastive analysis was born out of a deeply structuralist era rooted in classical
and operant conditioning techniques, Lado (1957) preceding remarks provide strong evidence suggesting that contrastive analysis was the theoretical catalyst for modern bilingual education. Based on the undeniable similarities and relationships between the theoretical frameworks of contrastive analysis, and Cummins’ threshold, linguistic interdependence, and common underlying proficiency hypotheses, one can definitively conclude that the frameworks put into place by Cummins (1976, 1979, 1981) are branches of contrastive analysis. Moreover, Thomas (2008) vehemently argues for an honest accounting of the development of second language education, and correcting the “historiographical” record, not only to bolster the credibility of the field, but to elevate it to a “a mature science” (p. 18).

Language Proficiency. Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) established key differentiations for understanding how emergent bilinguals develop English language proficiency. Surface fluency, proprietized by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) described the accessible nature of causal language—body language, facial expressions, setting—within dialogical registers and situations, which can be observed when people communicate with friends, or loved ones. Cummins (1979, 1981, 2001), building on the concept of surface fluency, introduced concepts such as basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), to explain their mutually exclusive development. Cummins (1981) coined the term contextualized language, which is supported by face-to-face interaction and non-verbal skills, and distinguishes basic interpersonal communication or (BICS) (Cummins, 1981; Cummins, 2001). Contrastingly, Cummins (1981, 2001) devised the term decontextualized language to describe cognitive academic language proficiency or
(CALP) which takes place within disciplinary specific discourses typical of school.

Cummins (2001) goes further, unpacking types of contextual support by describing “external contexts” as “characteristics of the language or the instructional presentation in isolation,” which are “less important” contextual scaffolds in comparison to “life experiences … prior knowledge … social interaction … of the learner that reflect the internal context that they carry around in their heads” … facilitating “contextualiz[ation]” of “content and language from a range of situations (p. 67; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, p. 54). The rigors of academic course work mandates the utilization of academic language with high Lexile demands, usually through independent activities, which in many cases is beyond the reach of emergent bilingual students, without interactional supports (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018; Cummins, 2001).

Cummins (1979, 1981, 2000) argues that emergent bilinguals can develop a high proficiency of BICS within two years of exposure to a secondary language, while CALP takes between 5 and 7 years. This finding has been corroborated by several studies and reviews spanning approximately 20 years (Gándara, 1999; Hakuta et al., 2000; Riches & Genesee, 2006; Collier & Thomas, 2017). This differentiation is highly relevant to educational leaders, policy, and practice, as “misconceptions about the nature of language proficiency” abound in education, and result in the disenfranchisement of language minority students (Cummins, 2000, p. 62). To illustrate, it is common for educators to erroneously conclude that emergent bilinguals’ mastery of BICS, is justification for English-only instruction, and consequently, placing emergent bilinguals in special education for not meeting standards (Cummins, 2000). Understanding that emergent
bilinguals need extended dual language education to develop academic language proficiency in L2, is a key for providing equity to language minority populations.

Cummins (2001) dives into a deeper discussion regarding the nature of context embedded and context reduced language by presenting the continuum in Figure 1. Context embedded language extends the idea of contextualized language, equivalent to interacting with people in authentic ways or (BICS), while context reduced is another way to appreciate decontextualized language and indicative of (CALP), the latter requiring a significant base of content understanding and linguistic specialization. Cummins (2001) articulates how to calibrate extralinguistic support, contextualize language, and utilize the continuum in Figure 1, to support the academic language development of emergent bilingual students:

The progression of academic tasks should ideally go from quadrant A (context embedded, cognitively undemanding), to quadrant B (context embedded, cognitively demanding) and then to quadrant D (context reduced, cognitively demanding). Cognitive challenge is essential for academic growth but the internal and external contextual support necessary for bilingual students to meet the challenge must also be built into the activities. If instruction stays at the level of quadrant A, there is no cognitive challenge; students are not pushed to go beyond what they already know and can accomplish. If instruction jumps prematurely to quadrant D, students are not given the contextual supports they need to meet the cognitive challenge. Quadrant C activities (context reduced, cognitively undemanding) can be useful for reinforcement or practice of particular points and for teaching discrete language skills. However, if instruction stays at the level of
quadrant C (rather than involving both quadrants B and C), it risks focusing only on out of context drills and worksheets. This kind of instruction usually fails to supply certain essential elements of facilitate learning. (pg. 71)

**Figure 1**

*Range of textual support and degree of cognitive involvement in language tasks and activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitively Undemanding</th>
<th>Cognitively Demanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Everyday Topics</em></td>
<td><em>Topic Specific Vocabulary, New Ideas, Abstract Concepts</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Easy Content)</em></td>
<td><em>(Difficult Content)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Embedded</th>
<th>Quadrant A</th>
<th>Quadrant B</th>
<th>Quadrant C</th>
<th>Quadrant D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expressions,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Easy Language)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Reduced</th>
<th>Lack of Non-verbal Help, Abstract Language, Complex Language Structures <em>(Difficult Language)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Note.* (Cummins, 2001, p. 66).

As Cummins (2001) explains, emergent bilingual students can grapple with highly challenging content and texts, with the support of context-embedded or contextualized language and can be apprenticed into navigating through context-reduced or decontextualized language discourses through a gradual progression and release of scaffolding through the linguistic continuum presented in Figure 1.
Emerging Frameworks

This section synthesizes scholarship regarding constructivism, sociocultural learning theory, scaffolding, and best practices for emergent bilingual students. In addition, an overview of the contributions of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Jerome Brunner, and other scholars who have pushed evidence-based learning scholarship forward will be highlighted.

Constructivism

Rousseau and Piaget. Pedagogy in the twentieth century has broken away from a stimulus/response focus on conditioning students, to a student-centered constructivist approach, where students learn by doing, interacting, and social participation (Oakes et al., 2018; Fosnot, 2005). In addition to the pedagogical shift, this was a monumental epistemological shift, inspired in large part by the work of Jean Piaget, who’s research in cognitive science revolutionized philosophy, psychology, and education, by establishing constructivism (Fosnot, 2005). Notwithstanding, Koops (2012) argues against Fosnot (2005) assertion, and explains the monumental role of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who’s enlightenment inspired pedagogy took Europe by storm, and established the foundation for modern equity-based education. In fact, Piaget appropriated his developmental theory from Jean Jacques Rousseau’s developmental hypothesis created over 200 years ago (Koops, 2012). Nevertheless, the essence of constructivism is captured by Fosnot (2005):

Constructivism is a theory about knowledge and learning; it describes both what “knowing” is and how one “comes to know.” … the theory describes knowledge not as truths to be transmitted or discovered, but as emergent developmental, nonobjective, viable constructed explanations by humans engaged in meaning
making in cultural and social communities of discourse. Learning from this perspective is viewed as a self-regulatory process of struggling with the conflict between existing personal models of the world and discrepant new insights, constructing new representations and models of reality as a human meaning-making venture with culturally developed tools and symbols, and further negotiating such meaning through cooperative social activity, discourse, and debate in communities of practice. Teachers who base their practice on constructivism reject the notions that meaning can be passed on to learners via symbols and transmission, that learners can incorporate exact copies of teachers’ understanding for their own use, that whole concepts can be broken into discrete subskills, that whole concept can be taught out of context. In contrast, a constructivist view of learning suggests an approach to teaching that gives learners the opportunity for concrete, contextually meaningful experience through which they can search for patterns; raise questions; and model, interpret, and defend their strategies and ideas. The classroom in this model is seen as a mini-society, a community of learners engaged in activity, discourse, interpretation, justification, and reflection. The traditional hierarchy of teacher as the autocratic knower, and learner as the unknowing, controlled subject studying and practicing what the teacher knows, begins to dissipate as teacher assumes more of a facilitators role and learners take on more ownership of the ideas. Indeed, autonomy, mutual reciprocity of social relations, and empowerment become the goals. (pp. i-ii)
The differences between traditional and progressive pedagogies are subtle on the exterior, but Fosnot (2005) accentuates the stark differences between the two, placing the imperative on the teacher to become a supporting actor, while the student seizes the leading role. While Piaget’s role in developing this highly noble and socially just philosophy—constructivism—should not be overlooked, Jean Jacques Rousseau should be equally appreciated, as the greatest enlightenment philosophers regarded him as the grandfather of modern pedagogy (Koops, 2012). Moreover, Koops (2012) argues for returning to the ideas of Rousseau, as an indispensable source of guidance in a forsaken era, where a large percentage of students are being marginalized, requiring a novel and enlightened pedagogy.

Piaget (1970) described constructivism and human learning as a deeply profound progression of observation, interaction, reflection, and application, of slowly and gradually making meaning, which was completely contingent on the experience and internalized constructions of the individual. In other words, Piaget believed that learning is conditional on an individual’s ability to reconcile past and present experiences, and assembling and fabricating new outlooks (Fosnot, 2005). Piaget’s constructivist concept was in stark contrast to the educational practices of the Industrial Revolution and the behaviorist tendencies of the early 20th century (Oakes et al., 2018) and inspired new research and educational pedagogies based on the learning potential of the individual experience (Fosnot, 2015)

Despite Piaget’s monumental role in establishing the modern psychological and educational foundation for what we know about how children learn, many of his theories have been discredited by other scholars (Genovese, 2003). Genovese (2003) argues for
viewing and reappropriating Piaget’s adolescent development and constructivist philosophies into a broader disciplinary scope—evolutionary psychology. In fact, Genovese (2003) asserts that without feedback and guidance informed by evolutionary psychology scholarship, Piagetian learning theory based on constructivism is invalid. Genovese (2003) contributes a compelling and implicative argument, when he explains the failure of constructivist pedagogues to differentiate between biological abilities: biologically primary and biologically secondary abilities, which determines the levels of intrinsic or extrinsic feedback that students need, and the applicability of constructivist techniques. Genovese (2003) argument transcends modern educational pedagogy, when he explains the need for perceiving “cognitive development” through “a modern evolutionary understanding,” that acknowledges the unorthodox nature of “academic learning,” requiring significant “extrinsic support” (p. 134).

For instance, Geary (1995, 2002) introduces an educational framework with such an evolutionary psychology perspective, where he differentiates between abilities that are hardwired and considered hardware of the brain, rather than abilities that are unnatural and deviate from the evolutionary process, and more like software. Contrary to progressive educational frameworks, some evolutionary psychologists contend that teaching practices rooted in student-centric and constructivist frameworks are inadequate, because they are not responsive to biologically primary and biologically secondary abilities, the latter requiring considerable practice and motivation (Geary, 1995, Geary & Bjorkland, 2000; Geary, 2002). Furthermore, Genovese (2003) demonstrates how the failure to distinguish between these abilities has led several renowned constructivists to fundamentally misunderstand how children learn. Genovese (2003) explains that the ideal
commonly held among constructivists that students’ internal motivation is a panacea for all learning, is deeply misguided. Genovese (2003) argues that “they have made the mistake of elevating a delimited set of instructional techniques into an overarching philosophy of teaching” (p. 134). Steinberg (1996) survey supports the above conclusions, when he found that internal motivation was not a strong factor on student achievement as a student ascends into secondary school and adulthood.

Feldman (2018) is in stark contrast to Genovese (2003) and Steinberg (1996), arguing that intrinsic motivation is superior for imaginative and intellectual work. Furthermore, Feldman (2018) argues against the implementation of extrinsic motivation and claims that there is an overwhelming consensus that has demonstrated the efficacy of intrinsic motivation for academics. Feldman (2018) asserts that extrinsic motivation strategies are manifestations of a deficit-perspective, a stance that perceives minority populations as incapable of intrinsic motivation. Ginsberg, and Wlodkowski (2009) go further by arguing:

Using only extrinsic incentives to inspire learning is a form of educational engineering that implicitly views students as inferior, inert, and in need of motivation. Such an orientation dims our awareness of learner’s own determination and promotes their dependency. (p. 12)

It is quite clear, no current consensus exists between evolutionary psychologists and educational researchers regarding the question of intrinsic vs extrinsic motivation, as Genovese (2003) presents a body of scholarship refuting Feldman (2018), that learning is unorthodox, tedious, and requires extrinsic motivation. Perhaps Piaget’s own interest in integrating his developmental theory into evolutionary psychology himself (Genovese,
2003), is an indication for all vested scholars to heed the call of Koops (2012), to return to the ideas of Rousseau, to forge another revolutionary pedagogy, in the image of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

**Sociocultural Learning Theory**

**Lev Vygotsky.** Following Piaget’s research, Vygotsky also adopted the constructivist perspective, but focused on the implications of speech and collaboration on learning and thought (Fosnot, 2005; Walqui & Van Leer, 2010). In addition, Vygotsky reviewed and diverged from Piaget’s early work on language and asserted that language production was deeply rooted in cooperation with others from birth (Fosnot, 2005). To Vygotsky, “learning first takes place on a social (intermental) level before it takes place on an individual (intramental) level” (van de Pol et al., 2010, p. 271). Extending from Piaget, Vygotsky established a learning theory grounded in communicating and interfacing with others, as the primary catalyst for learning: which is known as sociocultural learning theory (Spycher, 2015, p. 35).

As the student stands on the shoulders of a more capable interlocutor, the student can access learning that would otherwise be impossible, as a result of communicative interaction and focused apprenticeship (van de Pol et al., 2010; Spycher, 2015). Vygotsky argued for teachers to broaden students’ learning beyond their current capability, with teacher/student communication, interventions, and group work, which would act as force multipliers for the construction of meaning, and development (Spycher, 2017; Fosnot, 2015). Vygotsky conceptualized this process and the utility of direct instruction, collaboration, and language production with his *zone of proximal development* or ZPD, a schema for teachers to understand how students learn. Vygotsky diverged from Piaget on
the fundamentality of language and collaboration, as the keys for learning (Fosnot, 2015), and established the sociocultural learning framework, and an outline to visualize a student’s ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978).

However, Vygotsky failed to articulate the specific praxis that is essential to the sociocultural learning framework, inspiring much research on these mechanisms, commonly referred to as scaffolding (Stone, 1993). Much of this research has been focused on clarifying the dialectic vehicles for the graduated increase of responsibility to pupils (Stone, 1993). One such vehicle that that has been identified is prolepsis, a verbal strategy that suggests, and requires the listener to construct information (Stone, 1993, p. 171). Other related strategies that have been specified are conversational implicature: a strategy that provides the listener with necessary context; cognitive load: the amount of responsibility placed on students; mutual trust: the probability that students will want to learn from a given teacher (Stone, 1993, p. 175). “[I]nterpersonal relations” and social “influence” have also been underscored, extending our understanding of sociocultural learning theory and how to operate in a ZPD, by leveraging the power of cultural pressure to shape knowledge creation (Stone, 1993, p. 180). As Stone (1993) illustrates, since Bruner and associates introduced the term scaffolding, our conceptualization of how to create ZPD’s has transformed from a teacher-centric perspective, where the student’s learning is inactively progressed, to a model describing a dynamic interaction of meaning making between teacher and student.

According to Oakes et al. (2018) sociocultural learning is vibrant, fluid, adaptable, flexible, deeply communal, and adequately supports and maximizes learning for all students. Teachers who subscribe to a sociocultural learning approach strive to
foster communities of practice based on conversation, activation, and higher order thinking; sociocultural teachers also inspire students by empowering them to take charge of academic tasks (Oakes et al., 2018). Sociocultural work is disguised as fun, igniting students desire to learn, through multimodal and multisensory transformative learning experiences (Oakes et al., 2018).

A teacher who employs sociocultural learning theory, understands their primary role as a servant, rather than an omniscient lecturer, who does all the talking (Oakes et al., 2018). Teachers successfully achieve their sociocultural theoretical goals by providing conscientious interventions and interacting with small groups, providing continuous progress monitoring, as well as timely adaptations to all aspects of the learning environment as needed, and on a case-by-case basis (Oakes et al., 2018). Perhaps more importantly, “Vygotsky emphasized the primacy of linguistic mediation in the development of higher mental processes; he contended that language is the main vehicle of thought, and that all language use is dialogical, that is, based on social interaction” (Walqui & Van Lier, 2010, p. 7). Vygotsky’s idea about language production is profound and implicative, as emergent bilinguals are often hesitant to participate due to language barriers and socio-political pressures, creating inequitable learning environments that inhibit their ability to engage, and think.

According to Oakes et al. (2018) researchers have unequivocally demonstrated the efficacy of sociocultural learning theory. Moreover, research findings have debunked the myth of a standardized intelligence and provide a platform for conceptualizing a wide diversity of intelligences and assets that students bring into the classroom (Oakes et al., 2018). An overwhelming consensus in the psychological literature argues—Robert
Sternberg, Howard Gardner, Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole—that intelligence manifests itself in a multitude of forms, shaped by the norms and priorities of a given culture, geography, and contextual circumstances (Oakes et al., 2018). Teachers build on students’ intelligences within organic learning experiences, mimicking real world tasks and problems, so students can extrapolate knowledge with contextual support and accumulate meaning, bonding old and new practices (Oakes et al., 2018). The epistemological paradigm shift away from behaviorism, IQ, and a standardized intelligence has paved the way for constructivist, sociocultural, and equitable teaching practices, and compel educators to reevaluate their philosophies of teaching and support and amplify the broad diversity of intelligences and learning styles that students possess.

While applying sociocultural learning theory to practice is undoubtedly effective teaching for emergent bilingual students, there may be more specificity, and structure needed to maximize collaborative work in school (Mercer & Howe, 2012). For instance, Mercer and Howe (2012) underscore the extensive ORACLE study in the 1970’ which found that “just because several students were sitting together at a table (as was common), this did not mean that they were collaborating” (p. 16). Mercer and Howe (2012) illustrate the difficulties of optimizing group work when they affirm that meaningful disciplinary specific collaboration is unnatural and uncommon, as groups can misleadingly seem to be working together at first glance, but are simply socializing, without confronting tasks synchronously and in cooperation. Other scholars have raised similar concerns about collaborative learning, and report similar findings: collaboration is frequently unfruitful, as many educators and students struggle actualizing genuine collaborative experiences (Blatchford & Kutnick, 2003; Galton et al., 1999).
Furthermore, Blatchford and Kutnick (2003) highlight the disconnect between research that supports the efficacy of collaborative work, and a lack of studies providing an evidence-based framework for implementation; to reinforce the efficacy of sociocultural learning; to optimize valuable instructional time; and for the collaborative activation of the classroom as a whole. Mercer and Howe (2012) and Blatchford and Kutnick (2003) are in complete alignment, that the sociocultural learning framework needs a stronger pedagogical base, stronger guidance and clarity for applicability, and practical use in the classroom.

*Scaffolding.* Jerome Bruner developed the work of Vygotsky and introduced the term *scaffolding* to conceptualize a sociocultural learning praxis, based on interaction with advanced facilitators and a slow release of collaborative support to foster an evolving independence for students (Spycher, 2017; Fosnot, 2015). Bruner argued for teachers to endow their capabilities to students, challenging and supporting them with timely, methodical, and adaptable cues, elevating the learners grasp, and enabling transformation and persevering understandings (Fosnot, 2015; Spycher, 2017). van de Pol et al. (2010) describe scaffolding as “such a dynamic” process “finely tuned to the learner’s ongoing progress, the support given by the teacher during scaffolding strongly depends upon the characteristics of the situation” and “the responses of the student”; and when they state, “[t]herefore, scaffolding does never look the same in different situations and it is not a technique that can be applied in every situation in the same way” (p. 272). Nonetheless, several scholars argue that the practice of scaffolding has been widely misappropriated in the scholarship, diverging from the original spirit of the pedagogy, and losing its meaning as a dynamic student led procedure (Pea 2014; Puntambekar &
Hubscher, 2005; Stone 1998 a, b) van de Pol et al. (2010) explain how the scaffolding metaphor itself has also come under some scrutiny, for implying that students are static, stationary, and inactive during the learning process. Regardless, van de Pol et al. (2010) argue that scaffolding “is a teaching method that can focus on the development of the child in all its different facets” (p. 275).

van de Pol et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis on the peer-reviewed scholarship focused on scaffolding and found that an established framework has not been formulated. While some scholarship has been produced in the areas of literacy and metacognitive techniques, a general characterization for how scaffolding works is: “(1) teacher responsibility, (2) joint responsibility, (3) student responsibility p.” (274).

However, despite the lack of a comprehensive framework for scaffolding, van de Pol et al. (2010) identify three pillars of scaffolding: contingency, fading, and the transfer of responsibility. Contingency teaching is embodied by “responsiveness, tailored, adjusted, differentiated, titrated, or calibrated support,” while fading and transfer of responsibility describe the “contingent” removal of interventions based on the students evolving progress and needs, with the goal of fostering autonomy (van de Pol, 2010, p.272) van de Pol et al. (2010) explain that misconceptions abound regarding scaffolding strategies, and for scaffolding to truly take place with fidelity, educators need to implement scaffolding techniques that are conditionally calibrated dependent on students’ constructions of understanding, while graduating the student towards autonomous engagement.

Building from Tharp and Gallimore (1988) and Wood et al. (1976), researchers have distinguished between the mechanisms and the motives for scaffolding and
integrated a new framework for understanding scaffolding (van de Pol et al., 2010). The 6 means of scaffolding are summarized by van de Pol (2010):

Feeding back (1) involves the provision of information regarding the student's performance to the student him/herself. The giving of hints (2) entails the provision of clues or suggestions by the teacher to help the student go forward. The teacher deliberately does not supply the entire solution or detailed instructions under such circumstances. Instructing (3) involves the teacher telling the students what to do or explanation of how something must be done and why. Explaining (4) refers to the provision of more detailed information or clarification by the teacher. Modeling (5) (i.e., Wood et al.'s (1976) demonstration category) is "the process of offering behavior for imitation" (Tharp and Gallimore 1988, p. 47). This can include the demonstration of particular skills. Finally, questioning (6) involves asking students questions that require an active linguistic and cognitive answer. Whether a teaching strategy qualifies as scaffolding generally depends upon its enactment in actual practice and more specifically upon whether the strategy is applied contingently and whether it is also part of a process of fading and transfer of responsibility. (p. 277)

In addition, van de Pol (2010) provide a helpful breakdown of the six scaffolding intentions:

(A) refers to keeping the learning on target and maintaining the learner's pursuit of a particular objective. This intention is of a largely metacognitive nature. When the scaffolding intention is cognitive structuring (B), the teacher provides "explanatory and belief structures that organize and justify" (Tharp and Gallimore
Reduction of the degrees of freedom (C) entails taking over those parts of a task that the student is not yet able to perform and thereby simplification of the task for the student. Cognitive structuring and reduction of the degrees of freedom are mainly undertaken to aid the cognitive activities of learners. Finally, two scaffolding intentions concerned with learner affect can be distinguished: recruitment and contingency management/frustration control. Recruitment (D) refers to getting students interested in a task and helping them adhere to the requirements of the task. Contingency management/frustration control (E) concerns the facilitation of student performance via a system of rewards and punishments as well as keeping students motivated via the prevention or minimalization of frustration. (p. 277)

Furthermore, van de Pol (2010) assert that when and only when these elements are integrated in concert with one another, scaffolding in the true sense, is taking place. While van de Pol (2010) conclude that scaffolding strategies are effective, they also conclude that much is still “unknown about the effectiveness and the processes of scaffolding,” due to difficulties in “measurement and analysis” (p. 287).

Walqui (2006) provides a different perspective on scaffolding, much of which is aligned with the mechanisms and motives framework synthesized by van de Pol et al. (2010), and others. First Walqui (2006) differentiates between the different interlocutors who can act as mediators for scaffolding: the teacher, colleagues with comparable faculties, less proficient colleagues, and an individuals own executive functioning assets. Next, Walqui (2006) offers her scaffolding protocol: modeling, developing metacognition, bridging, text representation, contextualization, and schema building:
• modeling, provisioning students with a specific analog for what will be performed or produced;
• bridging, fusing individual knowledge structures with knowledge to be introduced;
• contextualization, promulgating a multisensory learning experience so student can benefit from a range of input to construct meaning;
• schema building, coaching students to see the big picture and build mental frameworks for organizing seemingly unrelated information;
• text representation, prompting students to diffuse information in one text type into an alternate text type;
• developing metacognition, fostering students to fabricate executive functioning and strategic skills for academic purposes (Walqui, 2006).

While most of Walqui (2006) scaffolding strategies are clearly explained, embedded, and aligned with the previous scaffolding framework based on Tharp and Gallimore (1988) and Wood et al. (1976), her conceptualization is much more useful and accessible for the everyday teacher.

Walqui and van Lier (2010) continue to develop the framework for scaffolding instruction for emergent bilinguals. The foundation for their framework, is built on the scholarship embodied by this review. The first component is a call for educators to challenge and engage emergent bilingual students within rich disciplinary learning experiences, which is a theme in bilingual pedagogy (Mariani, 1997; Cummins, 2001; Hammond, 2006; Gibbons, 2009; Walqui & van Lier, 2010; de Oliveira & Athanases,
To achieve deep disciplinary knowledge, learners must be supported to understand key ideas in the subject area, the deep connections between and across facts related to those core ideas, the basic conceptual structure of the discipline, the processes valued in the field, and the preferred ways of expressing them. This kind of search for integration and connection has been uncommon in teachers own training and practice. (p. 86)

Although seemingly common knowledge, this principle is lost in contemporary educational thought, as school systems gravitate towards an endless cycle of assessment and high stakes testing, placing a premium on low order thinking, regimented drills, and teaching to high stakes tests (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). In addition, the mere expectations that teachers hold of student academic potential has a powerful effect on academic outcomes (Walqui & van Lier, 2010; Oakes et al., 2018). These expectations can be asset and deficit based, can influence the way teachers approach students, and present barriers for emergent bilingual students who are often stigmatized (Walqui & van Lier, 2010; Oakes et al, 2018). Nevertheless, high expectations are not sufficient, without an equally elevated intensity of support, and “are inseparable in quality teaching” (Walqui & van Lier, 2010, p. 90).

Walqui and van Lier (2010) continue to draw inspiration from the sociocultural learning framework, the work of Vygotsky, Bruner, and many other pedagogues, emphasizing transformative teacher/student interactions. Walqui and van Lier (2010) urge for the need to immerse students in prolonged interactions that nurtures higher order
thinking, given them the appropriate time to erect conceptual edifices and forge knowledge within robust disciplinary specific discourses. Through rich conversation and the intertwining of perspectives, opinions, arguments, and conclusions, emergent bilingual students benefit from highly scaffolded academic language and transformative educational experiences, as peers engage in content specific pedagogy together (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Although the teacher operates as a guide rather than a lecturer, and allows instruction to be centered on the students, the teacher plays a quintessential role, judiciously nudging and pushing the conversation forward, diverging, and illuminating a path towards metacognition, intellectualism, and the evolution of understandings, interpretations, applications, analyses, syntheses, and justifications (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). A high-quality interaction facilitates the emergent bilingual to enjoy hands-on experiential learning, and a dynamic exercise of critical thinking, intellectual rigor, reflection, and realization (Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

Explicitly apprenticing students into mastering academic language within disciplinary specific activities is reinforced by a curriculum that is responsive to the needs of English learners (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Walqui and van Lier (2010) promote an objective oriented, inquiry focus, and a gradually progressive and profound curriculum that bridges relevance to the everyday life of the student, and incorporating students’ multiculturalism, assets, and experiences. After the establishment of a curriculum centered on the emergent bilingual, teachers should be deliberate in deploying the curriculum, so that students can become activated and engaged to the maximum extent possible (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Another component of the Walqui and van Lier (2010) Quality Teaching for English Learners approach is apprenticing students to
understand the trade secrets of academic English. Walqui and van Lier (2010) espouse explicit genre instruction, as the foundation for allowing students to master text types, academic discourses, structure, and jargon, and providing simplified analogs for disciplinary specific texts. A second focus of this principle is grounded on the facilitation of student understanding of key concepts and terminology, and allowing students to negotiate meaning in collaboration, and providing timely direct instruction and differentiation (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Equitable instructors of English learners maintain “challenging and meaningful activities” and provide language interventions in the moment, within rigorous scholarly contexts (Walqui & van Lier, 2010, p. 98). After building genre understanding, and making sure students see the big picture of what they are supposed to do, teachers can start narrowing down to focus on the matter of academic language, but within contextualized content specific activities (Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

**Over-Scaffolding.** However, emergent bilingual students are often marginalized by teachers who over-scaffold instruction. Delpit (1988) explains how mainstream teachers and power brokers generally, can subconsciously modify expectations for minority populations to their detriment. de Oliveira and Athanases (2017) corroborate this finding when they explain, “we need to rethink the scaffolding metaphor to serve such a linguistically diverse population. For example, in classrooms with many bilingual students, teachers often provide too much support (Valencia & Wixson, 2013), oversimplifying and over scaffolding writing tasks (Kibler, 2013)” (p. 123). de Oliveira and Athanases (2017) go further, when they illustrate the need for teachers to constantly and dynamically lower and raise scaffolding in the moment to delegate maximum responsibility to students as their capabilities increase, while avoiding regimentation. The
right combination of scaffolding, under the appropriate program of gradual release, can create and sustain the optimum amount of challenge for the stimulation of growth (Johnson, 2019). Understanding scaffolded instruction as an art form and a science, that constantly needs to be calibrated and recalibrated based on continuous assessment, is a best practice for language minority populations.

In sum, the emerging pedagogical frameworks for contemporary education span hundreds of years and are still evolving. The lack of consensus regarding the efficacy of intrinsic vs extrinsic motivation is alarming, in an age where we benefit from modern research methods and techniques. The implications of this stalemate in the scholarship are implicative, as we still do not definitively know when and how to apply constructivist techniques and when and how to implement more extrinsic approaches for academic mastery. Future research should focus on developing a methodology that transparently demonstrates how, when and why to shift among approaches, as the academic and real-world outcomes of our children hang in the balance.

Likewise, progressive frameworks—constructivism and sociocultural learning theory—are clearly on the vanguard of best pedagogical practices for emergent bilingual students. Koops (2012) analysis of the state of education was illuminating, and a wakeup call; that we have much more to accomplish pedagogically and culturally as a society to provide high quality educations to our marginalized students, and for that matter, all students. Koops (2012) revelation that “the modern Western child, construed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—the Enlightened child—disappeared in the second half of the twentieth century,” (p. 54) should be startling for all progressive stakeholders, who espouse high expectations. If we as an educational community truly hold high
expectations for all students, we should follow Koop (2012), and reflect on how we arrived at a point where masses of children arrive at secondary school with major literacy needs; and argue for something better. Although this matter will be set aside for the purposes of this project, it is clear, pedagogically speaking, we have not arrived at a pedagogy, or through a threshold as a society, that is adequate. I for one believe that all present-day students can rival the children of the Enlightenment, on academic, or any other terms, and urge all stakeholders to work together, to reform our education and society; to actualize the tangible and unlimited potential of our children.

Language Education Practices.

Although education has progressed drastically since the inhumane era of the 19th and early 20th centuries, education and the environments our children are developed in, need much further scrutiny. Notwithstanding, a consensus regarding inequitable and equitable practices specifically related to emergent bilingual students has coalesced. Here we review that consensus and discuss translanguaging: the embodiment of bilingual pedagogy.

Inequitable vs Equitable Practices

Garcia and Kleifgen (2018) provide a comprehensive report on the state of education and the implementation of bilingual pedagogy and conclude that the latest bilingual pedagogy scholarship based on primary language instruction, is still not being employed with fidelity. One example is the modus operandi of divorcing home language from target language that programs, schools, and educators propagate, subjugating the linguistic and discursive dynamism of the emergent bilingual (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018) Garcia and Kleifgen emphasize this point by stating, “this practice of strict language
separation and sheltering of languages has prevailed in bilingual education” (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018, p. 75). Educators should be mindful of the most recent scholarship regarding bilingual methodology, to avoid imposing monolingual restrictions, and propagating inequitable outcomes.

Home language education is undoubtedly the basis of bilingual pedagogy but fabricating a learning environment where the emergent bilingual feels safe and activated to participate, speak, and engage, is also paramount. As a result of an unquantifiable amount of diversity in California public schools, teachers are encouraged to resist the tendency to stereotype and classify emergent bilinguals based on dominant, unjust, and monocultural dogmas (Oakes et al., 2018; Nieto & Bode, 2012). Furthermore, publicly comparing students from dominant cultural backgrounds with language minority students, cements hierarchies that alienate vulnerable students, placing high performers coming from the dominant culture on the top rung, while unfairly stigmatizing diverse students and placing them on the bottom (Oakes et al., 2018). Prejudices are insidious and consequential for all citizens, contingent on the target groups’ exposure to such negative characterizations (Oakes et al., 2018). Considering the implications of the emergent bilingual experience, and the work of Vygotsky (1978) related to the intricately related nature of language as the essential mechanism for thought, access to a meaningful education for emergent bilinguals, hinges on cultivating a deeply hospitable learning environment.

According to Oakes et al. (2018), sociocultural learning insulates students from the socio-political threats of the dominant culture, as classrooms become vibrantly integrated multicultural and sociocultural communities: safe spaces for emergent
bilinguals to thrive in (Oakes et al., 2018). As we have learned, sociocultural learning theory and scaffolding, still needs to be developed as a science. More importantly, while several reviews on sociocultural learning theory and scaffolding such as van de Pol et al. (2010) and Johnson (2019) have neglected to mention Kagan (1985), it appears that Kagan (1985) and the cooperative learning strategies therein, remain the standard of practice for cultivating a sociocultural learning environment, and for providing all students with robust dialectical scaffolds (Wong, 2014; Kagan, 2000; Gradone, n.d.; García, & Baker, 1995) In addition, many of the collaborative learning techniques promoted by Walqui and van Lier (2010) were appropriated from Kagan (1985). Therefore, as a starting point for educators to begin their sociocultural work, Kagan (1985) and related strategies, should be employed frequently

   Bilingual and collaborative learning is bolstered with what is known as a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (CAST, 2018). Industry leading authorities in education, espouse the need to implement such a curriculum design, that provides admission to profound learning for all students regardless of circumstances (CAST, 2018; Oakes et al., 2018). Facilitating elaborate, dynamic, authentic, and collaborative experiences achieves this, by adapting teaching and learning to the universe of assets students bring to the table; affording teachers with golden opportunities to “assign competence to low-status students explicitly,” which dismantles monocultural structures (Oakes et al., 2018, p. 209). UDL is a teaching and learning framework that embodies and subsumes much of the literature that has been discussed in this review and provides user friendly guidelines for educators to apply in the classroom (CAST, 2018).
Industry leaders promote heteroglossic bilingual instructional practices, more commonly understood as bilingual instructional strategies (Cummins, 2005; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). These strategies tailor instruction based on a student’s given multilingual endowments, rather than coercing students to neglect their primary means of constructing knowledge (Cummins, 2005; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Anything otherwise would force students to abandon their gifts, and to surrender to the monolingual agenda, that alienates and marginalizes language minority people, embarguing the fluid communicative faculties of the bilingual individual (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Cummins (2009) argues for “bilingual instructional strategies” to be implemented into English-only spaces, in order to activate the “intelligence, imagination, and linguistic talents” of emergent bilingual students (p. xi). Teachers are encouraged to implement bilingual instructional strategies generously, as they are a primary mechanism for delivering bilingual pedagogy to emergent bilingual students, leveraging the mother tongue in the classroom.

One of the most powerful bilingual instructional strategies that teachers can employ, is explicit cognate instruction (Cummins, 2005, Riches & Genesee, 2006, Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Cummins (2005) affirms that cognate instruction has a force multiplying effect, especially between English and Spanish, as well as unrelated languages to certain degrees. Riches and Genesee (2006), after conducting a comprehensive review of studies focused on the efficacy of explicit cognate instruction, affirm Cummins (2005), when they conclude that cognate instruction facilitates literacy development of target languages.
Another powerful bilingual instructional strategy that should be strategically deployed are what Cummins (2005) refers to as *Dual Language Books*. Dual language books are excellent project-based options for teachers to differentiate instruction for emergent bilinguals, as they incorporate many of the theoretical constructs and best practices discussed in this analysis. Through dual language texts, emergent bilinguals engage in contrastive analysis, interfacing with all their linguistic tools, as they translate and construct knowledge utilizing both mother and target languages (Cummins, 2005). This strategy can also be adapted to incorporate culturally empowering texts, that promote emergent bilinguals to develop robust identities, through rich academic work (Cummins, 2005; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). These inherently bilingual techniques can take on many forms. Students can engage in writing tasks bilingually that activate personal experiences, and collaborate with other bilingual students, allowing them to code switch between different combinations of modes of communication and interpretation; teachers could also orient students to the content and frontload vocabulary in the mother tongue; educators should also provide translations to students in the primary language (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Explicitly apprenticing students to use literacy strategies is also a highly effective for literacy development of the target language (Riches & Genesee, 2006; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). Additionally, providing access and encouraging students to use bilingual language resources like Google Translate or dictionaries, are important elements (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018) Affording emergent bilingual students with bilingual instructional strategies allows them to tap into their profound reservoir of linguistic and cognitive gifts, there most powerful point of reference and their intimate thought processes, and helps students fuse their bilingual
systems into an evolving language, a translanguage that is greater than the sum of its parts; and perhaps more importantly these strategies allow for emergent bilingual students to construct vibrant bilingual identities, within academic contexts (Cummins, 2005; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018).

**Translanguaging.** The vanguard of psycholinguistics and bilingual education is gravitating towards a *translanguaging pedagogy*, which embodies how bilingualism works, and how bilingual people engage in constructing knowledge and language learning (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018) Originally conjured as a protocol for alternating between languages through different combinations of input and output, it has been developed as a method that not only maximizes the learning experience of emergent bilinguals, but underscores the linguistic power of bilingualism, as a singular meaning making apparatus (Garcia, et al., 2017; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018) This pedagogy allows an emergent bilingual to tap into and take advantage of their linguistic and cognitive resources, and provides them with license to feel comfortable and engage the learning environment naturally, as opposed to removing these assets by compartmentalizing the linguistic repertoire of the emergent bilingual into segregated systems (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018). A bilingual teaching philosophy based on translanguaging is transformative, not only for the emergent bilingual, but for a traditional one-size fits all monolingual educational paradigm, and society at large (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018).

Garcia et al. (2017) provide a rough outline for the objectives of a translanguaging pedagogy. They emphasize the following:

- scaffolding abstract material and disciplinary texts
- facilitating specialized academic language development
the creation of translanguage spaces

- culturally empowering instruction (García et al. (2017))

García et al. (2017) detail a translanguage pedagogy, when they stipulate *stance, design, and shift*. A translanguage stance speaks to educator understanding of bilingual pedagogy, and the ability and willingness to apply theory to practice; a translanguage design on the other hand, is the plan of action teachers implement based on sound theory; and a translanguage shift describes the disposition of a teacher who believes in bilingual pedagogy, and applies it with fidelity across the curriculum, throughout all aspects of instruction. When teachers create a safe and effective translanguage space for emergent bilinguals, they apply bilingual pedagogy effectively, and support them to actualize their unlimited academic and real-world potentials.

**Concluding Reflection**

This chapter incorporates a critical analysis of the scholarship related to the evolving theoretical framework for bilingual pedagogy, and best practices for emergent bilingual students. The extraordinary benefits of bilingualism were analyzed and corroborated, an indispensable turning point in the scholarship that debunked the pseudo-scientific monolingual agenda—that persists in the present day—and paved the way for a new era of human instruction for millions of vulnerable children. Many conscientious researchers have made tremendous contributions to the struggle for bilingual education, across a wide range of disciplines, while many others have attempted to derail the bilingual project. All responsible citizens should come together to remain vigilant, to challenge monocultural forces, and protect language minority children from disenfranchisement and subjugation.
Home language instruction in K-12 public school is backed by robust science. Bilingualism operates much like a high-performance automobile, benefiting from a super charged twin turbo system, that is deeply interconnected and facilitates superior performance within a broad range of cognitive and non-cognitive domains. Therefore, emergent bilinguals should be affirmed, supported, and celebrated in the classroom, as they embark on the grand quest to master two languages simultaneously. To support students in that quest, teachers are encouraged to implement translinguaging spaces, provide explicit cognate instruction, and allowed to engage academic content within activities that provide rich contextual cues, such as highly structured collaborative learning activities. Educators should be well aware of the brilliance of the bilingual child, so they may understand the need to place emergent bilinguals in highly challenging activities, supported by deliberate and calibrated supports. Teachers have the power to open doors for emergent bilinguals or close them. Bilingual pedagogy is they key for a future where bilingual children enjoy the same rights that monolingual children have; an objective that must be fulfilled for our country to honor the promise made in our founding documents.

Constructivism and sociocultural learning theory are Rousseauian constructs that embody humane and socially just educational practices. While undoubtedly efficacious and backed by a corpus of scholarship, much more is needed in order to close the achievement gap. Although many scholars proclaim them to be a panacea for providing equitable educations to at risk students, this review makes clear: evolutionary psychology should not be ignored. Furthermore, reconciling the matter of extrinsic vs intrinsic motivation is of the highest importance, as there is no consensus among educational and
evolutionary psychologist scholars. Motivation is what drives us to act. As an educational community, if we do not know what drives our students to engage in the classroom, we do not yet know how to educate them. Moving forward, scholars should refrain from engaging in bad faith research and propagating spurious conclusions to advance personal gain. Scholarship, and adults in general, should strive for a higher commonwealth, putting the welfare of children, above academic rivalries.
CHAPTER THREE:
METHODOLOGY

Target Population

Based on the argument that teachers influence the academic success or failure of emergent bilingual students more than any other factor (Cummins, 2000), the primary target population for this bilingual pedagogy field manual is California secondary school educators.

Content

The bilingual pedagogy field manual for secondary teachers is designed to provide important knowledge to reinforce the capabilities of secondary teachers, and their ability to support language-minority students in the classroom. The field manual is divided into 5 major sections. The first section is geared to orient the reader regarding bilingual pedagogy, providing insight on important background, key terms, and fundamental implications. The second section equips the secondary school teacher with a strong theoretical basis for the conceptualization and implementation of bilingual pedagogy. The third section provides a general understanding of ineffective practices and their implications on the student experience. The fourth section provides equitable and evidence-based best practices, to provide general guidance for teachers. The last section provides specific evidence-based strategies and models for teaching emergent bilingual students and supporting the development of biliteracy. The content herein was synthesized from peer-reviewed scholarship, and authoritative sources of the highest prestige and ethos within the discourse of bilingual education, pedagogy, and methodology, and will be overviewed in chapter two.
Format

This bilingual pedagogy field manual for secondary school educators is an embodiment of federal and judicial mandates, theoretical frameworks and constructs of bilingual pedagogy, as well as best language practices for emergent bilinguals, including peer-reviewed literature, research, and studies.
CHAPTER FOUR:

CONCLUSION

This project was undertaken to create a bilingual pedagogy field manual based on the existing corpus in the discipline and educate and support secondary school teachers provide equity-based education to emergent bilingual students. The primary topics critically analyzed herein are as follows: the struggle for bilingual education, the benefits of bilingualism, theoretical constructs of bilingual pedagogy, criticisms of bilingual pedagogy, constructivism, sociocultural learning theory, scaffolding, and inequitable vs equitable practices for emergent bilinguals. Although a consensus has been reached regarding the efficacy of sociocultural learning, and scaffolding instruction, meta-discursive scholarship must emerge to reconcile the stalemate regarding the question of intrinsic vs extrinsic motivation, in order to develop an updated pedagogy, that methodically and transparently guides educators as to how, when, and why to apply constructivist, and sociocultural techniques vs strategies that utilize extrinsic motivation. Moreover, there appears to be a vacuum in the scholarship regarding extrinsic motivation strategies, possible because they have been stigmatized. All scholars must reject playing politics with scholarship and honor their responsibility to science.

A starting point for future research may be the role of philosophy and childhood trauma. A strong philosophy provides a mechanism for the generation of intrinsic motivation. Conversely, that lack of a coherent philosophy may interfere with an individual’s ability to differentiate between the two and become fully aware of the implications of their own existence. Furthermore, traumatic childhood experiences undoubtedly have a powerful effect on a child’s education and life prospects. More
research and resources should be allocated to supporting families, parents, and children
close the information gap, and accessing best practices for welfare and wellness.
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PART TWO: PROJECT
Bilingual Pedagogy
Field Manual
For Secondary School Educators

By Russell I. Praslin
Purpose & Scope

The purpose of this bilingual pedagogy field manual is to provide secondary school educators with a general pedagogical framework that represents the latest theoretical consensus and best practices of the discipline. This field manual will provide the reader with fundamental context, theories, practices, strategies, and techniques to support emergent bilinguals develop biliteracy. This field manual is intended for any setting where emergent bilinguals are educated. While the primary focus of the field manual is geared towards the development and acquisition of English/Spanish biliteracy, the knowledge embedded in this handbook can be applied to facilitate the biliteracy of any combination of mother tongue (L1) and target language (L2).
Overview

The field manual is divided into five sections. The first section is geared to orient the reader regarding bilingual pedagogy, providing insights on important background, key terms, and fundamental considerations. The second section equips the secondary school teacher with a strong theoretical basis for the implementation of bilingual pedagogy in the classroom. Section three provides a general understanding of ineffective and inequitable practices and their implications on the student experience. The concluding two sections outline best practices and strategies for the benefit of emergent bilingual students, and their pursuit of biliteracy.

Mission:

The purpose of this bilingual pedagogy field manual is to provide secondary school teachers with best language education theories, practices, strategies, and techniques to foster the biliteracy of California’s emergent bilingual student population.
Field Manual Goals:

• To provide evidence-based bilingual pedagogy to secondary school teachers.

• To support California’s emergent bilingual student population, develop English/Spanish biliteracy.

• To provide evidence-based bilingual education to California’s emergent bilingual population.

• To educate all concerned stakeholders regarding the standard of practice for emergent bilingual students.

• To provide general guidance and evidence-based bilingual education praxis to all stakeholders.
Key Terms

**Bilingualism:** Varying degrees of dominion over 2 distinct language systems.

**Bilingual Pedagogy:** The application of evidence-based language practices that maximize biliteracy and the academic achievement of emergent bilingual students.

**Common Underlying Proficiency:** A theory that explains how information, knowledge, skills, and literacies can be accessed and generated by either home or target language through a common source of proficiency.

**Constructivism:** A philosophy of education that prioritizes and values the unique student meaning making experience.

**Contrastive Analysis:** A linguistic framework that provides a method for comparing home and target languages and positing that a facilitation effect would occur between areas of similarities and an interference would occur between areas of difference.

**Emergent bilingual:** Asset based term for aspiring biliterate students that recognizes the immense value of bilingualism and is a substitute for the deficit-based term English language learner.

**Equitable practices:** Fair and just educational practices that are responsive to the specific needs of students.

**Home language:** Student’s language that is predominantly spoken in the home and is commonly referred to as L1.

**Inequitable practices:** Unfair and unjust educational practices that are unresponsive to the specific needs of students.
**Interlinguistic transfer:** A hypothesis that describes the phenomenon by which bilingualism transfers knowledge, information, and literacy between home and target languages.

**Scaffolded instruction:** Responsive teaching that incorporates a carefully calibrated support structure for each student, based on their specific educational needs, and that amplifies student growth.

**Sociocultural learning theory:** Learning theory established by Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky, and developed by a series of researchers, which emphasizes the role of a more capable interlocutor in collaboration, as well as the importance of participation, and language production.

**Target language:** A secondary language that an emergent bilingual student is aspiring to gain proficiency with and is commonly referred to as L2.

**The threshold hypothesis:** A landmark hypothesis that established a theoretical framework for bilingual education, arguing that emergent bilingual students need to surpass a literacy threshold in either home or target language in order to experience benefits of bilingualism.

**Translanguaging:** A pedagogical framework that describes and leverages the dynamic linguistic tendencies of bilingual people
Section 1

Orientation on Bilingual Pedagogy
Introduction

Context

Before the seminal study conducted by Peal and Lambert (1962), bilingualism was perceived as a deficit rather than a force multiplier for communication and cognition. Since then, the works of Jim Cummins, and many other bilingual education researchers have unequivocally dispelled this myth and have established the reality: bilingualism is a powerful and an invaluable asset. Furthermore, bilingual education scholars have challenged and debunked the arguments for English-only instruction for emergent bilinguals and have ignited a beacon for teachers to implement bilingual pedagogy in the classroom, focused on home language practices for the acquisition of target languages.

Although not widely credited, bilingual education scholars have accomplished a historic civil rights victory, catalyzing a new era of humane instruction for millions of vulnerable language minority children. Notwithstanding, emergent bilingual students—over 2,500,000 in California alone—are still being underserved and disenfranchised in school in our present time. Moreover, challenges and backlashes against bilingual education have persisted for well over a century, reaching an apex during the 1980’s and 1990’s, and endure in discourses across the country. However, the bilingual education corpus represents a large and co-extensive scientific
consensus supporting the efficacy of bilingual education, and home language instruction, which is indisputable. This field manual is not only a call to action, but a plan of action, to continue the legacy and work of bilingual education leaders, and to unleash the unlimited potential of the bilingual community.
Implications for Achievement

An overwhelming scientific consensus has established the efficacy of bilingual pedagogy and the facilitation, support, and development of home language practices for academic achievement and English language acquisition. Bilingual education researchers have confirmed: there is a direct and positive correlation between a students’ academic development of their home language and achievement. In a series of landmark studies synthesizing decades of data on the efficacy of program effectiveness and sustained academic home language education, researchers have demonstrated that comprehensive home language instruction is superior to English-only models. These findings have been reinforced and cemented by an impressive body of peer reviewed research, making it clear, bilingual pedagogy maximizes achievement and English language acquisition, as well as providing a collection of other cognitive benefits.

Despite the overwhelming evidence regarding the efficacy of home language instruction, mainstream educational thought, policies, programs, and practices do not align with the science, and continue to alienate and disenfranchise language minority students.
The Impact of the Teacher plays the most influential role for
the academic success of children. Teachers spend a significant amount of
quality time with students, and for many households, this classroom time rivals the
time spent with parents and guardians. Academic achievement and language
development is shaped in large part, based on the
learning environments teachers create. Academic progress for emergent bilinguals depends on a teacher’s implementation of bilingual pedagogy, focused on evidence-based theory, practice, and culturally empowering instruction.

Adolescence is a dynamic biological and socio-emotional process that is vulnerable to the multitude of events that occur under a teacher’s supervision in the classroom. Emergent bilingual students are more vulnerable compared to language majority students because language minority students are coerced to abandon their language and culture, and compelled to assimilate to the dominant culture, while their own cultures are neglected and unappreciated. Emergent bilingual students need higher supports from teachers, so that language minority populations can receive what they need to fulfill their developmental needs. Therefore, because of a teachers’ fundamental purview over these academic, linguistic,
and developmental needs, teachers’ quite literally, shape the futures of our emergent bilingual students.

**The impact teachers have over the emergent bilingual experience is much more amplified compared to their influence on monolingual English speakers. A combination of complex factors intersect in the classroom, and often barricade language minority students from participation, engagement, and accessing an equitable education. This inequity is compounded by teachers who are not responsive, and who propagate inequitable practices or who hold misconceptions. Thus, providing students with the resources, supports, and the expertise required to remedy these inequities should be a high priority for all educators.**

Emergent bilingual students come from a diverse, multilingual, and multicultural background. Although this background is a profound source of assets and tools, dominant culture and society sends a contrary message, impeding language minority students from building robust identities. These dominant messages and deficit-based perspectives discourage diverse families from seizing the educational imperative and fully engaging the educational experience of their children. The teacher is fully responsible—in ethical, morale, and in civil rights terms—for creating a hospitable and culturally responsive environment, that
celebrates linguistic and cultural diversity, far beyond the superficial, and in a truly authentic way, allowing for linguistic minority students and families to enjoy equal opportunity, and an equitable education. The power and responsibility of a teacher is sobering and consequential, and the promise of an equitable and just society hinges on the day-to-day practice of the teacher.

The Emergent Bilingual Experience is a tapestry intertwining an infinite variability of circumstances. Variability ranging from immigration and socio-economic status, language proficiency and age, ethnicity and race, national origin and religion, family composition and culture: the emergent bilingual experience is in no way monolithic. Each emergent bilingual is an extremely unique case, and educators need to be equipped with comprehensive theoretical, pedagogical, practical, cultural, and linguistic knowledge in order to be able provide emergent bilingual students with equitable educations. Therefore, all educators need to continue to extend their educations and subscribe to an evolving praxis that incorporates the latest meta-discursive scholarship pertaining to the emergent bilingual experience.

Socio-Political Factors influence every aspect of student achievement. Language minority populations have been disenfranchised in the United States for hundreds of years. These inequitable socio-political structures persist in the present day within education and society at large. Language minority students must navigate through an unequitable society
and an educational system, while their identities are ignored, and their assets under appreciated. Cummins (2000) explains how bilingual students “are caught in the crossfire” of “xenophobic discourses” which is “broadcast into every classroom and constitutes the primary means through which coercive relations of power are enacted” (p. 4). Addressing the socio-political barriers students are confronted with, is a major component for supporting emergent bilingual students in the classroom.

**Language Policy** has a profound impact on the emergent bilingual student experience. Language restrictions mandating English or target language-only instruction disenfranchise students from actualizing their linguistic and academic potential and alienate students from their cultures and mother tongues. Inequitable language policies range from federal, state, and local initiatives, as well as the educational programs that schools and teachers implement. Nevertheless, the teacher is the most consequential policy maker, impacting emergent bilinguals’ success. Teachers need to fully educate themselves on bilingual pedagogy, so they may be equipped with evidence-based theory, practices and strategies and be able to challenge inequitable programs and methods within schools and classrooms.
**Bilingual Pedagogy** grounded in evidence-based scholarship fosters English-language proficiency, biliteracy, and academic success. Teachers should be well versed in equitable bilingual practices and understand how to deploy them effectively. Likewise, it is critical that educators understand how theory relates to practice, so they may confidently apply bilingual pedagogy without reservations. Effective bilingual education can reshape societies, communities, schools, learning environments, and most importantly, the lives of emergent bilingual students.
Section 2

Understanding Bilingual Pedagogy
The Benefits of Bilingualism

Educators should understand, appreciate, and promote the power of bilingualism in the classroom. Celebrating and conceptualizing the reality, that bilingualism is an indispensable asset, will enable educators to affirm the cultural, and linguistic identities of emergent bilingual students. In fact, a large body of research demonstrates that bilingual people benefit from a variety of advantages. The following are just some of the benefits of bilingualism that have been demonstrated by peer reviewed research:
Assessing Your Understanding of Bilingual Pedagogy

Educators are encouraged to self-assess their understanding of bilingual pedagogy and determine their depth of knowledge. Through self-assessment, educators can reflect, evaluate, and remediate gaps in understanding and seek professional development, for the benefit of language minority students.

The following *Bilingual Pedagogy Self-Assessment* is aligned with the current scholarship and will provide you with some excellent feedback for grasping your mastery of the discipline and helping you determine areas for growth.

Access the link to complete the self-assessment and receive your score:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScg8akQxVUd232VUNpbOkN5VEhJANeFuHpwf8bsR0Tn2Nc8A/viewform?usp=sf_link

If you did not answer all the answers correctly, it is possible that you are not supporting emergent bilingual students access an equitable education. Here are some recommended readings for you to develop your understanding of bilingual pedagogy:
Recommended Readings

Language, Power and Pedagogy
Bilingual Children in the Crossfire
Jim Cummins

Educating English Language Learners
Fred Genesee
Kathryn Lindholm-Leary
William Saunders
Donna Christian

Scaffolding: The Academic Success of Adolescent English Language Learners
Adela Wexler and Ann van Lier

Educating Emergent Bilinguals: Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners
Ofelia Garcia and Jo Anne Kleifgen
Foreword by Jim Cummins
Threshold Hypothesis

Although the threshold hypothesis has come under some scrutiny, it remains a most useful metaphor for understanding bilingual relationships. Jim Cummin’s threshold hypothesis argues that bilingual children must surpass a minimum level of literacy in either L1 or L2, in order to experience the benefits of bilingualism, which accumulate as a balance is approached among languages. The hypothesis interpreted the results of many groundbreaking studies on bilingualism and established an asset-based paradigm for bilingualism and a theoretical framework for bilingual education. Moreover, the threshold hypothesis provided a rationale for home language instruction, as a strong predictor for second language acquisition and proficiency. Some scholars have criticized the threshold hypothesis for maintaining the idea that bilingualism could result in negative consequences, while others argue that non-cognitive benefits accrue regardless. Notwithstanding, the hypothesis explains the barriers that language minority children confront in school when they do not receive responsive and equitable language education based on bilingual pedagogy (Teemant & Pinnegar, 2019).
Interlinguistic Transfer

Research has shown that a child must develop their home language to maximize the acquisition and academic proficiency in a second language. Primary language shapes the cognitive schematic of the brain, starting in a child’s infancy. Language, as a highly sophisticated and complex symbolic pattern, frames an individual’s thought process and communicative disposition. When a child engages and attempts to acquire a second language system, the primary language will attempt to reconcile the new pattern with the old. Although paradoxical, allowing students to engage and learn in their home language is backed by a large body of scientific evidence, as skills and content understanding mastered through the home language transfer to the secondary language. The below image provides a conceptualization of this process, as a new language system is gradually mastered, with the support and development of the home language pattern, languages transfer information between systems. Thus, a robust and highly developed home language facilitates second language acquisition and provides a dynamic and highly effective point of reference for interlinguistic and cognitive feedback.
Common Underlying Proficiency

An overwhelming consensus among language education researchers makes it abundantly clear: skills and understandings flow into a common pool of knowledge and literacy. This common underlying fund of knowledge and language skills is available to students, as they begin to read and write in a second language. Additionally, peer-reviewed research has proven, that literacy abilities developed in the home language is the strongest predictor for the development of L2 literacy and expanding a common underlying proficiency. The common underlying proficiency hypothesis provides a different perspective on how bilingualism works. The image below is an embodiment of common underlying proficiency, as both fountains can tap into a joint source of water, two language systems can also access a common source of literacy skills, knowledge, and abilities. The one difference between the image and how bilingualism works is that, while the fountains pump and spring old water, bilingualism generates new literacies that increase the level of the common reservoir. In this way, bilingualism is a dynamic and synergistic process that maximizes L1 and L2 proficiency.
Contrastive Analysis

The contrastive analysis hypothesis was perhaps the starting point for modern bilingual education theoretical frameworks. The contrastive analysis framework compares similarities and differences between L1 and L2, positive and negative transfer, and postulated that second language learners would experience a facilitation effect in areas where languages share commonalities, but complications and interference within the spaces where languages differ. It remains useful by providing a theoretical framework for comparing and contrasting bilingual systems.

Academic Language Proficiency

Misconceptions about how emergent bilinguals develop academic language are prevalent in education. Research has found that students need approximately 5 – 7 years in order to develop L2 academic fluency. This is an important finding, as emergent bilinguals are commonly placed in English-only settings and subsequently, into remedial or special education courses. Teachers should understand that emergent bilinguals can master conversational English rather quickly, between 1 – 2 years, while still needing home language instruction to support their L2 acquisition. Jim
Cummins created a useful chart for teachers to visualize the academic language development process, starting with basic conversational language, and progressing to academic language. Cummins explains that teachers should progress through the continuum first in quadrant A, then B, and finally to quadrant D, gradually increasing the academic language demands. Quadrant A represents activities such as anticipatory sets, class introductions, activating background knowledge, quadrant B includes collaboratively challenging activities, such as think-pair-shares, jigsaw activities, or quick write/round robins; while quadrant D activities are more abstract like independent readings of informational texts, or research reports. Quadrant C is the least interesting, usually in the form of busy work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Embedded</th>
<th>Cognitively Undemanding</th>
<th>Cognitively Demanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face,</td>
<td><strong>Everyday Topics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic Specific Vocabulary, New Ideas, Abstract Concepts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures,</td>
<td><strong>(Easy Content)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Difficult Content)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expressions, Familiar Language (Easy Language)</td>
<td>Quadrant A</td>
<td>Quadrant C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant B</td>
<td>Quadrant D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```markdown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant A</th>
<th>Quadrant C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant B</td>
<td>Quadrant D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Translanguaging

Translanguaging characterizes the linguistic practices of the bilingual community. Bilingual people draw from their full collection of cognitive and communicative tools in order to construct understanding. Similar to a strand of the DNA helix, bilingualism works together, intertwining into one linguistic apparatus. Emergent bilinguals thrive when they are allowed to fuse their home language with their target language, creating a new language: a translanguage. A translanguage is much more efficient than isolated bilingual systems, as they are interconnected and seamlessly communicate and transfer information. On the contrary, emergent bilinguals are disenfranchised when they are prevented from translanguaging and leveraging their linguistic and cognitive gifts.
Constructivism

Looking back at the Industrial Revolution, and a time when children were subjected to cruel and inhumane working and learning conditions, one can truly appreciate the significance of constructivism. Undoubtedly building off the Enlightenment ideals of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Piaget developed constructivism, and broke away from a behaviorist and deficit-based paradigm. Constructivism is a theory about education that prioritizes the student experience and is an approach that allows students to build profound and enduring meaning. Constructivist teachers know emergent bilingual students can thrive and engage in intellectual rigorous tasks and activities when they can learn by doing. Emergent bilingual students can engage and master any task when they are afforded with the time, space, and resources to synthesize their observations, their experiences, their realities, and construct evolving understandings. Constructivism is a highly ethical and noble pedagogical stance, an embodiment of democratic and socially just ideals, that honors the humanity of every student. A constructivist teacher is a highly skilled and conscientious operator, placing students in the epicenter of instruction, in authentic real-world activities, and facilitates transformative learning experiences for all students.
Sociocultural Learning Theory

Equity-based education was extended by the work of Lev Vygotsky, who established a sociocultural learning theory for education. Sociocultural learning theory builds from a constructivist perspective but emphasizes the teacher’s influence as a facilitator guiding students to construct meaning. A key to sociocultural learning is language production, collaboration with a more knowledgeable other, and student participation, as Vygotsky believed that language was the primary vehicle for thought. Vygotsky conceptualizes sociocultural learning with his Zone of Proximal Development, illustrating the difference between what students can do independently, with collaborative support, and with what is out of reach.

Scaffolding

The term scaffolding draws on constructivist and sociocultural philosophies but emphasizes specific supports for students in different situations. Refering to construction scaffolding, Jerome Bruner and associates wanted to invoke a pedagogy that was responsive and contingent to a given student’s needs, much like a building that is under construction. In essence, scaffolding is the specific praxis that would actualize Vygotsky’s sociocultural learning theory, and provides a mechanism for how to methodically operate in a ZPD.
## Principles for Quality Teaching for English Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Academic Rigor</td>
<td>Disciplinary specific knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplinary specific skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher order thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold High Expectations</td>
<td>High Challenge &amp; high Support activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metacognition and executive functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish criteria for mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Students in Quality</td>
<td>Sustained collaboration between teachers and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Construction of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain a Language Focus</td>
<td>Disciplinary language learning in meaningful context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit academic language instruction with specific feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Quality Curriculum</td>
<td>Scaffolded instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3

Inequitable Practices
English-Only Instruction

Monolingual language agendas persist in society at large, within schools, and classrooms. Although Prop 227, a bill restricting bilingual education in California has been overturned, the time on task argument is still widely held among educators and administrators. This misconception about how best to support emergent bilingual students is contrary to science, has severe ramifications, and is highly inequitable. Teachers have the discretion to reject English-only dogmas and implement evidence-based bilingual pedagogy in the classroom and provide equity to language minority people.

Isolating Languages

Imposing monolingual practices regardless of target language, is an inequitable practice because it restricts emergent bilingual students from leveraging their cognitive and linguistic assets. Isolating languages from one another deprives students from an indispensable component that facilitates the acquisition of any target language. Just like gears boost output speed for a machine, bilingualism torques the development of second language acquisition, as well as home language development. Separating languages systems stifles development, by restricting emergent bilingual students from utilizing their primary means of thinking, communicating, and constructing meaning.
**Impeding Home Language Development**

Dominant norms undermine home language development. These norms send inequitable and disempowering messages to emergent bilingual students. Emergent bilingual students are expected to abandon their home language and adopt English, by a society and educational system that devalues diversity and the cultural and linguistic practices of bilingual communities. Consequently, students are deprived of their most powerful asset: their mother tongues. As proceeding generations lose touch with their home language, language minority families experience communication barriers and may become disoriented from their cultures, which are invaluable resources. The implications of impeding the home language development of language minority populations are profound, and teachers need to refrain from stifling home language development in the classroom.

**Dominant Standards**

Language minority populations possess a universe of capabilities that are obscured in a classroom that only recognizes dominant standards. Science has only scratched the surface on the types of intelligences diverse people hold, and it is incumbent on educators to place a premium on discovering and appreciating alternative ways of doing and knowing. Standards are created based on what dominant culture deems important. Teachers should get to know their emergent bilingual students and their cultures deeply, so they may understand and promote those literacies in the classroom and support a plurality of standards.
Deficit Based Judgements

Unfortunately, deficit-based judgments about our emergent bilingual students are prevalent in education and among teachers. These deficit-based attitudes trickle down from society at large and toxify the learning environment for language minority students. Teachers should be aware that diverse families care deeply about the educations of their children, and that emergent bilingual students can engage and achieve anything that monolingual students can. In fact, a large body of research demonstrates that emergent bilinguals have a cognitive advantage. Educators should establish a learning environment where misconceptions and deficit-based predispositions are challenged and eradicated, so that emergent bilingual students are afforded with an equitable opportunity to learn.

Low Expectations

Teachers strongly influence student achievement as a result of their expectations. Teachers’ expectations determine a wide range of consequences for an emergent bilingual student. Low expectations can cause a teacher to reduce the intellectual challenge of a task, not call on a student, or over scaffold. Likewise, low expectations have the potential of marginalizing students into lower tracks, and disenfranchising students from academia. Teachers of emergent bilingual students should be aware of the benefits of bilingualism, the bilingual advantage, and related scholarship, and understand that emergent bilingual children thrive in cognitively demanding tasks. Holding low expectations prevents teachers from engaging students in intellectually stimulating and challenging cognitive activities.
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Equitable Practices
Home Language Development

Bilingual education focused on the home language development of emergent bilingual students is a best and equitable practice. Research shows that among the strongest factors for English language acquisition is extensive home language instruction. Furthermore, a strong body of scholarship has established that literacy instruction in the home language supports literacy development in English. Educators should be well versed in bilingual pedagogy, so they may have the confidence and expertise to support home language instruction, regardless of the setting in question.

Student Centered Instruction

Student centered instruction should be a priority for the benefit of emergent bilingual students. The traditional top-down educational approach, where teachers operate as the focal point of instruction, is common in schools, and has been proven to be highly ineffective. Emergent bilinguals thrive in activities where they can engage in challenging and authentic activities where they can learn by doing. A student-centered philosophy provides the foundation for equity-based practices for emergent bilingual students. As
teachers allow students to take control of the learning environment, they can focus on developing the capabilities of each student, through meticulous observation and contingent supports. Student-centered instruction optimizes instruction time, shifts the intellectual rigor to the student, and provides teachers with the appropriate stance to serve all students in the classroom.

Collaboration

Collaborative learning places emergent bilingual students in the best position to learn. Teamwork provides valuable context for students to construct meaning, such as facial expressions, body language, and casual language, providing language minority students with accessibility to academic language development and challenging content. While collaboration is undoubtedly a best practice, teachers should take care to maintain learning objectives, make in the moment adjustments to instruction and nudging individuals and groups towards enduring understandings on a case by case. Teachers should also gradually taper away from collaborative learning and towards independent learning, transferring the responsibility to the student.

Participation & Language Production

A key component for providing emergent bilingual students with an equitable education, is maximizing their participation. While misconceptions abound about participation-based learning, participation facilitates language production, which in turn stimulates higher order thinking and engagement.
Emergent bilingual students are often hesitant to participate due to language barriers and monocultural learning environments. Therefore, in order to provide language minority student with access to meaningful learning experiences, teachers need to prioritize creating hospitable learning environments that activate the cultural and linguistic practices of diverse students. Moreover, learning environments should be adapted to provide more opportunities for bilingual students to participate. Only then will emergent bilingual students feel comfortable to be themselves, engage, participate, and produce language.

**Scaffolded Instruction**

Scaffolding instruction, based on the specific needs of all students, is a highly equitable practice. Scaffolding instruction requires teachers to get to know each student in a genuine way, so they may diagnose their skills, background knowledge, literacy levels, and language proficiency. After teachers understand students’ strengths and areas for growth, they are able to implement contingent supports based on emergent bilingual students’ specific and evolving needs.
Scaffolded Instruction

Scaffolding instruction based on the specific strengths and learning needs of each student, is the hallmark of good teaching. Nevertheless, over-scaffolding instruction for emergent bilingual students is very common, and disenfranchises them from academically rigorous opportunities to grow. Below is a useful checklist for scaffolding instruction appropriately for emergent bilingual students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolded Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Asset based perspective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Contingent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Maintains the challenge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Student speaking and writing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Collaboration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Construction of knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Productive struggle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Higher order thinking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Inquiry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Problem solving?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Metacognition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Metalinguistic awareness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Executive functioning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Autonomy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Universal Design for Learning

A Universal Design for Learning is another equitable approach teachers can employ to support the specific learning needs of emergent bilingual students. A Universal Design for Learning or a UDL, recognizes the wide array of intelligences, learning styles, and background knowledge that diverse students possess. Adapting the learning environment to include a multiplicity of entry points for access to the curriculum, and meaningful learning experiences, embodies a Universal Design for Learning. Emergent bilingual students excel in school when they are able engage a curriculum that is adapted to incorporate their strengths, interests, and their experiences. For additional information about the UDL Framework please visit https://www.cast.org.
Project Based Learning

Project based learning is a great way to apply constructivist learning theory, as well sociocultural learning theory, especially when students are allowed to work in teams. Teachers are encouraged to create rich opportunities for students to work in groups, and construct disciplinary specific products, knowledge, and language.
Inquiry Based Learning

Inquiry based learning serves as a robust scaffold for all students, regardless of background knowledge and language proficiency levels. Essential questions require students to provide a cognitive and linguistic response, and guide students to construct meaning, within disciplinary specific contexts, and support all students to achieve academic standards.
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Equitable Strategies
Evidence Based Lesson Planning

In order to maximize valuable instructional time for emergent bilingual students, lesson plans should embody constructivist, sociocultural, and scaffolded instruction. Therefore, teachers should follow the following general lesson plan format:
Evidence Based Lesson Planning

Walqui, and van Lier (2010) build on this basic framework for lesson planning, with their *Three Moments in a Lesson*:

| 1. Preparing the Learners | • Explicit concept instruction  
|                          | • Activating/building content knowledge  
|                          | • Vocabulary instruction  |
| 2. Interacting with Text  | • Close reading text chunks  
|                          | • Contextualizing chunk to the text at large  
|                          | • Make connections between ideas in the text  |
| 3. Extending Understanding | • Reorganize the text in a new format or genre  
|                          | • Apply new understandings to the real-world, other scenarios, for inquiry, or problem solving  |

Evidence Based Lesson Planning

Below is a model lesson plan based on best practices for emergent bilinguals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Objective:</th>
<th>Students will be able to describe the growth and effects of new ways of disseminating information during the European Renaissance, citing textual evidence to support conclusions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the Learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Set</td>
<td>Teacher presents short clip of “Wreck it Ralph Breaks the Internet,” to connect the lesson objective to students lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think - Pair - Share</td>
<td>Students talk about their experiences and the consequences of using social media and the internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickwrite/Round Robin</td>
<td>Students quickly answer the essential question in groups of four and share their comments with group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>One student per group shares responses to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Model</td>
<td>Teacher models how to close read informational text set and how to use a literacy/comprehension strategy (e.g., double entry journal, anticipation reaction guide, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jigsaw Groups &amp; Cause and Effect Graphic Organizer</td>
<td>Students form base groups of four and close read the text set, each student focusing on a component of the lesson objective, completing a history cause and effect graphic organizer as a team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Jigsaw Groups</td>
<td>In expert groups of four, students work together, sharing insights, negotiating and constructing meaning, re-reading the text and modifying graphic organizers as a team, becoming experts on the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Original Jigsaw Groups</td>
<td>Experts return to their original groups and share their mastery of the topic with original members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Reading</td>
<td>Students continue reading the text independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming to a Consensus</td>
<td>Students in base groups come to a consensus and respond to the essential question prompt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Closure</td>
<td>Whole class discussion and summarization of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Learning Strategies

The following collaborative learning strategies can be used to design pedagogically rich lessons, placing emergent bilingual students in the best position to succeed (Kagan, 1985, Walqui & Van Lier, 2010). Each activity provides students with opportunities to construct knowledge, produce language in context— in writing and verbally— and through collaboration. As the entire classroom is engaged in these activities and communicating, teachers are afforded with valuable opportunities to assess all students and scaffold instruction on a case by case. Here are just a few collaborative learning strategies that can help teachers design evidence-based instruction for emergent bilingual students:

**Think - Pair – Share:**

**Prompt:** Yesterday we learned about the Colombian Exchange. Please explain what the lasting effects were of the Colombian Exchange?

1. Students work in pairs, with elbow partners.
2. Students first answer the prompt in writing individually.
3. Students take turns sharing their answers with each other.
4. Subsequently, teacher holds a whole class discussion, and calls on one member of each group to share both responses.
Quick Write/Round Robin:

**Prompt:** In what real-life situations would we see a linear function and an exponential function?

1. Students collaborate in teams of four to six.
2. Students answer the prompt in writing individually.
3. Students take turns sharing their answers with each other, in a circular fashion, each student providing their undivided attention to the speaker, without interruption.
4. After all students have a chance to share their written responses, students may engage each other more freely, constructing meaning together, and discovering the answer to the prompt as a team.
5. Subsequently, teacher holds a whole class discussion, calling on one or two members of each group to inform the class about the discussion.
The Expert Jigsaw Activity:

**Prompt:** Compare the German, Italian, Japanese, and Soviet drives for empire in the 1930s.

1. Students are placed in base groups of four, with each student focusing on one country.
2. In base groups, students receive the lesson text sets, orient themselves on the instructions and the expectations, and begin reading their portion of the text set independently.
3. Next, students are afforded a brief opportunity to share ideas in a round-robin, and subsequently discuss and comment freely.
4. Students now move to expert groups, meeting with other students who are tasked with the same country. All students close read the same text as a team, answering their portion of the prompt, and citing evidence.
5. After all students answer their portion of the prompt, they return to educate their base groups members accordingly.
6. Teacher facilitates a whole class discussion, calling on a few members per table to summarize their findings, engaging the prompt as a class.
7. Students are then required to answer the prompt in writing independently.
The Socratic Seminar:

Prompt: How do the four accounts of the first crusade show different perspectives? Please cite specific textual evidence to support your arguments.

1. Teacher selects a rich, relevant, and concise text that is carefully aligned to the learning objective and that can be interpreted in a variety of ways.

2. Students are provided with a Socratic Seminar rubric outlining the expectations for participation, emphasizing active listening, facilitation, referring to textual evidence, not interrupting, being respectful and tolerant to other students’ views, etc.

3. Students are seated in a circle, and are instructed to closely read the text, annotating, highlighting, and underlining relevant textual evidence.

4. Students are instructed to write down their reactions, and a list of open-ended questions for the discussion, after closely reading the text.

5. Teacher establishes the expectations for the conversation, emphasizing that the teacher is simply an outside observer, and that students are in control of the conversation. Students are also instructed to extend and to develop the ideas of others.

6. Teacher starts the Socratic Seminar by offering an open-ended essential question for students to consider.

7. After the Socratic Seminar is concluded, students are provided with an opportunity to reflect on the discussion, providing each other with feedback, and any transformative experiences.
Coming to a Consensus:

**Prompt:** Read the text set in groups of four and come to a consensus. Complete the graphic organizer and write a paragraph explaining how the military and economic balance of power shifted after World War II? All group members’ graphic organizers and paragraphs must be identical.

- Coming to a Consensus is an interchangeable strategy that could be adapted to a wide range of tasks and objectives. Below is a basic conceptualization of the coming to a consensus process.

![Flowchart of consensus based decision-making](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/)

Source. “Flowchart of consensus based decision-making” by Grant Horwood is licensed under creative commons 2.5 [https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/]
Bilingual Instructional Strategies

Explicit Cognate Instruction:

Teachers should model how to draw relationships among cognates between English and Spanish (Cummins, 2005). Teachers can utilize the following format to begin explicit cognate instruction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ify</em></td>
<td><em>ificar</em></td>
<td><em>ty</em></td>
<td><em>idad</em></td>
<td><em>ate</em></td>
<td><em>ar</em></td>
<td><em>ant</em></td>
<td><em>ante</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Justificar</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Utilidad</td>
<td>Activate</td>
<td>Activar</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Importante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantify</td>
<td>Cuantificar</td>
<td>Eternity</td>
<td>Eternidad</td>
<td>Fabricate</td>
<td>Fabricar</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectify</td>
<td>Rectificar</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Identidad</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Evaluar</td>
<td>Instant</td>
<td>Instante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unify</td>
<td>Unificar</td>
<td>Infinity</td>
<td>Infinidad</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>Eliminar</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>Distante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>Verificar</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Habilidad</td>
<td>Illuminate</td>
<td>Iluminar</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>Constante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Modificar</td>
<td>Humanity</td>
<td>Humanidad</td>
<td>Negotiate</td>
<td>Negociar</td>
<td>Repugnant</td>
<td>Repugnante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacify</td>
<td>Pacificar</td>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>Unidad</td>
<td>Terminate</td>
<td>Terminar</td>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>Elefante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversify</td>
<td>Diversificar</td>
<td>Dignity</td>
<td>Dignidad</td>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>Participar</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Infante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
<th>English Suffix</th>
<th>Spanish Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ify</em></td>
<td><em>ificar</em></td>
<td><em>ty</em></td>
<td><em>idad</em></td>
<td><em>ate</em></td>
<td><em>ar</em></td>
<td><em>ant</em></td>
<td><em>ante</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Utilidad</td>
<td>Activate</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantify</td>
<td>Eternidad</td>
<td>Fabricate</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectify</td>
<td>Identidad</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Instante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unify</td>
<td>Infinidad</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>Habilidad</td>
<td>Illuminate</td>
<td>Constante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Humanidad</td>
<td>Negotiate</td>
<td>Repugnante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacify</td>
<td>Unidad</td>
<td>Terminate</td>
<td>Elefante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversify</td>
<td>Dignidad</td>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>Infante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explicit Genre Instruction:

Emergent bilingual students can engage academic language within any discipline if they are apprenticed to understand the trade secrets of each register. Therefore, teachers should provide explicit genre instruction, so emergent bilinguals can understand, deconstruct, and construct the structures of the text types they work with. Teachers should create easy to understand exemplars that deconstruct abstract text types, so students can master abstract disciplinary texts, understand not only to decode them, but to create them as well.
Dual Language identity texts:

Teachers should encourage emergent bilingual students to compose dual language identity texts. Cummins (2005) explains the effectiveness of this bilingual instructional strategy best:

“In short, the creation of dual-language books (multimedia or just print) encourages students to take ownership of the target language in the context of a cognitively challenging (but engaging) task. They are enabled to express (and amplify) their identities through both languages and, literally, see themselves as bilinguals who can communicate with a wider audience by using two languages rather than just one. (p. 10)”

Students should be prompted to write a short story, that affirms their identity and culture, and translate the story in their home language. This technique is highly effective and equitable, on a multiplicity of levels and maximizes transfer among languages.
Home Language Strategies:

Teachers are encouraged to orient students in their home language, and leverage home language practices in the following areas based on students’ needs.

- Vocabulary
- Previewing lessons
- Providing translations of lesson texts
- Literacy strategies
- Making connections between home and target language
- Providing bilingual dictionaries, books, and software
- Permitting the use of Google Translate
- Heterogenous bilingual ability groupings
- Contrastive analysis between L1 and L2
- Using identity texts
- Home language writing assignments
- Code switching tasks

Translanguaging Spaces

Teachers should create learning environments where bilingualism is acknowledged and facilitated in the classroom. Bilingual education researchers have developed a *translanguaging pedagogy*, which recognizes the dynamic linguistic practices of bilingual people, as well as their educational value. Teachers should deliberately welcome emergent bilingual students to use all their linguistic resources, at any given time. Garcia et al. (2017) describe a translanguaging pedagogy, as a *stance, design, and a shift*:

**Translanguaging stance:**

The theoretical and epistemic background teachers need in order to have the confidence to employ bilingual instructional strategies

**Translanguaging design:**

The adaptations to the learning environment, resources, lesson planning, strategies, and assessment needed in order to implement a translanguaging space.

**Translanguaging shift:**

The predisposition teachers need in order to adjust the instruction towards bilingual ways of knowing and doing.

Scaffolding Strategies

Teachers can employ the following basic scaffolding strategies as a foundation for scaffolding instruction for emergent bilingual students:

**Modeling:**
Teacher provides students with a specific example of what is expected.

**Bridging:**
Teacher activates background knowledge and experience, connecting new knowledge with prior knowledge.

**Contextualization:**
Teacher uses multiple modes for presenting information and activating multiple senses to comprehend academic language.

**Schema Building:**
Teacher apprentices students to see the big picture and build mental frameworks for organizing seemingly unrelated information.

**Text Representation:**
Teacher prompts students to transform a text in one genre into another genre.

**Developing Metacognition:**
Teacher supports students build executive functioning and strategic skills

Literacy Strategies

Literacy strategies are specific techniques students use as they read or interpret any text, whether it be in writing or in any other mode. Emergent bilinguals should receive explicit instruction for how to interpret the texts they interact with, including strategies for interpretation through the mother tongue. These strategies are highly effective and come in many forms. The key element to an effective literacy strategy is if it promotes executive functioning, awareness, autonomy, comprehension, and academic language development. In addition, effective literacy strategies facilitate emergent bilingual students to use context, connect background knowledge with new knowledge, supervising their own comprehension, and contrastively analyze their languages (Riches & Genesee, 2006).
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